

Consultee	Comments received	Proposed response/ action
Loggerheads Parish Council	<p>1. At 1. Affordable Housing - the proposed change of wording for the rural area makes it less easy to understand than current, would prefer to see it stay the same.</p> <p>2. Support the change to 8. Heritage Assets</p> <p>3. The document does not have any reference to Neighbourhood Plans. Loggerheads should have one adopted in 2018 and other rural parishes are now working on their Neighbourhood Plans. Depending on when the next revision of the validation list is planned, some reference to Neighbourhood Plans would seem relevant.</p> <p>4. It would be extremely helpful if a pro-forma could be introduced for at least all major planning applications which allows the planning officer to demonstrate that the validation list has been applied. The pro-form would allow the planning officer to tick each criterion to show that the application reaches the standards required for validation. This would need to be put on the website with the other application papers.</p>	<p>1. The wording in the current LLVR does not reflect the national policy which was set out in the written ministerial statement of 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014. The statement indicates that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, <b>and</b> which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000m<sup>3</sup>. Therefore it does require amendment. An acceptable, policy compliant, compromise would be to word it as follows <i>Rural area – developments for 10 dwellings or more and which have a combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000m<sup>3</sup>.</i></p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. It would not be appropriate to include reference to Neighbourhood Plans at this stage, prior to such Plans being adopted. The lack of reference to Neighbourhood Plans would not affect the weight that can be given to them in the determination of planning applications as they will become part of the Development Plan. Reference will be included when the LLVR is next reviewed, and consideration will be given as to whether this should be done earlier than 2 years from now.</p> <p>4. This is not a suggestion as to how the LLVR should be amended, and it would not be appropriate to include such a requirement on the LLVR given that it relates to the Council's handling of applications whereas the LLVR role is to stipulate, to the applicant, what information must be included within a planning submission. A validation checklist is completed in the back office system, but this is not in a form that could be published. In some cases an additional validation pro-forma type checklist is completed for major development proposals. Consideration will be given to the merits of producing and publishing such a list for all such cases and whether this would be worthwhile bearing in mind the resources that would be required. There is no legal requirement to publish such completed checklists.</p>
Environment Agency (EA)	<p>1. Under 4. Biodiversity Survey and Report – welcome the requirement for a survey to be undertaken when <i>within 50m of rivers, streams, canals, lakes, swamps, reedbeds or other aquatic habitat</i>. It would be appropriate to include some reference to the Water Framework Directive (WFD), which requires that all waterbodies meet Good Status, and does not allow any deterioration. Habitat potential and ecology is key to meeting these requirements and should be assessed as part of any biodiversity report on a river, stream or canal. The Environment</p>	<p>1. Agreed – reference to the Water Framework Directive will be included at information item 4 and links to the information provided by the EA on how to complete a WFD risk assessment will be added.</p>

	<p>Agency provides further information on how to complete a WFD risk assessment for proposed development that include flood risk activities and channel modifications.</p> <p>2. Support the detailed reference to the required of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the associated requirements of the Sequential and Exceptions Tests at 7. The developer will be required to liaise directly with the Council on the undertaking of these tests, and it may be worth flagging this up.</p> <p>3. Strongly recommend that the Sequential Test is undertaken, prior to any detailed FRA as it may be that the principle of the development is unacceptable to the Council and unnecessary cost could be avoided. It would be worthwhile to highlight how this work should be done prior to a detailed FRA, and may therefore be prudent to put the requirements for the Exception and Sequential Test at the start of this section, before the FRA requirements.</p> <p>4. The updated link to the Flood Maps should be included.</p> <p>5. No requirements have been specified for the submission of information relating to the management of foul waste (a material planning consideration). This should be included as this links to paragraphs 109 and 120 of the NPPF. Non-mains drainage falls under the EA's remit and they require that any such proposals ensure they do not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to the water environment. The NPPG states that the presumption for foul drainage systems should be as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Connection to a public sewer</li> <li>2) Connection to a package sewage treatment plant</li> <li>3) Connection to a septic tank</li> </ul> <p>Options 2) and 3) should only be considered if it can be clearly demonstrated by the developer that a connection to a public sewer is not feasible.</p> <p>6. Recommend that Severn Trent Water Ltd are consulted to ensure that their requirements are covered for the connection of new developments into the existing foul main sewer system.</p>	<p>2. Agreed – the need to liaise directly with the Council prior to undertaking the Sequential and Exceptions Test will be added at information item 7.</p> <p>3. Agreed – a recommendation that the Sequential Test is undertaken prior to any detailed FRA will be included in information item 7.</p> <p>4. Agreed – the up to date link will be included.</p> <p>5. Agreed – an additional information item relating to the management of foul waste will be added.</p> <p>6. Severn Trent Water (and United Utilities) have been consulted. A response has not yet been received.</p>
Network Rail (NR)	<p>1. They advise that they are a statutory consultee for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Any planning applications within 10m of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedures Order) and</li> </ul>	<p>1. The LPA were aware of this and this is noted – no amendment required.</p>

	<p>(b) For any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing a railway (as the Rail Networks Operators, set out in Schedule 4(J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition it is a requirement to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR)</p> <p>2. Transport Assessments (23) should include consideration of the impact of proposals upon level crossing(s) with mitigation implemented as required. NR encourage the Council to adopt specific policy wording to ensure that the impact of proposed new development (including cumulative impact) on the risk at existing level crossings is assessed by the developer and suitable mitigation incorporated within the development proposals and fully funded by the developer. The consideration of the impact upon level crossings should therefore be included as part of the Transport Assessment requirements.</p> <p>3. Consideration should be given, with Transport Assessments to increased footfall at Railway Stations as a result of proposals for new dwellings and employment areas. Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development, trip generation data should be considered in relation to the railway stations within proposals. Where proposals are likely to increase footfall at railway stations the LPA should consider developer contributions to provide funding for enhancements at stations as a result of increased numbers of customers. Consideration of the impact upon railway stations should therefore be included as part of the Transport Assessment requirements.</p> <p>4. Proposals for open spaces, public open areas, Locally Equipped Areas for Play etc (at 14) should include requirements for trespass proof fencing if the proposal is adjacent to the operational railway. This is to prevent unauthorised access on the railway by increased numbers of people, including minors, at these sites.</p> <p>5. Where proposals are adjacent to the operational railway, consideration within FRAs (7) should include the potential to increase the risk of flooding, pollution and soil slippage on the railway. Sustainable drainage systems must carry surface waters/foul waters away from the railway. Attenuations ponds and basins will require NR review and agreement.</p>	<p>2. There are no level crossings within the Borough and as such the suggested amendment is not agreed as it is not necessary.</p> <p>3. Agreed - reference to need to address, within Transport Assessments, consideration of the impact of increased footfall on Railway Stations arising from development to be added.</p> <p>4. Agreed – reference to the need to provide appropriate fencing where public open space is adjacent to the operational railway to be added.</p> <p>5. Agreed – inclusion of the requirement to consider any increase in risk of flooding, pollution and soil slippage on the railway within FRAs to be added.</p>
Waste Management Section	<p>1. It would make it clearer to developers of major and other projects about the need to have appropriate waste/recycling arrangements if the site waste arrangements and post-construction arrangements, when the</p>	<p>1. Agreed – the reference to the need to make provision for waste collection to be removed from information item 17 ‘Site Waste Management Plan for non-waste related development, title changed to ‘Construction</p>

	<p>site is in use, are divided into separate sections.</p> <p>2. There is little reference to collection services from domestic properties which causes problems especially the small scale infill developments that are coming through at the moment.</p> <p>3. The list contains a link to the Waste Management Planning Practice Guidance Note which is now very out of date containing reference to requirements relating to the services that were offered in 2008. The document needs a rewrite.</p>	<p>Waste Management Plan' and new information item included titled 'Waste and Recycling Management'.</p> <p>2. Agreed – the new information item 'Waste and Recycling Management' to relate to all residential development.</p> <p>3. The link to the Practice Guidance Note will be removed given that it does not relate to a service that is now offered. The request that the document is rewritten will be passed to the Planning Policy Section for their consideration, but it is unlikely, in the context of the demand upon that section relating to the Joint Local Plan, to be considered to be a priority</p>
--	--	---