

19/11/13

We have lived in Colwall for 26 years, owning three different houses, all in Old Church Road.

We currently live at xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Has a calculation been made as to the number of houses that could be provided by all sites with a medium or higher capacity element? How does this compare with the number of houses the village will be required to contribute (estimated at the meeting to be 60 outside settlement boundary by 2031) to the Core Strategy?

Of the areas, other than low, identified in the Landscape Capacity slide the majority are in the Northern section of the village (12, 15, 15a, 16, 16a, 17, 17a 19,20 and 1a) incorporating an area currently occupied by The Downs School.

In total this represents a large area and access for ALL of these (except possibly 1a) will be off Old Church Road, be it Brockhill Road, Cowl Barn Lane, Mathon Road or directly off Old Church Road in the case of 12. Two of the feedback points from the March 2013 responses on the settlement boundary slide stated "no development along Old Church Road" and "take in to account narrow and/or steep road access. Mathon Road is very narrow near the junction with Old Church Road and Cowl Barn Lane is very narrow and partially unmade. In addition the access of Old Church Road on to Walwyn Road is already heavily compromised by the increased traffic from The Downs and the new development in Brockhill Road. The capacity slide also makes the village "fatter", another point on the response slides.

We consider any developments should logically be near the main road through the village, for example more land in Mill Lane, or indeed land opposite Brook House where, despite comments regarding flooding, extensive housing has been built adjacent to Brook House and a further block, 10a, has been identified as a possible site. These areas will take traffic directly in the Ledbury or Malvern directions.

Further higher classification could be given to the Colwall Green area near the village school to enhance the linear aspect of the village rather than "fatten up" the Northern end.

Particular points we would make:

1. Part of the block 14 includes the land of Burleigh and the Coach House Burleigh. From the map it can clearly be seen that the settlement boundary deliberately steps around three sides of this land. This land currently has the two dwellings noted above AND permission to erect a new building in the garden of The Coach House. Permission was granted by unanimous vote of the Herefordshire Planning Committee and the planning officer stated, in 6.5 of his report to that committee "the application site directly abuts the settlement boundary. In fact, when one examines the line of the settlement boundary it almost appears as an anomaly that this land was excluded. The land is already in residential use". In 6.6 he continues "as such the site is considered suitable for the erection of a dwelling house". We therefore find it inexplicable that this land is included within block 14 as low and it should be included as high taking in to account the recent planning committee view. The only explanation for continued exclusion

must be of a personal rather than planning nature and we trust this can be addressed at this stage of the plan documentation.

2. Block 19 has been identified as medium/medium to high. As stated above access to this land is completely unsuitable via Cowl Barn lane.

3. Block 12 has been identified as low to medium/medium, with the only access being off Old Church Road. This is a large block of land, currently farmland, overlooked by many houses, and opposite blocks 13 and 14 which are considered low capacity. We consider block 12 should be low capacity to carry on the protection already afforded to the part of Old Church Road exiting the village, and to prevent the village becoming "fatter".

4. As this is a "local community" initiative would it be possible for the ownership of blocks, with a medium capacity or higher classification, to be declared. Such information can be obtained via Land Registry searches but as representations from owners may well have already been made, either verbally or in writing, such information should be made available. We understand and accept that our representation in point 1 above will be made public.

We are happy to discuss any of our comments by e-mail or in person.