

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):

Vision, Objectives and Policies Comments

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

Please see my comments on the Vision, Objectives and Policies section 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.

Vision, objectives and policies Comments.

5.2.2 Why is the plan limited to these 3 policies only? By not developing the policies for Transport, Local Facilities and the Local Economy this is not best serving the future needs of the village. If a plan for an economy is discounted and growth/employment benefits are not considered, why should the village grow its housing? A more comprehensive strategy is needed beyond just increasing dwellings. Looking at the Broadway NDP, its policies are included and have been fully articulated. The missing policies cannot be ignored at this stage. A complete set of policies are surely essential for a cohesive NDP. Dates need to be set for when these additional policies are to be produced. This needs to be set out else there are no objectives to drive further development of the plan.

5.3.1 Mention of plan period "up to 2035" not obvious or apparent elsewhere. Were the community actually consulted on these policies? i.e. which ones.

5.3.2 In the opinion of a great number of residents, this was a biased survey. The (only) parishioner member of the actual Steering Committee in hindsight, actually agrees. Who pre-determined the vision and objectives? This needs to be made clear as to how these were arrived at and by whom.

5.6.1 It would be more helpful if the mapping of policies to objectives was explained.

5.7 Housing Policy

5.7.1 This is a very poor design brief. This housing policy may well fall foul of planning density guidelines that state "New housing development should avoid development of less than 30 dwellings per hectare and encourage between 30 to 50 per hectare". Policy SB1 quotes 1.55 hectares, less a "minimum of 0.20 for a community building with associated parking" and "0.50 hectares for public open space for recreational use" this would leave at the very most 0.85 hectares which could require provision for c40 dwellings to meet housing density guidelines.

5.7.1 It is not obvious where this "evidence base" has been taken from. This is a limited assessment of one particular site. There appear to be no similar assessments for the other identified sites. This bears out the bias in the Nov 2020 Options Survey questionnaire because there is no like-for-like data on which to compare.

5.7.6 Parish Council minutes do not show any proposals from the Steering Committee. None were proposed or seconded with votes on Steering Committee or Brodie Planning assessments of intended sites or approval of the preferred site. A preferred site was proposed for the MOU. Where was the vote for this? This is an absolute key decision which parish council minutes do not record. This selection of site is effectively presented as a fait accompli.

5.7.7 The Options Survey was heavily weighted in favour of one site - a widely held view in the village was that this process has been carefully 'steered' to avoid the choice of the previously preferred site on Winchcombe next to the home of the chair of the Parish Council being developed.

5.7.8 Whilst Springfield Nursery was chosen, the notion that parishioners preferred smaller sites as being more appropriate was carefully engineered out of the process to favour a single site. This was the intention all along and the die was set at the 07 Jan 2019 village meeting when the chair of the Parish Council heavily promoted Springfield Nurseries.

It should be recognised that the members of the Parish Council live predominantly on Winchcombe and Cheltenham Roads and that Main Street (where Springfield Nurseries is situated) is unrepresented.

5.7.9 Regardless of this NDP, it is now transpiring that the owners of the smaller sites that were excluded from the process are now submitting planning proposals. The depth of bad feeling at the poor handling of their interests has accelerated the applications.

The number of dwellings either accepted for currently in planning review in Sedgeberrow is:

16 Broad Meadow

6 Winchcombe Road Nurseries

4 Winchcombe Road - approved

4 Portway Farm - approved

This 30 properties would cover the SWDP allocation of housing and surely negates the need for further development as proposed in the NDP.

5.7.10 Building within the built form of the settlement creates many issues. There is no counter case for creating an extension of the village. Why is this not discussed?

5.7.11 “Demolishing the existing structures to deliver environmental benefits including visual enhancement” This is complete garbage. The site is now completely re-wilded. Its visual appeal is that of green space, trees and habitat for numerous species. There are red deer, muntjac deer, barn owls, red kites, rodents, and almost certainly great crested newts. This species in particular is prominent along Barn Lane. The springs and wells are a habitat for such species. Housing would destroy these habitats, remove the views to Bredon Hill and do untold damage to an abundance of wildlife.

5.7.13 Access via Barn Lane in previous applications was but only one reason for objection of Springfield Nurseries previously. The judgement by the Planning Inspectorate of the Department of the Environment rejecting the appeal on 26 Apr 1991 stated:

- “The development proposed lies outside the defined development boundary”
- “Adequate land had been provided within the village and surrounding sub-area for housing development”
- “In the absence of a detailed estate road design adjacent to Main Street, it would appear that the existing house precludes the provision of a new or improved road”
- “There is inadequate land within the applicants control to provide adequate visibility at the junction of the proposed estate and Main Street”
- “There is inadequate capacity in the Sedgeberrow Treatment Works to serve the proposed development”

5.7.14 The current landowner may have expressed agreement to make provision on part of the site area for land to accommodate a community building. This in practice does not guarantee or mean that one will be provided by a developer. How will this be addressed? Clearly the Parish Council is in close liaison with the landowner of Springfield Nurseries about their detailed intentions to develop or demolish their own residences. This is because the chair of the Parish Council is a regular visitor and a close family friend.

5.7.15 Where is the formal record of this from the landowner? Who was this declaration made to? Should the existing landowner sell to a developer, as is highly likely, how will the declared number of 24 houses plus green infrastructure, community building and associated parking be guaranteed as per this plan? 24 houses of the 1,2 and 3 bedroom variety would not be economically viable to a

developer on a site of 1.408 hectares. There must be a high likelihood that planning density will allow them to build many more as infill. The announcement here of bidding for £250k is not widely known or published in the village. This has not been discussed at recent PC meetings.

5.7.17 In the case of Springfield Nurseries, assuming an even mix of affordable 1,2 & 3 bedroom dwellings and using market figures for square meterage, the CIL levy to Sedgeberrow PC would be 25% which equates to a total of £19,200 for 24 houses. The actual amount and use of such funds needs to be made clear.

5.7.17 In light of the current situation facing the country as a whole and the need for more local employment, perhaps the use of redundant nurseries should be reviewed. If this site is to go forward, the owners will need to produce a Mixed Use Master Plan showing their intent before approval is given for planning. Such a plan is a very expensive undertaking and may impact the financial viability of the site itself.

5.7.18 This country, post Brexit and in light of environmental issues with food production needs local food production, if not only to reduce the effects on the environment of food miles. The site closed because it was not viable at the time. However other such sites, such as Rails End in nearby Ashton Under Hill rents its greenhouses on a similar scale and is certainly in demand.

5.7.19 Bird and bat boxes is a lame token gesture aimed at appeasing parishioners who should not be patronised in this way. The sheer number and diversity of the wildlife on this site is significant. Proper studies need to be undertaken and to eliminate the risk to protected species.

5.7.20 Traffic congestion now is a significant issue for residents at the west end of Main Street. There are 180 children in the school with c80% traveling in from outside of the village. The proposal states that the housing would negate some of this issue. The types of houses and the demographic suggests that bungalow residents and those in 1-2 bedroom houses do not have children. Assuming one third of the houses (3 bedroom) have children. This could equate to 4-6 children walking to school. This is insufficient to mitigate to the issue of continual congestion.

5.7.21 It is hard to see how 2 parking spaces for houses with one bedroom will address the parking issues on Main Street itself which is where the major problems are. This clearly has not been thought through. Single bedroom houses with such large parking areas will be more expensive and a developer will likely not provide this amount of space if it reduces profit margins or risks the development being unviable.

5.7.22 How can it be envisaged that traffic will not travel past the school? Traffic still travels westwards on Main Street in any event. To say that traffic will naturally avoid turning right through the village is conjecture.

5.7.23 The School headteacher agrees that parents, when presented with an easy option, will always park as near to the school on the road as they can get away with. A parking area 200m away as opposed to the road at 10-50m away will not be a choice unless it is enforced. Current yellow line parking restrictions largely ignored and are not widely enforced.

5.7.24 Who will staff a coffee bar in a community hall for parents on a school run? How will such a venture be viable? The current "I'm late and I'll park wherever is easiest and to hell with parking restrictions" trend backs up the notion that parents from outside have no actual interest in the village itself and they will be, in the majority of cases not interested in supporting a coffee bar. Children playing in the

outside space is a fanciful notion which as soon as the weather turns or in winter time is un-realistic.

5.7.25 Who has done this research? Where is the report? Why is this not published? I am a member of the local community and I have not been consulted.

Policy SB1 para d) The retention and creation of habitats for what? All current species will likely leave or be driven away by the development and noise of people and activity. To suggest that this can happen is pure conjecture. If this is a policy then a full and detailed environmental survey needs to back this up to ensure the total destruction of the current ecology of the site.

Page 31 Reasoned Justification Para 7. What could happen to mitigate the risk that a Habitat Survey recommends not building or destroying the varied habitat on the site? The destruction of habitat here could become a highly emotive issue judging by views in the village.

5.8 Local Green Space Policy

5.8.1 There is no evidence or records of PC minutes showing decisions and detailing dialogue with landowners. For example, the selection of site GS5 Orchard adjacent to 74 Winchcombe Road - appears a cynical attempt to prevent development next to the house of the chair of the NDP Steering Committee and Parish Council. The suspicion and view in the village is that this decision is a benefit to that person.

There are other sites that have been put forward and have been discounted. The decisions to reject have now been backed up by the selection of green space sites GS5, GS11, GS15 to prevent previously suggested development in the future.

5.8.5 The policy does not lay out the purpose of each designation which is necessary to avoid development conflict.

5.8.7 The proposed 0.5 hectares of public open space for recreational use at Springfield Nurseries should be included and clearly identified in the design brief to protect the area from development once ownership passes to a developer.

5.9 Flood Policy

Springfield Nurseries is the site of the source of a village spring that used to feed large ponds at the rear of West End Farm and flow down the ditch at the side of the School to the Moat at Hall Farm. The spring is now piped into the village storm drains which run down Main Street to the River Isbourne. These drains flow into a holding pond at the rear of the Mill and there is an Environment Agency Pumping Station that, when the water reaches a certain level, it pumps the water into the river. When the river is full after heavy rain, or the pump should fail, the lower end of the village will flood. Was this considered by the members of the Steering Committee?

There are no references to this issue within any analysis of sites or minutes of the steering group committee/Parish council meetings. Therefore the significant impact that this could have on the flood risk to the properties (including Grade 2 listed) on Winchcombe Road and the lower and upper ends of Main Street, has not been properly assessed or given due consideration. At the very least, a flood risk assessment survey should have been commissioned. Furthermore, the residents were not aware of this at the time they were asked to complete their preferences as

part of the SNDP survey. Additionally, it appears that the SNDP Steering Committee were not made aware of this critical detail by the current proposed development site owners.

Sedgeberrow was so seriously affected by the floods in 2007 such that some residents could not return to their homes for two years after the events of July 2007.

5.9.6 The policy states that “the basic infrastructure for handling surface water and sewage has not changed since the late 60’s early 70’s”. The chosen site was rejected in 1991 because of insufficient sewerage capacity. SuDS deals with stormwater drainage only. This cannot be the full solution and the policy does not state how sewage issues will be addressed.

5.9.10 Adding a large amount of stormwater into a site such as Springfield which is already an important water course could have a significant impact on neighbouring houses along Barn Lane and Main Street. The statements in this paragraph are conjecture. This does not amount to a viable mitigation to the serious flood risk that could arise by collecting large amounts of stormwater from houses and depositing it into a watercourse that is then expected to drain through the village as described above. A full study needs to be commissioned to back up this policy.