



Progression to Examination Decision Document

Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

Name of neighbourhood area	Colwall Neighbourhood Area
Parish Council	Colwall Parish Council
Draft Consultation period (Reg14)	1 February to 15 March 2018
Submission consultation period (Reg16)	14 February 2019 to 27 March 2020

Determination

Is the organisation making the area application the relevant body under section 61G (2) of the 1990 Act		Yes
Are all the relevant documentation included within the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map showing the area • The Neighbourhood Plan • Consultation Statement • SEA/HRA • Basic Condition statement 	Reg15	Yes
Does the plan meet the definition of a NDP - 'a plan which sets out policies in relation to the development use of land in the whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the plan'	Localism Act 38A (2)	Yes
Does the plan specify the period for which it is to have effect?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
Are any 'excluded development' included?	1990 61K / Schedule 1	No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County matter • Any operation relating to waste development • National infrastructure project 		
Does it relation to only one neighbourhood area?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
Have the parish council undertaken the correct procedures in relation to consultation under Reg14?		Yes
<p>Is this a repeat proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has an proposal been refused in the last 2 years or • Has a referendum relating to a similar proposal had been held and • No significant change in national or local strategic policies since the refusal or referendum. 	Schedule 4B para 5	No

Summary of comments received during submission consultation

External Consultation Responses	
Severn Trent	<p>Policy CD2 – supportive of sub section 5 however the policy should go further and include a specific section on Surface Water Drainage and Sustainable urban Drainage</p> <p>Building design – should include water efficiency in buildings</p> <p>Policy CD3 – surface water should be managed sustainably on site through SuDs. There is known hydraulic flooding incidents in the downstream network</p> <p>Policy CD4 – surface water should be managed sustainably on site through SuDs. There is a watercourse adjacent to the site which provides a potential surface water outfall. There are known hydraulic flooding incidents in the downstream network.</p>
Welsh Water	Not the statutory water and sewerage undertaken for Colwall therefore no comments to make.
Malvern Hills AONB unit	<p>Worked closely with the parish council, support the draft but would like to point out some corrections and amendments.</p> <p>Para 4.24 – should read context not contest</p> <p>Policy CD8 para 3 – needs sense checking</p>

	<p>Policy CD8 para 14 – delete the sentence with starts ‘An exception ‘</p> <p>Policy CD8 para 15 – suggested now sentence ‘use of timber boarding is encouraged as it provides excellent natural ventilation for new agricultural buildings and it may be possible to source this locally. Applying a stain or paint finish to this boarding would often help to integrate a building more successfully into the landscape, especially if it is sited in a more prominent position’</p>
Historic England	<p>Pleased to note that suggestions at Reg14 have been taken on board.</p> <p>No further substantive comments to make.</p>
National Grid	No record of assets within the neighbourhood area
Highway England	Not expected that the low development in Colwall will have any impact on the operation of the strategic network. No objections to make.
Ledbury Town Council	<p>Excellent and clearly worded document. Landscape assessment and analysis work very well presented and understandable. Design Guide inclusion was very useful and concise.</p> <p>Didn't always find the maps or diagrams easy to follow or accurately locate. Some keys a bit difficult to follow or relate to the information.</p>
Coal Authority	No specific comments to make
NFU	<p>Ensure that NDPs promote carbon neutrality and climate change provisions for farming. Policy CD2, CD5, CD6, CD8 and CD9 need to be amended.</p> <p>Plan should reflect appeal decision at Chances Pitch, Colwall.</p> <p>Plan appears onerous and restrictive for agricultural development.</p> <p>Design and Colour – concerned about this approach – too restrictive colour pallet</p> <p>Promote high quality design – policy CD2 can't be applied to farm buildings</p> <p>Policy CD5 – policy needs to support the farming community</p> <p>Policy CD6 – policy needs to support the farming community</p> <p>Policy CD8 – policy should accord with national policy and the Agricultural Bill</p> <p>CD9 - Polytunnels – should have positive policies to accommodate these and should not be more restrictive</p> <p>CRE1 - Renewable Energy – supportive of approach</p>
Herefordshire Council Responses	
Strategic Planning	Confirm that the plan is in conformity with the Core Strategy
Environmental Health	<p>Policy CD3 Site 1 – no previous historic potentially contaminative uses</p> <p>Policy CD4 Site 2 - western section of the site has historically been uses as an orchard and the majority of the site has been used as a farm. Could have been</p>

	<p>exposed to a legacy of contamination from agricultural spraying</p> <p>Historic maps indicate a tramline along the southern boundary - potential contaminative used could be present.</p>
<p>Environmental Health - air, noise</p>	<p>No comments to add</p>
<p>Transportation</p>	<p>Page 42 – Point 5 – The first 5m off the public highway should be of a consolidated/hard material such as tarmac or block paving, gravel is not acceptable to the local highway authority (LHA) for the first 5m. Gravel will also not be suitable for areas to be adopted by the LHA.</p> <p>Page 45 – Point 24 – Car parking should be adequately screened <u>whilst maintaining visibility splays</u>.</p> <p>Page 50 – Policy CD4 Site 2 Grovesend Farm – Point 2 – Can this be achieved?</p> <p>Page 82 – Point 2 – Malvern Hills AONB Guidance on Highway Design <u>and Herefordshire Council’s Highway Design Guide for New Developments</u>.</p> <p>From Page 83: 4. Use ‘flag signs’ to indicate side roads. Traditional finger posts and milestones should be retained wherever possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What does this mean in practice? For all side roads in the village? Does this mean local direction signage opposite junctions in lieu of warning signage etc. Some elaboration may be useful. <p>From Page 83: 7. Public lighting should be dimmed as per HC policy for whole county</p> <p>From Page 83: 9. Road surfacing should use local stone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Again, what does this mean, what is considered local in this context (e.g. is Kington local?). The LHA will have some specifications for materials that are unachievable for some quarries so understanding the meaning of this would be helpful. It may be an appearance led requirement which would benefit from clearer wording <p>Page 91 – Indicative layout – Avoid planting in visibility splays and a turning head should be provided.</p> <p>Page 92 – Indicative layout – A turning head should be provided.</p>
<p>Development Management</p>	<p>General Comment</p> <p>A contents page for policies would aid officers to find policies. A good example of this can be found at the end of the Cradley NDP, which sets aside a couple of pages and lists each policy individually.</p> <p>Policy CSB1 – Colwall Settlement Boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers felt that if you decide to define a settlement boundary, then it should be somewhat reasonable to build to the settlement boundary, albeit within. Confusion was raised given that the last sentence of this particular policy seems to conflict with that of the first part of the policy. • It was noted that the settlement boundary seems to exclude ‘Mill Lane’, to which it is understood that there is a current application in for this site.

- Questions as to whether there are there any realistic development opportunities at Orlin Road. If not, officers question as to why is it being included as part of the settlement boundary, and whether realistically, this should be omitted.

Policy CD1 – Protecting Exceptional Key Views

- Whilst acknowledging the sensitivity of the Malvern Hills AONB, it seems somewhat far-fetched/excessive for a LVIA to be undertaken for minor residential development (i.e. 1/2/3 new dwellings).
- Officers feel that the level of information really should be proportionate to the type of application proposed.
- A suggestion to re-word the policy in that – ‘development proposals will need to consider the landscape impacts and level of information is proportionate to development proposed’.
- The way the policy works, seems like the whole village would need an LVIA?
- Suggestion to simplify the map attached to this policy. Officers encourage to have a look at Wellington Heath viewpoints and ridgelines policy (WH14) – which actually directs where the viewpoints are identified.

Policy CD2 – General Design Principles for Development within Colwall Settlement Boundary

- It is suggested to split up this policy, as it is, to put it simply, too much detail. It is suggested that it can be broken up into individual policies, e.g. one for new residential development; one for householders; one for heritage assets – generally it would be much easier and 5 or 6 policies can be made out of this one policy.
- In relation to point 21. It is queried as to the use of steel as a material
- In regards to point 23. settlement pattern should really apply to the conservation area and perhaps reference should be made to the recent dismissed appeal at Mathon Road, particularly given Colwall settlement, as a whole, has a variety of different settlement patterns, particularly when you compare the conservation area and development immediately adjacent. May be worth including this point as part of conservation area and built environment.
- Point 26 can be a separate policy
- Less is more in truth.

Policy CD3 – Site 1 Former Primary School and adjacent land (approximately 9 houses)

- Officers felt on first impression that it does seem somewhat restrictive to limit where built development will take place, as the site plot is not dissimilar to Elms Drive above, which only has 5 houses and a completely different pattern of development on another part of the site. A proposed layout is likely to look completely out of context. Doesn't seem hugely sensitive.
- Indeed, when you viewed the indicative layout at the appendix, it seems

confusing when you read the policy. Namely, it says 9 in the policy but 14 dwellings are shown on the indicative layout. If so, is affordable housing to be sought after?

- Officers felt that points 2 thru 6 inclusive seemed to say the same thing.
- At point 7 officers queries as to how good design can really be achieved, if development is being restricted, likely to end up as out-of-context or character.

Policy CD4 – Grovesend Farm (approximately 37 houses)

- Officers have no comments to offer on this particular policy and felt it would defer to officers in the Majors team to offer any input on this.

Policy CD5 – General Design Principles for Development in the Wider Countryside

- A positive was felt that principle of development was comprehensively clear with outside the settlement boundary being immediately RA3/RA4/RA5/RA6.
- As a point of caution, at point B(12), it should be made clear that cabling is beyond the remit of planning and is permitted development.

Policy CD6 - Farmsteads

- Officers wish to make clear that a right to a view is not a material planning consideration.
- If the policy is to do with conversion as a whole, then this is appropriate, but a conflict would ensue if a farmstead is continued to be used as farmstead. For example, a new agricultural building next to the farmstead, would not conflict with policy, but queried about the continued viability of farmstead.
- Clearly, a question would be raised if conflict would take place with the NDP on siting because it's adjacent to the farmstead, but also alternative siting is isolated and remote, raising concerns also.

Policy CD7 – Protecting Archaeology

- No comments to make

Policy CD8 – New Agricultural Buildings

- Firstly, officers felt to draw attention to policy CD6, which needs clarification on point 2, particularly the appropriate location of farm buildings.
- Point 4 and 5 raises a question as to what is the operational need of the farmstead? This seems unnecessarily limited in terms of scope.
- An agricultural building is a simple rectangular form, compromising use by features.
- Officers felt that this policy is unduly restrictive and needs a comprehensive review. Its aims in reality are unrealistic.

Policy CD9 – Poly-tunnels

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to offer <p>Policy CH1 – Range and Mix of Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to offer on this policy <p>Policy CF1 Supporting A Range of Goods and Services in the Village Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers felt that the policy needs the inclusion of appropriate marketing for at least a continuous period of 12 months as a minimum, particularly in relation to community and social facilities such as public houses and the village shop, in line with supporting background information to Policy SC1 of Herefordshire Council’s Core Strategy. <p>Policy CF2 Recreation Facilities and Open Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make <p>Policy CF3 Local Green Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make <p>Policy CRE1 - Renewable Energy Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers noted that no mentioned of biomass proposals or ground source heat pumps has been made, bearing in mind that the Neighbourhood Area as received certain application types within recent times e.g. Barton Court. <p>Other comments by officers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers felt that some aspects of planning were not evident within the NDP and thoughts should be given to potentially including this aspects. This encompassed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tourism – particularly given Colwall’s relation to the Malvern Hills AONB ○ Rural Economy – for the same reason as above ○ Full Householders policy – many NDP tend to focus predominately towards residential development when 70/75% of applications are full householder applications. • Officers noted the potential of a new highways policy, which was located in appendix 1, and cannot be considered as a policy in its current location. It was suggested that this could be a policy on its own. • As a matter of closing, Policy CD2 needs to be split up clearly into residential/full householder applications.
Other Responses	
Kathleen Beard Local Resident	<p>Field adjoining the school should be included and Grovesend field should be excluded</p> <p>Planning application for 37 houses on the site next to the school.</p> <p>The landscape assessment has been dramatically altered over time for both Mill Lane and Grovesend Farm.</p>

	<p>Object that the village was not consulted on the designation of the fields or given a chance to express views. Villagers views at Reg14 were ignored.</p> <p>Grovesend site is in a Conservation Area, listed houses to the north, outside the settlement boundary, part of industrial heritage in the southern section.</p> <p>Village had no input in the site selection. Accept the need for housing but Grovesend Farm will not satisfy this.</p> <p>Is within the AONB and has poor access – Old Church Road is very narrow with no passing places.</p> <p>Mill Lane site has none of the problems and benefits from easy access.</p>
<p>Carl Tipping Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend field is unsuitable for development. Is within a conservation area. Church Road is unsuitable to accept the increase in traffic.</p>
<p>Lyn and Marcia Ballard Local Resident</p>	<p>Consider access for the large number of vehicle movements which are bound to occur from such a large development must be a very important consideration.</p> <p>Grovesend Field needs to be accessed onto Old Church Road, potential hazardous junction. No pavements and sight line blocked. No pedestrian access to school in Mill Lane.</p> <p>Access for school children much safer from Mill Lane. Consider Mill Lane would be far the best.</p>
<p>David Longman Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to Mill Lane.</p> <p>Mill Lane is much busier than Old Church Road and extra traffic would destroy rural aspect of the road. No footpath after the village hall. Only facility is the church. The original plan should be adhered to.</p>
<p>Fiona Campbell Local Resident</p>	<p>Current planning application for 37 dwellings near the school is not included within the plan. This looks well thought through within a variety of house types. Makes sense considering the location, close to facilities,</p> <p>Grovesend Field would seem a less attractive proposition given the location. Old Church Road is narrow and no pavements. Increase in traffic will be disruptive to the village.</p> <p>Mill Road site is incorporated in place of the Grovesend Field site as the safer and better option.</p>
<p>Bob and Pauline Wood Local Resident</p>	<p>Ridiculous proposing building houses on Grovesend field. Narrow lane, no public transport, no pavement, no adequate drainage. Bungalows on Crescent would almost certainly flood.</p>
<p>Alan Seddon Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Field is an area of major significance in the history of Colwall, building would destroy matters which need to be conserved. How can traffic safely access as Church Road is narrow and without pavements.</p> <p>Better solution to develop around Mill Lane with access to the school and village hall.</p>

<p>Peter Hayward Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend is misconceived. The site is within a Conservation Area, the proposed development does not preserve or enhance the conservations area. Poor access, road is too narrow to permit a footpath.</p> <p>Visual sensitive is a challenge for Colwall as the whole village is visible from the Malvern Hills. Grovesend Field is clearly visible from Herefordshire Beacon and Worcestershire Beacon</p> <p>Mill Lane (current planning application (P200156) has not been seriously considered by the parish council because of the landscape sensitivity. This seems arbitrary and difficult to see why they are different.</p> <p>The school changes the balance. Wrapping housing around the building will reduce its visual impact. Mill Lane has better vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian access.</p>
<p>Zoe Cartell Baker Local Resident</p>	<p>Ask that Mill Lane is added to the current Colwall NDP and Grovesend Field is removed.</p> <p>Grovesend is not appropriate for development and should be given greater protection as it lies within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Old Church Road is already without pathways and increased flow of traffic would be dangerous.</p> <p>Mill Lane has better access to key parts of the village</p>
<p>Sylyia Stringer Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Field is a ridiculous place to develop considering the narrow roads surrounding it and terrible access.</p> <p>Mill lane is much more logical, safe and easily accessed.</p>
<p>Chris and Christine Honeywell Local Residents</p>	<p>Development of Mill Lane, behind the school, would be far more acceptable than Grovesend Field which lies within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Grovesend Field has historical links which should be preserved. Problem with unsafe access. Mill Lane has safer access to village amenities.</p>
<p>Brian Ballard Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Field should be deleted from the NDP and Mill Lane substituted. The plan to have housing and a school was popular in the village. The inclusion of Grovesend Field surprised many in the village.</p> <p>Both sites were rated identical in Jan 2018 but the ratings was set differently. The capacity of Mill Lane was also reduced. Seems a flimsy argument when set against the feelings of the village. View of residents are secondary to views of outside consultant then the plan is merely a fig leaf.</p>
<p>Geoff Standland Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to the inclusion of Grovesend Field. Area is of historical importance to Colwall with the remains of industrial heritage and bordered by a number of listed buildings. The access is poor. Old Church Road is narrow and lacks pavements.</p> <p>Mill Lane provides a safe and more sustainable option with links to local facilities and a junction with excellent sight lines.</p>
<p>Alan Martin</p>	<p>Object to Grovesend Field. Site is totally unsuitable from a number of viewpoints.</p>

Local Resident	<p>Very narrow traffic outlet of Old Church Road and narrow lanes, no pavements facilities. Awkward junction which is seriously congested.</p> <p>Do see the reasoning behind the selection of Grovesend Field rather than Mill Lane. More safe option for pedestrians, good clear direct vehicle exit to the main road and close to village facilities.</p>
Christopher Walker Local Resident	<p>Objection to Grovesend Field</p> <p>The plan prevents building on the land by the school in Mill Lane, option supported by villagers.</p> <p>Both sites are within the AONB, both visible from the Malvern Hills.</p> <p>Mill Lane should be included because Grovesend Field is within the conservation area, historic industrial importance and bordered by listed buildings. Poor access and awkward junction, lack of pavements.</p> <p>Mill Lane provides a safer option, excellent pedestrian access to key amenities.</p>
F Allsop Local Resident	<p>Best way to preserve Grovesend Field is by using the Mill Lane site for development.</p> <p>Less dangerous giving access to many key amenities and not committing extra traffic to Oak Drive; an already busy slip road</p>
Mrs Howe Local Resident	<p>Concerned about building on Grovesend Field two years ago. Unsuitable access via Old Church Road. No pavements or paths only grass verges.</p>
Stephen West Local Resident	<p>Great concern regarding the development of Grovesend Field. Concern for safety of road users, destroy rural feel of this part of the village.</p> <p>Alternative near the school is vastly more sensible for residential development, safe access to the road network. The value and connectivity of Grovesend Field for wildlife is considerably more significant than the residual on the already disturbed land near the school.</p> <p>Object to the development of Grovesend Field wholeheartedly</p>
Julian Beard Local Resident	<p>Vehicle and pedestrian access totally unsuitable for development of this size</p>
Ann Roberson Local Resident	<p>Do not support proposed 37 additional houses at Grovesend Farm.</p> <p>Instead the Mill Lane site adjacent to the school would be more suitable.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm is in a conservation area and of historic industrial importance with listed buildings. Very poor access road, poor visibility.</p> <p>Mill Lane site is the safer option, more convenient solution for younger families near the school. Better pedestrian and vehicular access.</p> <p>These views were reflected in the 2012 and 2015 SHLAA.</p>

<p>Keith Fairburn Local Resident</p>	<p>Proposed development of Grovesend Farm is absolutely ridiculous. No amenities, no sewerage, electricity, water, gas. Sewerage plant needs upgrading.</p> <p>Extra traffic will cause pollution, roads are in a terrible state. Within an area of outstanding natural beauty. All brownfield sites should be developed first.</p> <p>Mill Lane site would be better option.</p>
<p>Miles Huckle Local Resident</p>	<p>Process to identify land does not represent the direction the village has made clear.</p> <p>The land off Mill Lane originally proposed with broad village acceptance would be preferable</p>
<p>Peter Bridges Local Resident</p>	<p>Cannot understand why the proposed development site at Mill Lane is not included within the NDP and more sensitive Grovesend Farm is.</p> <p>Both sites are within the AONB and visible from the Malvern Hills</p> <p>Grovesend Field is within the conservation area and should have greater protection. Of historical importance to industrial heritage and listed buildings to the north. Very poor access and awkward junction, lack of pavements</p> <p>Mill lane provides a safer and more sustainable option, pedestrian access to local amenities, well designed junction.</p> <p>Affordable housing on Mill Lane will allow families to settle in Colwall neat school</p>
<p>Dawn Harford Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Field is within the conservation area and should be awarded greater protection. Historical important industrial heritage, listed buildings to north. Poor access, lack of pavements</p> <p>Mill Lane provides a safer option with excellent pedestrian access to key amenities. Well-designed junction with excellent sight lines</p>
<p>Richard King Local Resident</p>	<p>Do not support Grovesend Farm.</p> <p>Mill Lane adjacent to the school would be far more suitable.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm is in a conservation area and should be protected. Important historical industrial heritage and listed buildings. Very poor road access and poor visibility</p> <p>Mill Lane provides a safer option and convenient for young families near the school. Better pedestrian access. Outside the floodplain</p> <p>These views expressed in the 2012 and 2015 SHLAA.</p> <p>In 2015 version of the plan, option for a new school was put forward, there was no option for Grovesend Farm. Parish consultation supported housing as Mill Far, with the school site. At this point Mill Lane was seen as suitable.</p>
<p>Michael Raymond Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to the inclusion of Grovesend Farm in the NDP. It is within the conservation area, off historical importance. Poor access, narrow roads and awkward junction.</p> <p>The Mill Lane development is excluded and offers a safer and more suitable</p>

	option, better pedestrian and road access, near key amenities and offering affordable housing.
Richard Beard Local Resident	<p>Strongly object to the Colwall NDP</p> <p>NDP is not in line with the community response. Mill Lane site was heavily supported by the village for a school and housing. Consultation document ignored or dismissed. 2018 a u-turn on site selection.</p> <p>LSCA used but other matters not considered or weight given to them. The NDP fails to deliver sites that can be developed. LSCA out of step with the 2012 and 2015 SHLAA which indicated Mill Lane as suitable and Grovesend unsuitable.</p> <p>Site selection has been heavily contested by villagers to no avail. Based purely on the LSCA. Both sites within the AONB but Grovesend also within the conservation area. Parish Council have objected to one house in the conservation area. The road network to Grovesend farm is unsuitable whereas there is no problem with Grovesend. This is included within the 2012 and 2015 SHLAA.</p> <p>The site on Mill Lane is deliverable.</p> <p>Many chose to build in Mill Land rather than Grovesend Farm. NDP should be referred back to the parish council and the village given the chance to decide between the two sites.</p>
Margaret Coates Local Resident	<p>Gorvesend Farm is totally the wrong area for development as the impact on surrounding roads which are narrow with no footpaths or easy access to the main road.</p> <p>Mill Lane is much better as the access is suitable without impacting on the village.</p>
Valda Bridges Local Resident	<p>Grovesend Farm is in the conservation area whereas Mill Lane has always been the popular choice for development with local residents.</p> <p>Access to Grovesend Farm is very poor, narrow and listed buildings and trees. Always congested with the doctor's surgery. No pedestrian access and narrow pavements.</p> <p>Mill Lane has excellent vehicular and pedestrian access.</p> <p>The logical choice is Mill Lane.</p>
Ben Cooper Local Resident	<p>Mill Lane like Old Church Road is a country lane. Increasing weight of traffic on a narrow lane is causing damage. Mill Lane is the main route to Bosbury, high volume of traffic using it.</p> <p>Significant safety issues at busy times – especially school times. No pavement beyond the school.</p> <p>40 houses near the school would only increase this unsatisfactory situation. There is a longer walk to the village shops</p>
Margaret Harris	Both sites within AONB, clearly visible from the Malvern Hills.

Local Resident	<p>Old Church Road will become more dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and cars.</p> <p>The Grovesend Field site is in proximity to listed buildings and industrial heritage</p> <p>Not convinced that development needs to occur on either sites. Do not need both sites to be developed</p>
Ann Easthope Local resident	<p>Grovesend Field is not the right place for building. Surrounding roads are very narrow with no pavements and virtually impossible to access.</p> <p>Rethink and transfer to Mill Lane which is safer and sustainable option.</p>
Simon Williams-Hewitt Local Resident	<p>Object to the NDP believe an important land allocation decision has taken the wrong direction</p> <p>The plan had housing and school off Mill Lane with excellent support from the village. The change that Mill Lane could not be used for housing does not seem to be a village decisions</p> <p>Grovesend Farm accesses off Old Church Road, more traffic through narrow lanes. Not an issue in Mill Lane</p> <p>Grovesend was identified as an important green space in village plans and forms part of the conservation area. Housing goes against this.</p>
Phiona Hewitt Local Resident	<p>Object to latest version of plan.</p> <p>Plan to have housing and a school off Mill Lane had excellent support from the village. The change was not a village decision.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm means pushing even more traffic down narrow roads. Mill land has none of these issues.</p>
Xinyu He Local Resident	<p>Development of Grovesends Field is not a good idea. It is within the conservation area and very narrow roads to access it.</p> <p>In contract Mill Lane has excellent access. Much better this site replaces Grovesend Field.</p>
Sara Brain Local Resident	<p>Opposed to the inclusion of Grovesend Field as within the AONB and the conservation area and a number of listed buildings closeby. Access via Old Church Road with no pavements and single track.</p> <p>Mill Lane strong case for development, excellent access, amenities nearby, not within the conservation area. Far more suitable location</p> <p>Should remove Grovesend Farm and replace with Mill Lane. Colwall residents favour Mill Lane.</p>
Robert Brain Local Resident	<p>Grovesend Farm should be removed. Vehicular access offers poor visibility ontp narrow lanes with no pavements.</p> <p>Despite support from local residents for Mill Lane, Grovesend Farm, within the conservation area, continued to be incorporated within the plan.</p> <p>Mill Lane is the ideal location for development of this size.</p>

<p>Naomi Beard</p> <p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to the current plan. Too heavily based on the opinions of the LSCA report.</p> <p>Do not believe local people have been consulted properly or views appropriately considered.</p> <p>Strongly believe land at Grovesend Farm inclusion is fundamentally inappropriate and unsupported by evidence. Believe Mill Lane offers much more sustainable and deliverable option.</p>
<p>Gavin Beard</p> <p>On behalf of 28 residents</p>	<p>Significant concerns about the process and the decisions made by the parish council – feel the NDP does not meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>NDP ignores the Herefordshire Council SHLAA, the LSCA led approach to site selection excluded other important consideration, lack of community engagement.</p> <p>U-turn regarding the housing allocations between 2012 SHLAA, 2015 draft, school site options and 2018 Reg14. This led to Mill Lane being removed and being replaced by Grovesend Farm. In 2015 Grovesend Farm only considered for a school not housing. Consultation responses indicated that the Mill Lane site was strongly supported. The Reg14 was accompanied by a revised LSCA which fundamentally changed the capacity rating and unexpectedly included land at Grovesend Farm for housing. Many objections to the draft plan and surprise at the consultation response from the parish council. Position conflicts with planning decisions reducing confidence in the robustness. No opportunity of the local community to feed into the process.</p> <p>Robustness of the LSCA – concerns about the reliability and robustness of the evidence base. Not clear how and why some fundamental changes were made.</p> <p>Need for wider site assessment – local highway network, conservation area, connectivity and the views of the local community should also be taken into account.</p> <p>Lack of community involvement – fundamental lack of community involvement in the plan and its landscape evidence. The plan is landscape led to meet the required housing targets. No opportunity to be guided by local's views. Only really choice was in 2015 over the site for the school.</p> <p>Object to Land at Grovesend Farm as a housing allocation and promote land adj to the primary school on Mill Lane as more sustainable.</p> <p>Old Church road has highway and access capacity limitations – single track, poor visibility, narrow.</p> <p>Impact on the conservation area – no indication on the character and appearance of housing on the conservation area. There are no such constraints at Mill Lane. Parish Council have objected to a single dwelling in the conservation area which conflicts with their decision to allocate 37 at Grovesend Farm. Open spaces are highlighted as an important feature of the conservation area. There are important views and TPOs identified as well as nearby listed buildings.</p> <p>Deliverability of the site – the ability of the site to deliver the required number of houses maybe an issue. There may also be a restrictive covenant on the land.</p>

	<p>Suitability of the Mill Lane site – most sustainable site in terms of highway capacity, heritage, connectivity and community support.</p>
<p>Heather Fryer Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Mark Fryer Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>

<p>Andy Meany Local Resident</p>	<p>Add Mill Lane site to the plan instead of Grovesend Farm. Mill Lane was previously supported when the new school as approved. Has a much safer access and egress. Grovesend Field would add considerable pedestrian and vehicle traffic on Old Church Road which is inadequate narrow road.</p>
<p>William Hawes Local Resident</p>	<p>Decisions do not reflect the views of villerages.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm means pushing more traffic through narrow Old Church Road with parked cars and an awkward junction.</p> <p>2015 plan has good support to have a new school and housing off Mill Lane, having the benefit of not being part of Conservation Area, has far better vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Unexpected change of land allocation in 2018 was not broadly supported and comments in consultation have been ignored.</p>
<p>M Lees-Briggs Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Sally Dare Local Resident</p>	<p>Surprised to see Grovesend Farm site is an allocated development site when it is in a conservation area and access would be onto Old Church Road which is narrow and winding.</p> <p>Mill lane site around the new primary school has better roads and is not in the conservation area.</p>
<p>Colette Redmond Local Resident</p>	<p>Old Church Road is narrow, twisting and without pavements – dangerous and encourages people to drive not walk. Poor access and an awkward junction. Lies within the conservation area and has remains of industrial heritage.</p> <p>Planned development adjacent to Colwall Primary on Mill Lane provides a clear</p>

	<p>and unrestricted vehicle access and safe access for pedestrians. Near amenities.</p> <p>Mill Lane should replace Grovesend in the NDP</p>
<p>Michael Cooke Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Field should not be developed – it has poor access, within the conservation area and the Mill Lane site is much better option for access and adjacent to the new school.</p>
<p>Janet Bartlett Local Resident</p>	<p>All the objections raised to Grovesend Farm in the past remain. No advantages over the Mill Lane site. Strongly object to this current draft NDP.</p>
<p>Chris Stephens Local Resident (submitted twice)</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Emilie Stephens Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same</p>

	<p>consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Andrew Downs Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to the NDP, plan seem to have taken the decision not to reflect the views of the villagers.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm would put more traffic on narrow roads with parked cars and awkward junction. Does not identify a separate pedestrian access</p> <p>Mill Lane has support in 2015. Not within the conservation area, far better vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Unexpected change in 2018 was not broadly supported and comments have been ignored.</p>
<p>Charlotte Stephens Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Tiffanie Stephens Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the</p>

	<p>only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Arielle Stephens Local Resident (submitted twice)</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Dr Sarah Mather Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p>

	<p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Isabel Mather Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Jonathan Mather Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and</p>

	<p>excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Oliwia Kowalska Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend Farm is not a good choice for future development. Part of conservation area, would put more traffic on Old Church Road, has not have good pedestrian walkways. Worried for children's safety.</p> <p>Believe previous plan from 2015 to build on Mill Lane is better to Grovesend Farm</p>
<p>Dr James Mather Local Resident</p>	<p>Agree with the concept of an NDP and having a minimum housing target. Don't support the current recommendations and the process of selecting housing sites. Does not support the strength of evidence and the majority of consultation feedback.</p> <p>Frustrated that comments and those of the majority of the respondents not considered and acted upon during the consultation process.</p> <p>Do not believe the LSCA has been developed consistently and should not be the only determination for housing sites. It has changed over time without a detailed explanation or consultation.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm in now included and Mill Lane excluded. Recent application on Mill Lane was very strongly supported yet the Parish Council rejected and excluded from the NDP.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Historic England's confirmation that Grovesend Field is the green lung of the village and conservation area have not been given the same consideration.</p> <p>Old Church Road is not suitable. Mill Lane site is located near to services and highway links are more suitable. Both fields are within the AONB, Grovesend has industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings Poor access and narrow roads and pavements, awkward junction. Mill Lane is safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access to amenities and well designed junction.</p>
<p>Andrzej Kowal Local Resident</p>	<p>Object to 2020 version of the NDP, believe Grovesend Farm should be protected at all cost as within the conservation area.</p> <p>Original plan to build off Mill Lane was more acceptable by the village but not ignored,</p> <p>Grovesend Farm will mean greater traffic on Old Church Road and Stone Drive, unsafe narrow roads. No assurance of safe pedestrian access. Will become less safe for families.</p>

<p>James Rose Local Resident</p>	<p>Use of land off Church Road seems to ignore the concerns raised by village about access down narrow roads with poor junctions. Road can't cope without becoming dangerous.</p> <p>Value of Grovesend Farm in the conservation area has not been respected and goes against the will of the village when consulted.</p> <p>Mill Lane had agreement of the village and seems to have been dropped for reasons that do not make sense.</p>
<p>Ann Richardson Local Resident</p>	<p>2012 SHLAA concluded that Grovesend Field is unsuitable since the road network would not sustain intensification.</p> <p>Plan prevents building adjacent to the school, a site well supported by villagers. Site being opposed by the parish council despite the wishes of villagers.</p> <p>Both sites are within the AONB and can be seen from the Malvern Hills. Grovesend Farm is within the conservation area and a green lung for the village.</p> <p>Grovesend Farm is of historical importance and remains of industrial heritage and boarded by listed buildings. Poor access and narrow roads</p> <p>Support the change to Mill Lane and the removal of Grovesend Farm</p>
<p>Brian Richardson Local Resident</p>	<p>Strong objection to NDP</p> <p>Concern over housing allocation - evident U turn by the parish council. Land adjacent to the village hall has been removed and replaced by Grovesend Farm. Mill Lane was strongly supported for housing and a school and Grovesend Farm was rejected for a school (housing was not considered). No further consultation was undertaken until 2018. This changed the LSCA, the village hall site removed.</p> <p>Fundamental lack of community involvement, no meaningful debate. Heavily dependence on the sole use of the LSCA without consideration of other factors.</p> <p>More suitable sites available than Grovesend Farm</p> <p>Site is within the conservation area, historical importance to Colwall, bordered by listed buildings, poor access and awkward junction, lack of pavements.</p> <p>Mill Lane is a safer and more sustainable option with excellent pedestrian access. Opportunities for planning conditions, enhanced planting and landscape protection.</p> <p>In favour of the Mill Lane site and the removal of the Grovesend Farm site.</p>
<p>I Baker Local Resident</p>	<p>Concerned about development at Grovesend Farm but it excludes land at Mill Lane.</p> <p>Grovesend is within the conservation area, of historical industrial importance and bordered by listed buildings</p> <p>Poor access, narrow and lacking pavements</p> <p>Mill Lane is a better site in terms of safe pedestrian access to local facilities.</p>

<p>Lady Lechmere Local Resident</p>	<p>Against plans to build on Grovesend Farm. Agree with the four reasons given and should be given the greatest protection.</p> <p>Don't want the village to be spread out into adjoining fields</p> <p>Mill Lane would be better with a smaller number.</p>
<p>G Lay Local Resident</p>	<p>Grovesend is within the conservation area, of historical industrial importance and boarder by listed buildings</p> <p>Poor access, narrow and lacking pavements</p> <p>Mill Lane is a better site in terms of safe pedestrian access to local facilities.</p> <p>Preserve Grovesend Field.</p>
<p>Peter Bridges Valda Bridges Colin Neville Jeffrey Neville Local Residents Received late but accepted</p>	<p>Submitted after site of FOI email regarding access.</p> <p>It is clear that the development of Grovesend Farm is totally dependent on the provision of pedestrian access via Old Church Road, Stone Close between no 5 and 6 and Pembroke Lodge.</p> <p>Object to the impact on resident amenity. No indication to the owners given about this provision and scant reference within the NDP. Owners do not give consent to this access.</p> <p>There is no gap between 5 and 6 Stone Close. Encroachment will impede access to the properties. Fencing will be needed to maintain privacy which will be an eyesore.</p> <p>Deeply concerned that after all this time and several requests to the parish council no response.</p>
<p>Gavin Beard Local Resident Additional comment Received late but accepted</p>	<p>Submitted after site of FOI email regarding access</p> <p>The access options require engagement with one or more landowners to deliver – none of the landowners has been approached.</p> <p>Have these options been properly assessed.</p> <p>Footpath on Old Church Road – not achievable given the narrowness of the lane and require purchase of land from Pemborke Lodge and removal of TPO trees. Rural nature is key to the conservation area.</p> <p>Pedestrian access via Stone Close – it is not possible to install a footpath between no 5 and 6, these are private driveways Neither owners are willing to sell land as would result in significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>Footway improvements towards the Crescent/Thai restaurant – reliant on multiple landowners who have not been consulted.</p> <p>These details are not included within the NDP but important to the deliverability of housing at Grovesend Farm.</p>
<p>Russell Pryce Collins Design and</p>	<p>Object on behalf of landowners</p> <p>Policy CSB1 – land at Walwyn Road has been excluded from the settlement</p>

<p>Build</p> <p>On behalf of the landowner</p>	<p>boundary.</p> <p>Proportional growth figure is low for the largest and most sustainable rural settlement. 20% buffer should be included which would equate to an additional 16 dwellings.</p> <p>Settlement boundary should be extended to encompass Barton Villas and Broadleigh Cottage applying the criteria highlighted within the plan. Outer boundaries are well defined and contained by mature hedges and trees and form part of the historic part of the built up area of the village.</p> <p>The deliverability of the windfall is not clear. The settlement boundary has been tightly drawn especially given the sentence in CSB1 which states that new development should not be built up to the edge of the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Daniel Hatcher</p> <p>Rosconn Strategic Land</p>	<p>Policy CSB1</p> <p>The final paragraph is unclear as to whether it includes the site allocations or just windfall. Paragraph needs amending</p> <p>Policy CD4</p> <p>Support the identification of Grovesend Farm as a housing allocation. Site is suitable and achievable. Well evidenced and justified with local community being fully consulted</p> <p>Indicative layout – should not preclude an alternative layout</p> <p>Item 2 – support of objective. Modern engineering features can detract from the identified character. Only provide where absolutely necessary. Para 2 of Policy CD4 should be amended to make reference to the advice contacted within appendix 1</p> <p>Item 4 – the indicative layout densities are below standard however there is not open space within the site</p> <p>Item 6 and 11 – open space could be accommodated within the site itself. Area to the south and west of the proposed housing allocation should be omitted from the policy and maps.</p>

Please note the above are summaries of the response received during the submission consultation. Full copies of the representations will be sent to the examiner in due course.

Officer appraisal

This plan has met the requirements of the regulations as set out in the table above. All the requirements of Regulation 14 were undertaken by the parish council and all the required documentation was submitted under Regulation 15.

89 representations were received as a result of the Regulation 16 consultation including 9 external bodies and 5 service areas from Herefordshire Council. The Strategic Planning team have indicated

general conformity with the Core Strategy and Development Management and others have suggested wording amendments to a number of policies.

66 local resident representations and a joint representation from 28 residents have been received. The vast majority of these were objecting to the site allocation at Grovesend Farm. Many consider that the site is unsuitable due to access and heritage issues and are suggesting Mill Lane as a prefer allocation site. There is a current undetermined application on the Mill Lane site. Many have raised issues about the criteria used to select sites and the consultation undertaken between the regulatory consultation periods. The passage to examination with this regards is determined on whether the regulatory requirement have been met, additional consultation and public support is determined ultimately by way of the referendum

However, this level of objection to the site and the grounds for objection raises concerns that if the Grovesend Farm site is not deliverable then the plan would not meet it's proportional growth requirements and ultimately not be in conformity with the Core Strategy. As at April 2019 the proportional growth for the parish was indicating that 53 dwellings would be required.

2 planning consultants have made representations on behalf of landowners – one for an additional site to be included within the settlement boundary and the other regarding Grovesend Farm.

It is considered that these issues would not prevent the plan being recommended for examination and the outstanding issues and concerns regarding the Grovesend site should be subject to the examination process.

Assistant Director's comments

Decision under Regulation 17 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The decision to progress to appoint an examiner for the above neighbourhood plan has been

Approved.

Richard Gabb



Programme Director – Housing and Growth

Date: 17 April 2020

Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) – Core Strategy Conformity Assessment

From Herefordshire Council Strategic Planning Team

Name of NDP: Colwall- Regulation 16 submission draft

Date: 21/02/20

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
<i>CSB1- Colwall Settlement Boundary</i>	SS1; SS6; RA1; RA2	Y	
<i>CD1- Protecting Exceptional Key Views</i>	SS6; LD1	Y	
<i>CD2- General Design Principles for Development within Colwall Settlement Boundary</i>	SS1; LD1; LD2; LD3; LD4; SD1; SD2; SD3; SD4	Y	<p>It is considered that some design principles could be outlined in a more concise manner here. This would give the policy a less prescriptive appearance.</p> <p>For instance, points 13, 14 and 15 appear to be encouraging broadly similar principles, could these be presented as one broader criterion?</p>
<i>CD3- Site 1 Former Primary School and adjacent land (Target- approximately 9 houses)</i>	SS1; LD1; LD2; LD3; LD4; SD1; SD2; SD3; SD4	Y	
<i>CD4- Site 2 Grovesend Farm (Approximately 27 houses)</i>	SS1; LD1; LD2; LD3; LD4; SD1; SD2; SD3; SD4	Y	<p>It should be noted that this was assessed as part of a larger site in the 2012 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). It was not considered appropriate for development due to concerns over the ability of the road network to sustain</p>

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
			intensification of use. Though a smaller area is proposed for allocation, in the event of a proposal this issue would be considered.
<i>CD5- General Design Principles for Development in the Wider Countryside</i>	SS1; LD1; LD2; LD3; LD4; SD1; SD2; SD3; SD4	Y	(Excl CD7) As with CD3, there are some very detailed and prescriptive design principles given. It is considered that these could be condensed into more concise, broader design principles.
<i>CD6- Farmsteads</i>	SS1; RA5	Y	
<i>CD7- Protecting Archaeology</i>	SS6; LD4	Y	
<i>CD8- New Agricultural Buildings</i>	SS1; RA3; RA4; RA6	Y	
<i>CD9- Polytunnels</i>	SS1	Y	
<i>CH1- Range and Mix of Housing</i>	SS1; H3	Y	
<i>CF1- Supporting a Range of Goods and Services in the Village Centre</i>	SS1; SC1	Y	
<i>CF2- Recreation Facilities and Open Space</i>	SS1; OS1; OS2; OS3	Y	
<i>CF3- Local Green Space</i>	SS1; OS1	Y	
<i>CRE1- Renewable Energy Schemes</i>	SS1; SD2	Y	