

[REDACTED]

From: Tim Plews [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 September 2021 09:37
To: Plans, Policy
Subject: Draft Broadway Neighbourhood Plan (BNP): comments on the Submission Version
Attachments: Fw: Broadway Neighbourhood Plan: Comments of Sue and Tim Plews.eml; Fw: 79794096_1.eml

Dear Sir/Madam,

Introduction

We are attaching to this email the comments we made in October 2020 in relation to the BNP which was made available last year for public consultation (the "2020 Consultation"). We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Submission Version of the BNP (the "2021 Consultation"). We understand that these comments will be passed to an independent examiner who will review the Submission Version before a finalised version of the BNP is put to a referendum of residents.

The comments in this email largely relate to the proposals for development of the Kennel Lane Site ("KLS" or "Kennel Lane Site") and the breakthrough of the existing cul-de-sac in Church Close into the Kennel Lane Site. Aside from the known allocation of land on Station Road, Broadway (in the ownership of Wychavon District Council ("Wychavon")) for 65 houses, the next biggest development proposal in terms of size (up to 30 houses) in the BNP is KLS. In terms of developing a large site in a supremely sensitive area at the core of Broadway village, the KLS proposal is much more significant than the Station Road proposal.

Many of the comments in the attachments to this email were made in the name of the Kennel Lane Objection Group, some 50 residents who have expressed deep concern about the contents of the 2020 Consultation as it pertained to the Kennel Lane Site and its breakthrough into Church Close. In addition, the proposed expansion of Wychavon's short stay car park in Church Close and the associated loss of woodland were seriously unwelcome proposals in the 2020 Consultation. Such proposals were simply at odds with other parts of the 2020 Consultation, which dealt at length with the importance of retaining green spaces, and reducing the impact of too much traffic and car parking, in the centre of the village.

A new story? The changed proposition for the Kennel Lane Site when comparing the 2021 Consultation to the 2020 Consultation

The description in the BNP of the plan for KLS has been substantially changed. The one factor common to both versions of the BNP is the agreement between the Planning Department at Wychavon and the Broadway Parish Council ("BPC" or "Parish Council") in relation to KLS. The content of this agreement is not disclosed in the BNP, although the BNP does note that the agreement has been made in order to ensure collaboration between the Planning Department and the Parish Council. A representative of the Parish Council has said that the agreement is private and cannot be made available to the public. This seems neither right nor appropriate. We understand from the Planning Department that there are aspects of the agreement that are subject to confidentiality restrictions pending resolution of discussions between the local authorities that have input into the review of the South Worcestershire Development Plan. We have asked the Planning Department whether a suitably redacted version of the agreement may be disclosed to us. We trust that the independent examiner will obtain an unredacted copy of this agreement.

Where the agreement appears to be consistent, as between the 2020 Consultation and the 2021 Consultation, is that Wychavon and the BPC are agreed in regarding KLS as being capable of delivering up to 30 new houses.

The other consistent feature between the two versions is the persistent misdescription of KLS as a brownfield site. This suggests that the agreement between the Planning Department and BPC regards KLS as brownfield land. The

comments attached to this email made in response to the 2020 Consultation still stand. KLS should not be misdescribed as brownfield. It does not appear on the Wychavon brownfield register. The presumption in favour of development of brownfield sites does not apply to land that is not on the brownfield register. There appears to be widespread misunderstanding of this among residents - some of whom think the redevelopment of KLS is a "done deal". The independent examiner should correct this inaccuracy in the BNP and require the BNP to explain:

- (1) KLS is not on Wychavon's brownfield register
- (2) a statutory consultation process on brownfield designation is required before KLS can be placed on Wychavon's brownfield register
- (3) such a consultation process would allow for public representations to be made as to considerations such as heritage assets and conservation aspects which are central to KLS but which are neglected and ignored by the inaccurate shorthand description of "brownfield site"
- (4) until such time as KLS is placed on Wychavon's brownfield register there is no presumption in favour of redevelopment.

These explanations are important. If these points are not explained, residents will be asked to vote on a misleading set of statements in relation to KLS.

Two other points that the independent examiner should consider in relation to KLS:

- KLS presently supports parking for 70 cars used by workers in the village's businesses; all of which would have to find new places to park
- the BNP is aspirational as to a whole of village parking strategy; it promises nothing more than a study of the problems.

To focus minds, the BNP should contain a commitment that KLS is not redeveloped until a whole of village parking strategy has been formulated and implemented. To permit the redevelopment of KLS, before solving the parking problem that such redevelopment would bring about, would represent a serious failure of the planning process. To ensure this is understood by those looking at the BNP after it has been accepted by a referendum, this order of events should be set out in the BNP: sort out the parking before removing the current parking from KLS.

The 2021 Consultation is silent as to proposals made in the 2020 Consultation for the breakthrough of Church Close into the Kennel Lane Site or an expanded Wychavon car park. Given that the agreement between Wychavon and the Parish Council is being treated as at least partially confidential (and likely to be so from now until after the time when a referendum takes place on the BNP), there is no way of knowing whether these aspects of the 2020 Consultation have been removed from the BNP to avoid confrontation with objectors before the referendum takes place or whether they have been permanently abandoned by Wychavon and the Parish Council. A statement ought to be added to the BNP, before it is put to a referendum, as to what is ruled in and what is ruled out by way of a policy for these aspects of KLS. The 2021 Consultation in relation to KLS appears to leave much unsaid. Saying nothing at this stage will simply cause long term uncertainty as to what the policy position should/will be when determining a future planning application relating to all or part of the Kennel Lane Site.

Tim and Sue Plews

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Kennel Lane Objection Group

Comments on the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft of the Broadway Neighbourhood Plan published on 4 September 2020 by the Broadway Parish Council

Introduction

The Kennel Lane Objection Group (KLOG) has been formed to draw attention to what KLOG sees as unacceptable proposals contained in the draft Broadway Neighbourhood Plan (draft BNP). KLOG consists of residents of Broadway who strongly oppose these proposals. KLOG welcomes the fact that there is a public consultation and that the Parish Council has encouraged residents to “have their say” on the draft BNP. Contact details for KLOG are set out at the end of this memorandum.

Proposed Policy HD.4: Site Allocation – Land off Kennel Lane/Church Close (pages 30 to 33 of the draft BNP)

Objection 1 – no traffic access from Church Close

KLOG objects to the proposal to allow a road breakthrough from Church Close to the land off Kennel Lane (Policy HD4.2(a)). The development proposals in Policy HD.4 are all based on this breakthrough happening. The draft BNP fails to mention the traffic consequences of this proposal. It contains no analysis of the traffic consequences. This point appears to have been missed and should be addressed in a new draft of the BNP.

Community Projects 6 and 7 in Policy COM 1 (“Traffic” and “Report on Traffic” respectively: see pages 123 to 126) make no reference to Policy HD4.2(a), to Kennel Lane or to Church Close. If changes are to be evaluated for other roads in the village as per CP 6 and 7, why is Church Close not being given the same consideration? The traffic consequences of HD4.2(a) are considerable and permanent. A different solution needs to be found.

Objection 2 – no expansion of the Church Close car park

KLOG objects to the proposal to extend the existing Church Close public car park with approximately 50 additional spaces (Policy HD4.2(c)). In common with the road breakthrough proposal addressed in Objection 1, there is no mention or analysis of the traffic consequences of this proposal. According to the Wychavon District Council website the existing car park has 146 spaces. The draft BNP contains no justification for expanding the existing car park.

Policy HD4.2(c) is also utterly inconsistent with the parking focused Community Projects 4 and 5 in Policy COM 1 (see pages 120 to 125). CP 5 describes “A Full Survey of Parking in the Village” to be done in due course to assess car parking needs. Paragraph 5.5.21 on page 122 states that “It would be inadvisable to create

more parking near the village centre, which could be unsightly and create a perverse incentive for more car journeys.”

Why does Policy HD4.2(c) prejudge the outcome of CP 5?

How is HD4.2(c) to be reconciled with the view that the Parish Council has formed in Paragraph 5.5.21 as to the undesirability, on both aesthetic and environmental grounds, of “more parking near the village centre”?

Objection 3 – destruction of green space

Both the road breakthrough and the public car park expansion would result in the complete removal of an extensive and valued green space between the existing Church Close built environment and the Kennel Lane retail and car parking area. HD.4 pays no attention to this reality, failing to address it other than to wrongly claim that the area is brownfield – in the context of this extensive green space that label is absurd and should be withdrawn from the draft BNP. References elsewhere in the draft BNP to the value of green space look like lip service in this instance.

Paragraph 5.1.2 on page 18 refers to the Green Wedge. The green space wrongly described as brownfield in HD.4 is as much a part of the Green Wedge as any other part of the land identified as (to quote from 5.1.2): “areas of open green infrastructure which collectively form a Green Wedge” and are “much valued by residents and visitors alike” as they “play an important role in conserving the village’s rural ambience.” The green space in HD.4 should be accorded the same respect as other open green infrastructure, given that (to quote again from 5.1.2): “Protection of this wedge is also considered vital in maintaining the existing linear pattern of the village’s built-up areas and preventing merging of housing concentrations.”

The road breakthrough from Kennel Lane to Church Close, taken together with the destruction of the HD.4 green space to provide more public car parking, would create a merger of housing/building concentration - with a related parking concentration - on a scale that would be completely out of proportion to the existing linear pattern of the village’s built-up areas. It would do irreparable damage to what remains of the linear pattern of Broadway’s historic core.

Respected correctly, this green space will provide biodiversity and a valuable space close to the centre of the village for flora and fauna for centuries to come. The case for a nature reserve needs to be seriously considered. Nature reserves have been established in, for example, Lifford Gardens and the Sands. This green space needs similar protection.

Objection 4 – too much new traffic each day for Church Close and Church Street

A conservative estimate of the additional traffic movements each day for Church Close and Church Street is 350 additional journeys by cars, lorries and motorbikes forever. This calculation is based on (i) current parking practices in the vicinity of Kennel Lane and the Hunt premises and (ii) the additional 50 parking spaces proposed for the Church Close public car park. There are also the additional construction traffic movements over several years that would be necessitated by the

redevelopment of the land off Kennel Lane, the Hunt premises and the expansion of the public car park.

Objection 5 – existing traffic problems will be made worse

Both Church Close and Church Street suffer from speeding and parking problems, notwithstanding the 30 mph limit and double yellow lines. The frontage of properties on Church Close is very near to the road. The road itself is narrow. Noise and pollution levels are already an issue, and would be aggravated severely by the proposed increase of volume in traffic. Residents of Church Close already have to close windows to shut out the traffic noise and exhaust pollution when there is traffic congestion.

The junction of Church Close with Church Street is too narrow to cope with existing traffic. Two cars are frequently unable simultaneously to enter and leave Church Close. The position with vans and lorries is worse. The junction is further stressed by lorries, vans and some cars using it to make three point turns to return to the High Street/Station Road. Articulated lorries have a particular challenge undertaking such three point turns. Banning these three point turns would be counter-productive as there is nowhere else further along Snowhill Road for such manoeuvres to be performed.

The current configuration of Church Close allows for pedestrians to cross the road in relative safety when moving to and from the car park. The road breakthrough (Objection 1) would change this, turning this section of Church Close into a thoroughfare rather than a cul-de-sac. With pedestrian movements between 600 and 1,000 on many days, pedestrian safety will be compromised. Installing a controlled crossing would be largely ineffective because the road is narrow enough to tempt people to cross without waiting.

KLOG supporters have said that they have to calculate travel times from their off-street parking to allow for the difficulty of getting on to Church Close at busy times and for negotiating the junction of Church Close and Church Street. Taxis called to houses in Church Close are delayed at busy times, causing residents to miss appointments and train departures. The congestion is such that there are concerns about emergency vehicles reaching call-out destinations as quickly as we all would wish.

Church Street is the route of the Cotswold Way, a National Trail. The pedestrian traffic across the junction of Church Close and Church Street is a material consideration, which is not considered in the draft BNP. In fact, the draft BNP appears to have a map of Broadway's Public Rights of Way (page 128), which fails to show the route of the Cotswold Way along Church Street. Church Street is also a popular route for cyclists and horse riders, in both directions.

Adding the demands of the traffic contemplated by Policy HD.4 to the current load will result in too many conflicting, and ultimately incompatible, uses of Church Street and Church Close. There is no recognition of these realities in the draft BNP.

The congestion suffered today will be compounded by Policy HD.4. Broadway's enduring appeal for visitors will be damaged by increased traffic congestion. As

framed in the draft BNP, Policy HD.4 will result in Broadway's tourist image being permanently altered for the worse.

Observation 1 – the GWSR car park on Station Road

This car park is barely used at present. It should be utilised for Broadway's first Park and Ride facility. There is no justification for expanding the Church Close car park when other car parks sit empty.

Observation 2 – changes to the access regime for the Church Close car park

Instead of expanding the Church Close car park, there is a strong case for enhancing long stay car park provision and encouraging visitors to walk or cycle into the centre of Broadway. The Church Close car park could be reserved for use by blue badge holders and the drivers of electric vehicles. The car park might even be reduced in size.

The length of stay and pricing regimes for Broadway's council car parks should be re-examined. Why not consider higher prices for shorter stays in the Church Close car park and offer better value for the longer stay car parks?

Observation 3 – the parallel with Back Lane

It is widely recognised that Back Lane has serious traffic problems. Church Close has serious traffic problems already too. Do not compound those problems by allowing the planning process to be used to squeeze the last drop of property development out of the core of Broadway's historic central area. The Parish Council should aspire to better solutions.

Tim and Sue Plews [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments of Sue and Tim Plews on the Pre-Submission Public Consultation for the Broadway Neighbourhood Plan dated 4 September 2020

Kennel Lane Objection Group (“KLOG”)

We wish to endorse the contents of the submission made to the Parish Council by KLOG. KLOG consists of more than 50 residents of the Church Street and Church Close areas of Broadway. The degree of concern in connection with the proposed breakthrough from Kennel Lane into Church Close, and the expansion of the Church Close public car park, should not be underestimated. Our elected representatives should recognise this when reviewing the comments received on the draft Broadway Neighbourhood Plan (“draft BNP”).

Description of the Broadway retail economy in the draft BNP

The description of Broadway’s retail economy should be reviewed. It appears to have been written a long time ago. It paints an inaccurate and overly optimistic picture of the retail health of the village. It was inaccurate before March 2020, with a number of retail outlets disappearing in the months before the national lockdown came into effect. Others have gone since and whilst some replacements may be expected to appear in fairly short order, the draft BNP must recognise that there is a material risk of a “long ascent” (as per the International Monetary Fund: October 2020) to regain previous levels of retail and business occupancy. Even at the height of the last business cycle, there were empty units in several buildings. Proposals in the draft BNP that favour the construction of more business units need to be framed in a context that recognises the material number of vacant commercial properties in the High Street and off the High Street. Pretending that retail or office usage after the pandemic will go back to how it was before will be naïve.

The pandemic has unleashed the staycation phenomenon. Whilst this may tail off over time, it is more likely than not that Broadway will continue to be an attractive destination for both day trippers and holidaymakers. Summer 2020 has revealed the strains on Broadway’s infrastructure. The draft BNP says that the Parish Council will not support proposals for hot food takeaways. This summer the government has actively encouraged this kind of activity and removed licensing constraints to allow dining and drinking facilities to spill out on to streets. This has been evident in Broadway.

Also evident to all residents is the plague of motorbike noise since the national lockdown was lifted on 4 July. This is not a new problem but it seems to have got worse. The draft BNP does not mention this or consider responses: for example, Public Space Protection Orders are in use elsewhere. Perhaps the draft BNP could explain whether these are a policy tool that is relevant to Broadway: if not, say so and explain why.

The draft BNP should recognise the full range of visitor pressures on Broadway, and give a Parish Council vision of what a post-pandemic retail economy for the village might look like.

Policy HD.4 (Kennel Lane area)

Is this a brownfield site? It is not in Wychavon's brownfield register

The proposal for changing the village development boundary in the Kennel Lane area is premised on a misleading statement that all of this area is a brownfield site. Brownfield sites are sites that appear in a publicly available brownfield site register maintained by the local authority. The relevant register is visible on the Wychavon DC website. It does not include any area in Broadway. Land may only be placed on this register following a statutory consultation process and determination that it comprises brownfield land. No such process has taken place in relation to this land. So why is the Parish Council calling it a brownfield site in the draft BNP?

The statutory consultation process contains a number of factors that are relevant to Kennel Lane including heritage assets and conservation area/AONB considerations. Why are these factors not mentioned in the draft BNP, let alone analysed?

The Kennel Lane area: three distinct areas for planning purposes

The Kennel Lane vicinity, as mapped in the draft BNP, comprises clearly three distinct areas for planning purposes:

- (i) the green space (see the KLOG submission) that is formed by woodland, including an orchard,
- (ii) the Kennel Lane retail area and private car parking, and
- (iii) the Hunt premises and related land (not including the area commonly referred to as the Hunt Field or the land on which the Broadway Bowling Club stands).

The green space

As the KLOG submission notes, this provides a green buffer between two separate built environments. Turning it into a car park as Policy HD.4 proposes is objectionable at several levels (see the KLOG submission for reasons). The green space is a wooded area, including an orchard that does not appear, at present, to be harvested. It is, at least in part, horticultural land and quite different from the two other elements. A community orchard rather than a council car park would command much greater support from Broadway's residents.

The Kennel Lane retail area and private car parking

This area has been redeveloped since the meat and pie factory closed. Characterising it as a brownfield site is very much open to debate. It comprises retail units and car parking. It is hardly derelict nor has it fallen out of commercial use, so recharacterisation as brownfield is questionable. Policy HD.4 speaks of residential development and of business units. A vision of three storey houses and a builder's yard is not worthy of this area of the village.

The Hunt premises and related land

The Hunt premises and related land service an agricultural enterprise – the Hunt. As such, these are buildings with an agricultural purpose: stables, kennels, sand school and so on. They do not comprise a brownfield site. They are currently associated with the Hunt Field and connected fields in which grazing takes place (grade 5 agricultural land in planning terminology).

Were the Hunt to leave these premises, and cause Broadway to lose a valued heritage and tourist asset, it does not follow that the site should be immediately treated as a brownfield site with a consequent presumption in favour of residential development. The Parish Council needs to do a deeper analysis of the possible options for the Hunt premises and related land, and lay out the choices fairly and squarely in the draft BNP.

Status of the Hunt's abbatoir

The re-drawing of the village development boundary includes the Hunt's sand school but omits the abbatoir. Why? Should the Hunt leave Broadway, it will presumably stop using its abbatoir. Of any land belonging to the Hunt, the land on which the abbatoir stands is the most likely to be seen as a candidate for brownfield treatment. The fact that it stands in a beauty spot complicates the brownfield analysis. However, the wisdom of leaving the abbatoir outside the village development boundary is questionable. It would give a property developer a reasonable argument that the abbatoir should be replaced with residential property that satisfies the relevant criteria for replacement of agricultural buildings. The draft BNP is silent on this.

Allocation of land in Broadway for residential development up to 2040

The consequence of treating the Kennel Lane vicinity as brownfield will be a presumption in favour of residential development. The draft BNP recognises this and therefore proposes to remove land off Leamington Road from a possible housing allocation status up to 2040 in favour of an allocation of the Kennel Lane vicinity in its place. Given that Broadway has seen housing development in excess of its allocated "share" in the period 2006 to 2020, why does the Parish Council seem to think that adding another 30 houses in the Kennel Lane vicinity is the right thing to do between now and 2040 – in addition to the development off Station Road? No plausible justification is provided for this proposal – the brownfield site description is inaccurate in a number of respects (see above). In addition, why should Policy HD.4 regard three storey houses as acceptable when any such development will damage existing vistas of the escarpment from village viewpoints and from the escarpment of the village?

Reconciling residential development with a tourist economy and a set of remarkable heritage assets

The draft BNP contains many fine sentiments about Broadway's assets. And yet it persists in proposing further development which, were it to happen in the next two decades, could detract materially from Broadway's tourist credentials and seriously diminish the environment for those who live and work here. Policy HD.4 lacks vision as to what a "Build Back Better" plan for the next two decades should look like. It is

also at odds with other more worthy parts of the draft BNP. Policy HD.4 should be dropped or radically reframed.

Sue and Tim Plews

15 October 2020