

Sedgeberrow Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Consultation



RESPONSE FORM

Under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Sedgeberrow Parish Council has submitted its Neighbourhood Plan to Wychavon District Council. In accordance with Regulation 16, Wychavon District Council would like to invite comments from individuals and organisations on the submitted Neighbourhood Plan.

This consultation runs from Monday 18 July to 5pm on Monday 5 September 2022.

All comments will be made publicly available and identifiable by name and organisation (where applicable). The personal information you provide on this form will be held and processed in accordance with the requirements of Data Protection Legislation. More information on how we will hold your data can be found at:

<https://www.wychavon.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Please fill in your details in the boxes below:

Full Name: Philip David Jones

Organisation (if applicable):

Address (including postcode):

Hunters Lodge, Barn Lane

Sedgeberrow

Evesham WR211 7UR

Telephone number: 01386 882270

Email address: philjones@uwclub.net

Please state which part of the Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. which section, objective or policy) your representation refers to (please use a separate form for each representation):

Introduction/Background Comments

Please use the space below to make comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Please see my comments on the Introduction/Background appended to the bottom of the form below.

Thank you.

Please use a separate form for each representation.

Please state whether you would like to be notified of the Council's decision on the Neighbourhood Plan proposal:

Yes

No

Please email this form to policy.plans@wychavon.gov.uk or post it to Planning Policy, Wychavon District Council, Civic Centre, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Pershore, WR10 1PT.

Introduction/Background Comments.

Comments on the plan document itself.

1.1.3 The Sedgeberrow Parish Neighbourhood Plan cites a Village Meeting on January 7th 2019.

Para 1.1.3 states "An exceptionally well attended open village meeting was held with in excess of 90 residents". In actual fact, this meeting was attended by no more than 70 residents.

The document states "The driving force was to protect the remaining fields from development and to utilise a redundant nursery site [Springfield Nurseries]". A number of alternative locations were identified alongside the redundant Springfield Nursery site.

When Springfield nurseries was shown with photographs we remember confused looks and people asking "where is that?"

It was not possible to, nor did, any assessments of the individual sites take place at this meeting. To make such a suggestion that the community were in support of the development of the redundant nursery site at this time is disingenuous and misleading.

There were no minutes of this meeting and certainly no record of a vote or show of hands. The offer or suggestion of Springfield Nurseries as the site to be considered was very much presented as a preferred option over the existing site on Winchcombe Road. Those local to that part of Main Street were somewhat suspicious that this was being driven by persons in the Parish Council who's interests were questionable.

1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3 and 1.3.4

Financial benefits of having an adopted Neighbourhood plan.

The paragraph states that there is a greater percentage of the CIL levy assigned to the Parish. This amounts to 25% of the total square metres of the development.

The square meterage levy brought by Wychavon is £40 per sq metre.

In the case of the proposed development at Springfield Nurseries and assuming the suggested 1,2 & 3 bedroom housing allocation will at the sizes quoted by David Wilson Homes, a national developer, amounts to £19,200 being allocated to Sedgeberrow PC.

The inference that "our parish receives one and a half times the amount of CIL money" may be true but in reality £19.2k his amount of funding would be spread too thinly to be of any great benefit in this case. The plan needs to be open and honest about the actual funds involved here.

1.4.2 This refers to the provision of green space for land for a community building with associated parking and green space.

It is not clear how this can be made viable. Does the owner of the land gift this to the parish? Or does the developer who buys the total plot give up the land for free?

There can be little assurance unless a deed of covenant is applied for the land to be guaranteed for community use.

How can we truly protect this from being developed and built on? Any developer would surely do this in order to realise maximum revenue and profit from an opportunity.

1.5.2. The mention of a “small, dedicated Steering Group comprising of residents and Parish Councillors” This may be true. The fact here is that there was only one resident and two councillors forming this group. The guidance has come from Brodies as stated with heavy influence from the chair of the Parish Council. There has been at least 5 FOI requests to ask for records of these meetings and each of these has been dismissed due to lack of actual information to provide. This has been found to be operating somewhat ‘under the radar’ in the majority of its business.

1.5.3. The ‘group’ have been largely anonymous. I have attended numerous parish council meetings both as a councillor and as a parishioner. I can say that on many occasions I asked to see records of decisions and I was shunned and ignored even. I saw little evidence of the group looking to actively address community concerns and aspirations. Indeed many in the village are very suspicious of the way this group has been ‘steered’, particularly by the chair of the Parish Council.

1.6.3 The “consultation draft contains three key policies to address the issues identified as being most important to our community”

This does not seem to represent a robust cohesive set of policies that would future proof our community and offer opportunities for businesses and employment for residents. The plan does not include provision for sustainability that reflects the great work being done on green matters. It does make mention of an environmental policy in para 1.7.6. However considering this is a plan, it does not say how or when this will be concluded.

Nor does it provide policies for traffic management, local facilities and the local economy. Policies are needed to set out how the CIL funding suggested at Paras 1.3.2 - 1.3.3 is to be applied.

1.7.1 It is hard to understand why Traffic speed, the volume of traffic and road safety is not relevant to planning.

This would be a key consideration in the case of Main Street and Springfield Nurseries. Here volume of traffic, inconsiderate parking by parents at the school and speed absolutely is a serious concern. Surely without a policy, this site, as it stands, would struggle to gain highways approval. The wider view and a coordinated set of policies need to be applied and not as it seems to have simply a plan which appears to want to only address where to put new houses, flooding and green space.

These policies should not be ignored at this time as they are all fundamental to a cohesive Neighbourhood Plan. Consideration for future discussions must be given and be stated as part of the plan to detail how the plan is to be completed fully.