

15 February 2019

Pebworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation – Wychavon District Council Officer Comments

These officer comments are made on behalf of Wychavon District Council (WDC), as the Local Planning Authority, on the submitted Pebworth Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) for consideration by an Independent Examiner.

Throughout Document – the document is referred to as both the Pebworth Neighbourhood Plan, see Para 9.1, and the Pebworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Given reference is made to the Pebworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan on the front cover, the document should be referred to as such elsewhere.

Policy P1 – larger map showing extent of allocation would be useful for clarity. Agree that, given the gateway location of the site, it will require high quality design and delivery at a low density is central to that, however approximately 10-12 dwellings is still considered too low. The requirement for a footpath to be provided to link up with village raises a potential land ownership issue? Also, would this requirement for a footpath to be provided come as part of the planning application?

Policy P2 – both elements of the policy are overly onerous. It is suggested that the policy encourages but does not require the provision of bungalows and affordable market homes, including small family homes with up to three bedrooms and starter homes with up to two bedrooms, as on smaller schemes this is likely to be make the development unviable. It is also not clear if the discouraging of four or more bedroom dwellings relates to sites of more than three dwellings or on all proposals which include the provision of at least one dwelling? In either case, 'overwhelming evidence' should be defined.

Policy P3 – insert wording 'achieve high quality design and' after 'and alterations should'. Policy includes certain requirements which are beyond the control of planning, such as road markings, highway signs and retention of kerbs. Requirement for any street lighting to be agreed with the Parish Council seems overly onerous? Worcestershire County Council's Interim Parking Standards (2016) have been replaced by the Streetscape Design Guide (2018) and the latter should therefore be referenced.

Policy P4 – a specific map showing the numbered Local Green Spaces would be useful for clarity.

Policy P6 – suggest new title for policy as it refers to footpaths and biodiversity?

Policy P7 – criteria a) should include currently available facilities with capacity, and for criteria c) two years seems extensive.

Policy P8 – “rural building” should be defined in the RJ or perhaps a footnote; presumably this means a building outside of the defined Development Boundary but does it just mean farm buildings, as the reasoned justification suggests, or could it include, for example, commercial buildings, residential garages and annexes too?

Policy P9 – it would be useful to know whether this policy relates to just B Class Business Uses or all premises where a business is operating, such as farms and existing tourism, recreation and leisure uses.

Appendix 3 – as detailed in response to Policy P3, Worcestershire County Council’s Interim Parking Standards (2016) have been replaced by the Streetscape Design Guide (2018) and the latter should therefore be appended.

Appendix 4, Map of Viewpoints – the inclusion of vista splays, as opposed to locational markings, will aid the decision maker in determining whether or not a Locally Important View will be impacted.

Appendix 6 – Policies Map is currently visually complicated with conflicting layers. Earlier suggestions of a larger map showing the extent of the Housing Allocation at Policy P1, a separate map showing the numbered Local Green Spaces at Policy P4 in addition to Locally Important Views showing vista splays at Appendix 3 may mean that the Policies Map is unnecessary.