

Neighbourhood Development Plan Meeting 7th June 2016

Present: NDP Members: Chris Lowder (Chair), Ann Scarsbrook, Anne Carver, Tanya Lloyd-Jones, Jeff White, Alan Eldridge.

Apologies: Geoff Fielding,

Minutes taken by Jeff White – The meeting commenced at 6pm.

1.0 Minutes of meeting of 31st May 2016 – Agreed

2.0 Main purpose of meeting: To draft the briefing notes for David Croft following the consultation.

2.01 Terminology re 'Gap' – The current general map for the NDP shows the 'Strategic Green Gap' as set out in the Malvern Hills District Local Plan from the 1990's. As it is considered that there may be criticism of the overall size of this area from Herefordshire and the Inspector, and many similar comments have been received in these consultations – the group has decided to send to David, for his views, an alternative plan reducing the 'Gap' to the area at it's narrowest, between the 'built up' parts of the village, represented by the Settlement Boundaries. This can be identified as the public highways of 'Bumpy Lane' (CD28); Road from Bumpy Lane to King's Bridge; Road from King's Bridge to Old School Close (U65641); Footpath CD32B to Brookside Cottage; Road from Brookside Cottage over Pound Bridge to Bumpy Lane. **JW** will draw an amended map.

2.02 Flooding – The problem of the proper maintenance of the areas prone to local 'Flash' Flooding. The aim is to actively work with stakeholders such as the water, highway and drainage companies. Include map in Plan.

2.03 Affordable Housing – To have a local policy to encourage and influence developers to provide this in their schemes.

2.04 Light Pollution – To have a firm policy to minimise any increase in artificial street lighting and sports floodlighting.

2.05 Housing Provision and Settlement Boundary – To refer to the Landscape Assessment (2015) and the Visual Design Statement (2004) for the capacity of any additional sites.

2.06 Existing Facilities – To emphasise support for existing facilities within the parish, and require that any new facilities must demonstrate sustainability.

TLJ will circulate a draft of these amendments, which will go on the website.

3.0 Regarding criticism of the NDP process –

3.01 The brief for the Landscape Assessment has been available on the Parish Council website, but to make it easier to locate it will now be put on the NDP website. This study was commissioned from an independent, qualified and experienced expert in the subject recommended to Cradley by Herefordshire.

3.02 'Targets' are not relevant to an NDP.

4.00 The second purpose of the meeting: To review example Consultation Statements, which have to accompany the Plan, and select a preferred approach.

4.01 Statements from Weston under Penyard, Staunton on Wye and Erdisland have been recommended to us by Herefordshire as suitable and successful examples.

4.02 The paper comments to go in the Statement will be proof-read by **AE** to ensure that the spelling is correct where they have been transcribed. Comments sent to the website and copied directly will stay as presented.

4.03 Consultation record - **JW** and **AC** will go through the returns from all the recent consultations stored at the Village Hall to provide a schedule for the Consultation Report. **AS** will draft a 'Time-Line'.

5.0 Next Meeting: 4th July 2016 – To consider and agree to final draft to go to the Parish Council.

The meeting closed at 7:45.

NDP Meeting June 10th 2016

Reg 14 Consultation - Points from consultation responses to be considered by David Crofts

1. CSNDP 1 Settlement Boundary

Consider proportionate housing in areas that are adjacent to the settlement boundary but specify that these should only be considered in areas that have been identified as of at least moderate to high capacity as defined in the Landscape Assessment report (Carly Tinkler 2015) and **up to a maximum of 10 units in accord with the findings of the September 2015 questionnaire.**

2. East and West Cradley

Remove capitalisation of 'east' and 'west' throughout.

3. CSNDP 3 Housing Provision

Include reference in support of affordable housing specifically in relation to the proposed allocation at Pixiefields.

4. CSNDP 4 Community facilities

Review policy to address HCC comments specifically relating to retaining existing facilities. Include reference to the importance of the existing facilities including the two Village Halls, **two Parish Churches and the Cradley Chapel**, the Butchery and General Stores, Crumpton Hill Shop, the Red Lion Pub, the British Legion Club, the Doctors Surgery and Dispensary and Blue Ginger Gallery and Cafe and how these will be supported. Any new proposal should only be supported if it does not conflict with existing facilities and is sustainable with a viable business plan.

5. CSNDP 5 AONB and landscape protection

Review AONB policy on basis of comments received from AONB and HCC planners regarding strengthening the protection at the local level. Furthermore, take on board Historic England's comments to include reference to the Landscape Capacity assessment in more detail throughout the plan.

6. CSNDP 6 Nature conservation

Review comments from Natural England regarding additional SSSIs that need to be referenced.

7. CSNDP 7 Areas of Flood Risk

The policy relating to flooding should be reviewed to provide more emphasis on local issues such as points of flash flooding and blocked culverts. It should include reference to actively working with all stakeholders to reduce potential risk at specific pinch points (a plan showing these will be sent under separate cover by Jeff White).

8. CSNDP 8 Strategic Green Gap

Of those that commented on the Strategic Gap – approximately 50 - there is an even split between those that do not want any development in the strategic gap at all and those that think that Morgan's field should be excluded to allow a community shop/café to be developed or that there should be no protection of the Strategic Gap (NB the remaining 20 or so respondents do not reference the Strategic Gap at all). In light of the comments received from HCC and with reference to the NPPF we would welcome your advice and thoughts on the following:

- The strategic gap, as currently indicated in the draft NDP, is as was originally identified in 1998 as part of the Malvern Hills Local Plan; we propose reducing the indicated extent to the area defined in the Village Design Statement as *"The single most significant space in the village and central to its character is the "green gap," straddling the Cradley Brook and west valley side, dividing the village into two distinct settlement areas"* (paragraph 7.1 Village Design Statement 2004 and 2010). This would go towards addressing the concerns raised regarding the large extent of the strategic green gap between the two parts of the village but would still maintain the additional protection from development to prevent coalescence as supported by a majority in the parish.
- Is there any other terminology that could be used in policy terms to define this area of land?
- Is it appropriate to include the full planning definition of 'development' for clarity?

9. Design criteria & Lighting

Consider including another policy which includes prescriptive criteria for design by cross reference to the Village Design statement.

Include specific reference to not allowing increase in artificial street lighting and flood lighting. In terms of evidence base there is support from the Parish Plan 2010 questionnaire and a commitment was included in the Parish Plan 2010.

Include requirement for safe access for all road users as part of any proposed development.