South Worcestershire Development Plan Examination

Representation Form
Consultation on Proposed Modifications to SWDP: 6 October – 14 November 2014

South Worcestershire Councils

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response. There is an extension form available on the SWDP website that can be downloaded / completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments must be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.
The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) are seeking representations on the Proposed Modifications to the SWDP, following stage 1 of the Examination (March 2014). The changes are proposed by the SWC to address issues around the need for an uplift of housing numbers to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and we are only able to accept representations on these matters.

**REPRESENTATIONS MUST ONLY RELATE TO THE CURRENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.**

Further representations to the submitted SWDP will not be accepted. There is no need to repeat representations that you submitted at the Pre-Submission consultation stage (January/February 2013).

You can access the SWDP documents online and obtain additional copies of this form from the SWDP website [http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393](http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393)

Completed forms should be returned either by

**Email to:**
contact@swdevelopmentplan.org

**Post to:**
Paul Bayliss, SWDP Project Manager
c/o Wychavon District Council
Policy Plans Team
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Pershore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

**Please note:** Unfortunately we are now unable to receive responses sent to the Freepost address previously used. Please ensure that only the address given in this current guidance and associated response forms are used.

**ALL REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED IN WRITING NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON 14th NOVEMBER 2014.**

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

Before completing the response form we would be grateful if you could tell us more about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title (if relevant)</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if relevant)</td>
<td>Hallam Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW WE WILL USE YOUR DETAILS**

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will be used only for the preparation of local development documents or any subsequent statutory replacement. However, your name and representations will be made publicly available when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential.

**OTHER DETAILS, INCLUDING YOUR ADDRESS AND SIGNATURE, WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.**

In agreeing to the holding of your information you are giving permission for your details, held on the database, to be shared between the three local authorities. If you have any concerns or queries relating to this process, please contact 01905 722233.

I agree that contact details and any related responses can be held by the planning service departments of the three South Worcestershire local authorities. I understand that they will only be used in relation to the plan making process as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and other planning-related legislation.

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 14/11/14
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

### 3. Are you attaching any additional sheets that relate to this representation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 incl this one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As also set out in the accompanying guidance note (paragraph C, page 2 of GUIDANCE NOTE – How to Respond to the Proposed Modifications), these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern Hills District in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills' housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 2
Proposed Modification Reference: PM2

This amendment incorporates text stating that the Development Strategy will “provide for and facilitate the delivery of sufficient housing to meet objectively assessed needs to 2030.” We consider that this change is not fully justified insofar as the approach to housing provision set out in Policy SWDP 3 does seeks to re-direct a higher proportion of the Malvern Hills District need to other sub-areas than is required. Further capacity exists on sustainable sites within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. This is discussed further in respect of the amendments to Policy SWDP 3 and SWDP 52 and only when these policies are revised to reflect the additional growth that can be accommodated within the Malvern urban area (within the Malvern Hills (excluding...
WWA) sub-area), will be new statement in Policy SWD2 be considered sound.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.

Expand box / use additional page as necessary
Part B
Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.
7. If your representation is seeking a change to the Proposed Modification, are you content for it to be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at an examination hearing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written representations</th>
<th>Participate at an examination hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a. If you wish to participate at an examination hearing, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

This representation should be considered alongside those already submitted by HLM at earlier stages of the SWDP process. HLM are a key stakeholder in South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) - particularly the development and implementation of the West of Worcester urban extension (Temple Laughern) and, additionally, at Evesham, land off Abbey Road as well as at Cales Farm – and are therefore a key partner in the delivery of the SWDP.

HLM is able to make substantial contributions to the SWDP examination having provided, and being able to provide, substantial evidence in relation to SWDP proposals both in support of the representations made, and in testing the evidence base put forward by the three Councils. While much evidence has been made available to the Councils' in the Development Plan process, and set out in representations, it is important that such evidence, and the views of such a key partner in the Plan's delivery, are presented by participating at the examination so the Inspector may rely upon a comprehensive evidence basis and understanding of the SWDP issues.

8b. Where there are a large number of identical or very similar responses to a particular modification, it would assist the Inspector if individuals could work together on presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you are able to do this, please indicate below who will be representing you. Your individual comments will still be considered by the Inspector.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this representation.
South Worcestershire Development Plan Examination

Representation Form
Consultation on Proposed Modifications to SWDP: 6 October – 14 November 2014

South Worcestershire Councils

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response
There is an extension form available on the SWDP website that can be downloaded / completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014.
All comments must be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.
The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) are seeking representations on the Proposed Modifications to the SWDP, following stage 1 of the Examination (March 2014). The changes are proposed by the SWC to address issues around the need for an uplift of housing numbers to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and we are only able to accept representations on these matters.

**REPRESENTATIONS MUST ONLY RELATE TO THE CURRENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.**

Further representations to the submitted SWDP will not be accepted. There is no need to repeat representations that you submitted at the Pre-Submission consultation stage (January/February 2013).

You can access the SWDP documents online and obtain additional copies of this form from the SWDP website [http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393](http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393)

Completed forms should be returned either by

**Email to:**
contact@swdevelopmentplan.org

**Post to:**
Paul Bayliss, SWDP Project Manager
c/o Wychavon District Council
Policy Plans Team
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Pershore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

**Please note:** Unfortunately we are now unable to receive responses sent to the Freepost address previously used. Please ensure that only the address given in this current guidance and associated response forms are used.

**ALL REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED IN WRITING NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON 14th NOVEMBER 2014.**

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

Before completing the response form we would be grateful if you could tell us more about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title (if relevant)</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if relevant)</td>
<td>Hallam Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Lock Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW WE WILL USE YOUR DETAILS**

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will be used only for the preparation of local development documents or any subsequent statutory replacement. However, your name and representations will be made publicly available when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential.

**OTHER DETAILS, INCLUDING YOUR ADDRESS AND SIGNATURE, WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.**

In agreeing to the holding of your information you are giving permission for your details, held on the database, to be shared between the three local authorities. If you have any concerns or queries relating to this process, please contact 01905 722233.

I agree that contact details and any related responses can be held by the planning service departments of the three South Worcestershire local authorities. I understand that they will only be used in relation to the plan making process as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and other planning-related legislation.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 14/11/14
3. Are you attaching any additional sheets that relate to this representation?

| Yes | X | No | Number of sheets | 7 incl this one |

4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

| Modification Number | PM9 |

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

| Yes | X | No | No Comment |

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

| Positively prepared | X | Effective | X |
| Justified | X | Consistent with National Policy |

As also set out in the accompanying guidance note (paragraph C, page 2 of GUIDANCE NOTE – How to Respond to the Proposed Modifications), these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response – there is an additional document available on the SWDP website that can be completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the...
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern Hills District in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 9

Whilst we support the general increase in the Proposed Modifications to the level of housing provision in Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) to 5,600 from 4,900, this increase is not considered to be sufficient. Whilst we acknowledge that the full, objectively assessed need of Malvern Hills cannot be accommodated within the district’s boundary, we strongly consider that there is additional capacity within / adjacent to the Malvern urban area to meet housing needs that arise locally. Importantly, and in the context of the objectives of Policy SWDP 2 to focus growth at the urban areas including Malvern, there is known capacity immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern (at Cales Farm). As this has not been pursued as an allocation to contribute
towards the potential supply in the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area, the amendment to attribute 5,600 units to this sub-area is not fully ‘justified’ as the modification does not represent the most appropriate alternative when assessed against other available alternatives, and as such does not meet objectively assessed local needs to the extent that is possible.

Furthermore, the subsequent iteration published in the ERRATA to the Proposed Modifications to reduce the Malvern Hills provision from 5,900 to 5,600, which we assume was based on updated information on existing commitments, has resulted in a greater reduction of Malvern Hills’ need being met within its own district. When additional / alternative sites are available within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area, the provision for Malvern Hills set out in table 4b, which is based on the available ‘supply’ (table 4e) is not considered to be an accurate reflection of the supply that would be available if other sustainable, deliverable sites were allocated.

The land at Cales Farm has the capacity to deliver at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure, without impacting upon the AONB. This site is well positioned adjacent to the existing development at North Site and has the potential to provide an integrated scheme and create a consolidated edge to the urban extent of Malvern. Taking into account the capacity of this site, it is considered that the supply of housing in the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is at least 5,950, so more akin to the figure set out in the initial Proposed Modifications Document published (of 5,900).

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.

Expand box / use additional page as necessary
**Part B**
Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

In order to make Policy SWDP 3 sound in respect of Table 4b, the ‘AREA SUBTOTAL’ for Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) Area should be increased from 5,600 to 5,950. This change would result in a lower redirection of Malvern Hills District’s housing need by 350 units. This change would ensure that the objectively assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’.
7. If your representation is seeking a change to the Proposed Modification, are you content for it to be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at an examination hearing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written representations</th>
<th>Participate at an examination hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a. If you wish to participate at an examination hearing, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

This representation should be considered alongside those already submitted by HLM at earlier stages of the SWDP process. HLM are a key stakeholder in South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) - particularly the development and implementation of the West of Worcester urban extension (Temple Laughern) and, additionally, at Evesham, land off Abbey Road as well as at Cales Farm – and are therefore a key partner in the delivery of the SWDP.

HLM is able to make substantial contributions to the SWDP examination having provided, and being able to provide, substantial evidence in relation to SWDP proposals both in support of the representations made, and in testing the evidence base put forward by the three Councils. While much evidence has been made available to the Councils’ in the Development Plan process, and set out in representations, it is important that such evidence, and the views of such a key partner in the Plan’s delivery, are presented by participating at the examination so the Inspector may rely upon a comprehensive evidence basis and understanding of the SWDP issues.

8b. Where there are a large number of identical or very similar responses to a particular modification, it would assist the Inspector if individuals could work together on presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you are able to do this, please indicate below who will be representing you. Your individual comments will still be considered by the Inspector.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this representation.
South Worcestershire Development Plan Examination

Representation Form
Consultation on Proposed Modifications to SWDP: 6 October – 14 November 2014

South Worcestershire Councils

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response
There is an extension form available on the SWDP website that can be downloaded / completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments must be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.
The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) are seeking representations on the Proposed Modifications to the SWDP, following stage 1 of the Examination (March 2014). The changes are proposed by the SWC to address issues around the need for an uplift of housing numbers to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and we are only able to accept representations on these matters.

**REPRESENTATIONS MUST ONLY RELATE TO THE CURRENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.**

Further representations to the submitted SWDP will not be accepted. There is no need to repeat representations that you submitted at the Pre-Submission consultation stage (January/February 2013).

You can access the SWDP documents online and obtain additional copies of this form from the SWDP website [http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393](http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393)

Completed forms should be returned either by

**Email to:**  
contact@swdevelopmentplan.org

**Post to:**  
Paul Bayliss, SWDP Project Manager  
c/o Wychavon District Council  
Policy Plans Team  
Civic Centre  
Queen Elizabeth Drive  
Pershore  
Worcestershire  
WR10 1PT

**Please note:** Unfortunately we are now unable to receive responses sent to the Freepost address previously used. Please ensure that only the address given in this current guidance and associated response forms are used.

**ALL REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED IN WRITING NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON 14th NOVEMBER 2014.**

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
Before completing the response form we would be grateful if you could tell us more about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td>Freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title (if relevant)</strong></td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (if relevant)</strong></td>
<td>Hallam Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tel. No.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW WE WILL USE YOUR DETAILS**

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will be used only for the preparation of local development documents or any subsequent statutory replacement. However, your name and representations will be made publicly available when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential.

**OTHER DETAILS, INCLUDING YOUR ADDRESS AND SIGNATURE, WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.**

In agreeing to the holding of your information you are giving permission for your details, held on the database, to be shared between the three local authorities. If you have any concerns or queries relating to this process, please contact 01905 722233.

I agree that contact details and any related responses can be held by the planning service departments of the three South Worcestershire local authorities. I understand that they will only be used in relation to the plan making process as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and other planning-related legislation.

**Signed:** [Signature]  
**Date:** 14/11/14
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Are you attaching any additional sheets that relate to this representation?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
<th>7 incl this one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?</th>
<th>Modification Number</th>
<th>PM12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)</th>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As also set out in the accompanying guidance note (paragraph C, page 2 of GUIDANCE NOTE – How to Respond to the Proposed Modifications), these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response – there is an additional document available on the SWDP website that can be completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications' are not ‘positively prepared' or not ‘justified' and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound'.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills' housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 12

The HLM representations in response to PM 9 object to the level of housing provision attributed to the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area on the basis that there is available capacity at Cales Farm for at least 350 units. This would increase the level of the Malvern Hills housing need that can be met, not only within the district where it is arising, but immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern, consistent with Policy SWDP 2. The allocation of Cales Farm would increase the capacity of the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area to 5,950 units (as a minimum). Therefore, as amended in the Proposed Modifications, Table 4e is not considered ‘sound’ as the available ‘SUPPLY subtotal’ fails to meet the objectively assessed needs of Malvern.
Hills and underestimates the capacity of the sub-area. The urban capacity allocations should be increased to reflect the allocation of Cales Farm, and subsequently the overall supply subtotal should be increased accordingly.

Notwithstanding our support for an overall increase in the total housing provision within the Malvern Hills sub-area, we consider that there is currently an overreliance on small scale allocations and windfall sites as a proportion of the current total. To ensure a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF, it is considered essential to allocate the land at Cales Farm to balance the range of supply to include an additional medium / large scale, greenfield sites.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

**Part B**

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

The ‘urban extension’ row of table 4e should be amended to reflect the proposed allocation of land at Cales Farm with a capacity of at least 350 dwellings, increasing this figure from 800 to 1,150 units. Subsequently, the ‘SUPPLY subtotal’ in table 4e should be amended to 5,976 units. This change would ensure that the objectively assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable strategy, thus making the plan fully ‘justified’.
7. If your representation is seeking a change to the Proposed Modification, are you content for it to be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at an examination hearing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written representations</th>
<th>Participate at an examination hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a. If you wish to participate at an examination hearing, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

This representation should be considered alongside those already submitted by HLM at earlier stages of the SWDP process. HLM are a key stakeholder in South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) - particularly the development and implementation of the West of Worcester urban extension (Temple Laughern) and, additionally, at Evesham, land off Abbey Road as well as at Cales Farm – and are therefore a key partner in the delivery of the SWDP.

HLM is able to make substantial contributions to the SWDP examination having provided, and being able to provide, substantial evidence in relation to SWDP proposals both in support of the representations made, and in testing the evidence base put forward by the three Councils. While much evidence has been made available to the Councils’ in the Development Plan process, and set out in representations, it is important that such evidence, and the views of such a key partner in the Plan’s delivery, are presented by participating at the examination so the Inspector may rely upon a comprehensive evidence basis and understanding of the SWDP issues.

8b. Where there are a large number of identical or very similar responses to a particular modification, it would assist the Inspector if individuals could work together on presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you are able to do this, please indicate below who will be representing you. Your individual comments will still be considered by the Inspector.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this representation.
Please use a separate sheet for each modification response
There is an extension form available on the SWDP website that can be downloaded /
completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the
Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014.
All comments must be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.
South Worcestershire Development Plan
Proposed Modifications: 6 October – 14 November 2014

The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) are seeking representations on the Proposed Modifications to the SWDP, following stage 1 of the Examination (March 2014). The changes are proposed by the SWC to address issues around the need for an uplift of housing numbers to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and we are only able to accept representations on these matters.

REPRESENTATIONS MUST ONLY RELATE TO THE CURRENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.

Further representations to the submitted SWDP will not be accepted. There is no need to repeat representations that you submitted at the Pre-Submission consultation stage (January/February 2013).

You can access the SWDP documents online and obtain additional copies of this form from the SWDP website http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393

Completed forms should be returned either by

Email to:
contact@swdevelopmentplan.org

Post to:
Paul Bayliss, SWDP Project Manager
c/o Wychavon District Council
Policy Plans Team
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Pershore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

Please note: Unfortunately we are now unable to receive responses sent to the Freepost address previously used. Please ensure that only the address given in this current guidance and associated response forms are used.

ALL REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED IN WRITING NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON 14th NOVEMBER 2014.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
Before completing the response form we would be grateful if you could tell us more about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title (if relevant)</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if relevant)</td>
<td>Hallam Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Lock Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW WE WILL USE YOUR DETAILS**

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will be used only for the preparation of local development documents or any subsequent statutory replacement. However, your name and representations will be made publicly available when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential.

**OTHER DETAILS, INCLUDING YOUR ADDRESS AND SIGNATURE, WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.**

In agreeing to the holding of your information you are giving permission for your details, held on the database, to be shared between the three local authorities. If you have any concerns or queries relating to this process, please contact 01905 722233.

I agree that contact details and any related responses can be held by the planning service departments of the three South Worcestershire local authorities. I understand that they will only be used in relation to the plan making process as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and other planning-related legislation.

Signed: [Signature]  
Date: 14/11/14
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

3. Are you attaching any additional sheets that relate to this representation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
<th>7 incl this one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification Number</th>
<th>PM13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Consistent with National Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As also set out in the accompanying guidance note (paragraph C, page 2 of GUIDANCE NOTE – How to Respond to the Proposed Modifications), these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

**Part A**

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response – there is an additional document available on the SWDP website that can be completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

---

**1 SUMMARY**

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the
following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills' housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 13

Footnote (B.) to table 4e refers to an amended discount of 5% on commitments for planning permissions not being implemented. We support the inclusion of such a discount, and also strongly advocate the role of large scale urban extensions to deliver housing growth given their ability to plan comprehensively in a coordinated manner and deliver significant infrastructure. However, our experience of large scale development is that in order to determine the appropriate infrastructure requirements and achieve the best possible scheme, a long term commitment over the plan period is required for such sites. Taking this delay on early delivery into account we consider that a 5% discount is insufficient to reflect the level of growth attributed to urban extensions in the
SWDP: To ensure that this PM is ‘effective’ i.e. that it can ensure the objectives of the Plan can be achieved, a discount of 10% should be applied. This level of discount would in turn require an increase in overall housing provision to ensure a flexible supply. The allocation of Cales Farm would help secure this additional provision and build sufficient contingency into the identified housing supply.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.

Expand box / use additional page as necessary
Part B
Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

The footnote should include a discount of 10% on commitments. Subsequently, Cales Farm should be allocated to address the associated reduction in overall supply when taking a 10% discount into account. This change will ensure the Plan is ‘effective’ by applying a more realistic contingency and helping to secure the required housing provision as set out in Policy SWDP 3.
7. If your representation is seeking a change to the Proposed Modification, are you content for it to be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at an examination hearing?

| Written representations | Participate at an examination hearing | X |

8a. If you wish to participate at an examination hearing, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

This representation should be considered alongside those already submitted by HLM at earlier stages of the SWDP process. HLM are a key stakeholder in South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) - particularly the development and implementation of the West of Worcester urban extension (Temple Laughern) and, additionally, at Evesham, land off Abbey Road as well as at Cales Farm – and are therefore a key partner in the delivery of the SWDP.

HLM is able to make substantial contributions to the SWDP examination having provided, and being able to provide, substantial evidence in relation to SWDP proposals both in support of the representations made, and in testing the evidence base put forward by the three Councils. While much evidence has been made available to the Councils’ in the Development Plan process, and set out in representations, it is important that such evidence, and the views of such a key partner in the Plan’s delivery, are presented by participating at the examination so the Inspector may rely upon a comprehensive evidence basis and understanding of the SWDP issues.

8b. Where there are a large number of identical or very similar responses to a particular modification, it would assist the Inspector if individuals could work together on presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you are able to do this, please indicate below who will be representing you. Your individual comments will still be considered by the Inspector.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this representation.
South Worcestershire Development Plan Examination

Representation Form
Consultation on Proposed Modifications to SWDP: 6 October – 14 November 2014

South Worcestershire Councils

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response
There is an extension form available on the SWDP website that can be downloaded / completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014.
All comments must be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.
The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) are seeking representations on the Proposed Modifications to the SWDP, following stage 1 of the Examination (March 2014). The changes are proposed by the SWC to address issues around the need for an uplift of housing numbers to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and we are only able to accept representations on these matters.

REPRESENTATIONS MUST ONLY RELATE TO THE CURRENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.

Further representations to the submitted SWDP will not be accepted. There is no need to repeat representations that you submitted at the Pre-Submission consultation stage (January/February 2013).

You can access the SWDP documents online and obtain additional copies of this form from the SWDP website http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=5393

Completed forms should be returned either by

Email to:
contact@swdevelopmentplan.org

Post to:
Paul Bayliss, SWDP Project Manager
c/o Wychavon District Council
Policy Plans Team
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Pershore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

Please note: Unfortunately we are now unable to receive responses sent to the Freepost address previously used. Please ensure that only the address given in this current guidance and associated response forms are used.

ALL REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED IN WRITING NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON 14th NOVEMBER 2014.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
Before completing the response form we would be grateful if you could tell us more about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title (if relevant)</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if relevant).</td>
<td>Hallam Land Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW WE WILL USE YOUR DETAILS

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It will be used only for the preparation of local development documents or any subsequent statutory replacement. However, your name and representations will be made publicly available when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential.

OTHER DETAILS, INCLUDING YOUR ADDRESS AND SIGNATURE, WILL BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.

In agreeing to the holding of your information you are giving permission for your details, held on the database, to be shared between the three local authorities. If you have any concerns or queries relating to this process, please contact 01905 722233.

I agree that contact details and any related responses can be held by the planning service departments of the three South Worcestershire local authorities. I understand that they will only be used in relation to the plan making process as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and other planning-related legislation.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 14/11/14
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Are you attaching any additional sheets that relate to this representation?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
<th>7 incl this one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PM22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)</th>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Consistent with National Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As also set out in the accompanying guidance note (paragraph C, page 2 of GUIDANCE NOTE – How to Respond to the Proposed Modifications), these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response – there is an additional document available on the SWDP website that can be completed and appended to this form as many times as required. This will enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the
following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications' are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetIQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills' housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 22

Taking account of the HLM representations in respect of PM 9 and PM 12 which indicate that further capacity is available within the Malvern Hills District, and importantly adjacent to the urban area of Malvern, we do not consider that the modification to re-direct 3,000 units to other sub-areas is ‘sound’ in helping to meet the full, objectively assessed need of the Malvern District when other sites are available within the District.

PM 22 indicates that the ‘Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area target has been based on supply consistent with a scale of growth in the sub area which reflects the need to respect key natural and environmental
assets…Other material considerations were taken into account such as site availability…”: This statement is not considered to be fully ‘justified’ as further growth could be accommodated in the sub-area without any negative impacts on natural and environmental assets.

The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP process and it was noted in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (2012) that it was not taken forward due to landscape sensitivities. Furthermore, the ‘Schedule of potential housing sites considered and rejected following the Objective Assessment of Housing Need (summer 2014)’ indicates that Cales Farm was discounted at this subsequent stage due to access and landscape issues, and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2012) also dismissed the site. In light of all of the evidence put forward by Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties, which demonstrates that the site is well positioned adjacent to the North Site and can be accessed both through this current development site and from Sayers Avenue, and that it does not have an impact on the AONB, we do not consider that an accurate assessment has been undertaken and therefore the SA underpinning the Proposed Modifications is flawed.

In light of the lack of evidence to dismiss the site at Cales Farm on either access or landscape grounds, the flawed assessment of this site means that this site is a) able to be delivered without harm to natural and environmental assets and b) available. Therefore, the text in PM22 is inaccurate given the availability of this site to deliver additional capacity in Malvern Hills.

PM22 goes on to state that the re-direction of 3,000 units from Malvern Hills is necessary due to limited opportunities for urban growth within the district. For the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, this statement is not ‘justified’ as sustainable alternatives are available. The allocation of Cales Farm could help accommodate further housing growth within the Malvern Hills district, and the flawed assessment of this site has resulted in an incorrect derivation of the actual available capacity of this sub-area.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
Part B

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

It is essential that a re-assessment of Cales Farm is undertaken. The site has a robust access solution and does not impact upon the AONB. Therefore, the level of growth to be re-directed should be amended accordingly to take account of the fact that this site can accommodate further housing growth within Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. The level of housing to be de-directed should be reduced to 2,700.

This change would ensure that the housing needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable strategy, thus making the plan ‘justified’.
Please use a separate Part A / B form for each modification you wish to respond to and attach to the one containing your contact details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written representations</th>
<th>Participate at an examination hearing</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. If your representation is seeking a change to the Proposed Modification, are you content for it to be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at an examination hearing?

| Written representations | Participate at an examination hearing | X |

8a. If you wish to participate at an examination hearing, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

This representation should be considered alongside those already submitted by HLM at earlier stages of the SWDP process. HLM are a key stakeholder in South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) - particularly the development and implementation of the West of Worcester urban extension (Temple Laughern) and, additionally, at Evesham, land off Abbey Road as well as at Cales Farm – and are therefore a key partner in the delivery of the SWDP.

HLM is able to make substantial contributions to the SWDP examination having provided, and being able to provide, substantial evidence in relation to SWDP proposals both in support of the representations made, and in testing the evidence base put forward by the three Councils. While much evidence has been made available to the Councils’ in the Development Plan process, and set out in representations, it is important that such evidence, and the views of such a key partner in the Plan’s delivery, are presented by participating at the examination so the Inspector may rely upon a comprehensive evidence basis and understanding of the SWDP issues.

8b. Where there are a large number of identical or very similar responses to a particular modification, it would assist the Inspector if individuals could work together on presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you are able to do this, please indicate below who will be representing you. Your individual comments will still be considered by the Inspector.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this representation.
Additional sheet(s) for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response to enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments should be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
South Worcestershire Development Plan  
Proposed Modifications: 6 October – 14 November 2014  

Please use a separate sheet for each modification number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name / Organisation Name (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for tracking purposes only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Freer / David Lock Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification No.</th>
<th>PM164</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each reference number.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:
i) It is not “Positively Prepared” in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to
accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings)
nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as
at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also
having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high
number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the
level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust
and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more
strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period
and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply
of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a
priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury
Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus
growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of
Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and
adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of
the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control
of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily
available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be
delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the
adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the
Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas,
including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites)
should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside
of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to
accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where
they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are
arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the
District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and
would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide
flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development.
This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the
smaller allocations and windfall sites.

The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered
sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations
PM164
PM 164 allocates a new site – land at Lower Howsell Road (former allotments) for 81 dwellings. The allocation of this site ahead of more sustainable, suitable alternatives including Cales Farm is considered ‘unsound’. The allocation of this site increases the reliance on smaller scale sites, resulting in an even high proportion of the Malvern Hills supply coming from one type of development. We object to this allocation and consider that the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued ahead of this site to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
Additional sheet for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Part B

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above the allocation of this site. Currently, this allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. This allocation should only come forward once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of allocating additional smaller scale sites.
Representation Form – Additional Pages
Consultation on Proposed Modifications to SWDP: 6 October – 14 November 2014

South Worcestershire Councils

Additional sheet(s) for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response to enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments should be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

| Modification No. | PM168 |

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

| Yes | X | No | No Comment |

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

| Positively prepared | Effective |
| Justified | X | Consistent with National Policy |

As mentioned above, these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each reference number.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:
i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to
accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of
development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings)
nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as
at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also
having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high
number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the
level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust
and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more
strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period
and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply
of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a
priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury
Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus
growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of
Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and
adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of
the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control
of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily
available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be
delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the
adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the
Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas,
including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites)
should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside
of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to
accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where
they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are
arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the
District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and
would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide
flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development.
This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the
smaller allocations and windfall sites.

The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered
sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations

PM168

PM 168 allocates a new site – Land off Brook Farm Drive Poolbrook for 77 dwellings. The allocation of this site
ahead of more sustainable, suitable alternatives including Cales Farm is considered ‘unsound’. The allocation of this site increases the reliance on smaller scale sites, resulting in an even high proportion of the Malvern Hills supply coming from one type of development. We object to this allocation and consider that the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued ahead of this site to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
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**Part B**

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

---

The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above the allocation of this site. Currently, this allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. This allocation should only come forward once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of allocating additional smaller scale sites.
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Additional sheet(s) for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response to enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments should be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)

SWCs: October 2014
South Worcestershire Development Plan
Proposed Modifications: 6 October – 14 November 2014

Please use a separate sheet for each modification number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name / Organisation Name (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for tracking purposes only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Freer / David Lock Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification No.</th>
<th>PM172</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Consistent with National Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy
that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as
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at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations

PM172

Reasoned Justification paragraph 1 of Policy SWDP 52 relates to the directions of growth outside of the Malvern town boundary. The modifications reflect the new and amended allocations both within the development boundary and immediately adjoining it. The figures provided in PM172 are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not reflect the opportunity presented by the Cales Farm site to provide further housing growth, also immediately
adjoining the development boundary.

In allocating more small scale sites to increase the ‘urban capacity’ of Malvern, this has in turn increased the proportion of Malvern’s overall supply that is provided through small scale sites. Therefore, the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued as a priority to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites within and immediately adjoining the development boundary of Malvern, rather than applying an even greater reliance on small scale sites.

Furthermore, the revised figures in PM172 reflect the amended allocations at North East Malvern and the Qinetiq site. Whilst we support the overall increase in supply within Malvern, we consider that the development opportunities of all available and deliverable sites (including Cales Farm) are maximised as a priority before the capacity of existing sites is increased or other less suitable sites introduced by PM164 (Land off Lower Halsell Road (former allotments) – 81 dwellings) and PM 168 (Land off Brook Farm Drive Poolbrook – 77 dwellings). It is important to maintain a flexible supply of housing land, with a balance of small, medium and large brownfield and greenfield sites.

There are serious flaws in the assessment of the Cales Farm site undertaken through the Sustainability Appraisal (2012) and the SHLAA (2012) which do not accurately reflect opportunities and constraints of this site despite the high level of technical information that has been submitted during the SWDP process. This site is sustainable and deliverable and does not have a negative impact on the AONB or present access issues. It could contribute at least 350 units to Malvern’s housing supply and therefore should be allocated as part of the SWDP. The figures provided in PM 172 should reflect the allocation of this site which would help meet a greater proportion of Malvern’s objectively assessed housing needs within its own district.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
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Part B

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

To ensure Policy SWDP52 is sound PM172 should reflect the contribution that the allocation of Cales Farm would provide to the Malvern supply. This would result in at least an additional 350 (approx.) units immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern. This change would ensure that the objectively assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable strategy, thus making the plan ‘justified’.
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Please use a separate sheet for each modification response to enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments should be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
South Worcestershire Development Plan
Proposed Modifications: 6 October – 14 November 2014

Please use a separate sheet for each modification number.

Your Name / Organisation Name (if relevant)
(for tracking purposes only)
Nick Freer / David Lock Associates

4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?
Modification No. PM173

5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?
Yes X No No Comment

6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively prepared</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with National Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Additional sheet for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each reference number.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershires (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy
that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flaw</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

SWDP53 – Malvern Technology Centre (Qinetiq)
PM173 (and associated PM174 & PM175)

This PM increases the capacity of the existing allocation at Qinetiq by 50 dwellings which we consider to be ‘unjustified’ in the absence of an accurate assessment of other available sites. In accordance with paragraph 50 of the NPPF the SWDP should seek to provide sites to deliver a wide range of homes. This requires a balanced mix of sites of all scales, both brownfield and greenfield, to ensure a flexible housing supply. Cales Farm presents a more sustainable, suitable alternative to increasing the capacity of existing allocations by helping to
balance the housing supply, particularly if the latter would result in an increase in density. Ensuring a strong portfolio of sites is essential in maintaining a secure housing land supply. Therefore, Cales Farm should be allocated ahead of pursuing an increase in capacity at the Qinetiq site.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern's needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
Additional sheet for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Part B

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above increasing the allocation at this site. Currently, this increased allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. Such an increase of capacity should only be pursued once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy 'justified' Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of increasing this allocation.
Additional sheet(s) for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Please use a separate sheet for each modification response to enable the Inspector to consider your comments on each modification as promptly as possible.

Consultation runs from Monday 6th October to Friday 14th November 2014. All comments should be received by 5.00pm on the 14th November.

(The following form can be edited electronically by clicking into the boxes and typing – boxes should automatically expand as needed. Cursor marks will not affect the text or readability of the document)
### South Worcestershire Development Plan
Proposed Modifications: 6 October – 14 November 2014

Please use a separate sheet for each modification number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name / Organisation Name (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for tracking purposes only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Freer / David Lock Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Which Proposed Modification does your representation relate to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Do you consider the Proposed Modification to be legally compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. If you consider the Proposed Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Additional sheet for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

Part A

Please use a separate sheet for each reference number.

Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Please note - your representation should provide evidence and information to support / justify your representation and any suggested change.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

1 SUMMARY

Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy
that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as...
Additional sheet for responses to individual modifications – to be appended to main form as required

at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.

Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

SWDP56 – Development at North East Malvern

PM176 (and associated PM178 & 179)

This PM increases the capacity of the existing allocation at North East Malvern by 100 dwellings which we consider to be ‘unjustified’ in the absence of an accurate assessment of other available sites. In accordance with paragraph 50 of the NPPF the SWDP should seek to provide sites to deliver a wide range of homes. This requires a balanced mix of sites of all scales, both brownfield and greenfield, to ensure a flexible housing supply.
Cales Farm presents a more sustainable, suitable alternative to increasing the capacity of existing allocations by helping to balance the housing supply, particularly if the latter would result in an increase in density. Ensuring a strong portfolio of sites is essential in maintaining a secure housing land supply. Therefore, Cales Farm should be allocated ahead of pursuing an increase in capacity at the North East Malvern site.

Conclusion

In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.
Part B

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the Proposed Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Modifications.

The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above increasing the allocation at this site. Currently, this increased allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. Such an increase of capacity should only be pursued once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of increasing this allocation.
South Worcestershire Development Plan

Proposed Modifications October 2014

Report of Representations on Behalf of Hallam Land Management Limited

November 2014

Prepared by David Lock Associates
1 SUMMARY

1.1 Hallam Land Management (HLM) are submitting representations in response to the consultation on the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Proposed Modifications (October 2014) in respect of land at Cales Farm, Malvern, in which they have an interest. These representations relate to the level of growth attributed to the Malvern Hills District, particularly that which is to be accommodated in the Malvern Hills (excluding the Wider Worcester Area (WWA)) sub-area and the provision within and immediately adjacent to the Malvern urban area itself.

1.2 It is understood that responses to this consultation should focus solely on the Proposed Modifications. Accordingly, completed response forms are enclosed with this report, which is intended to serve as a summary of and justification for the comments on the proposed modifications.

1.3 Representations have previously been submitted in response to the SWDP in respect of this site by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties Ltd. The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP with the potential to accommodate at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure (a copy of the site boundary is attached to these representations).

1.4 The site is considered to present a sustainable option to deliver housing growth at Malvern. It is ideally situated adjacent to the MoD North Camp site (North Site), currently being implemented for residential led, mixed use development, and development of this site will not adversely affect the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

1.5 The three South Worcestershire (SW) Councils have now reviewed the growth strategy for the SWDP to seek to address the concerns and recommendations highlighted by the appointed Inspector and to take account of the updated Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN). This has resulted in an increase in the overall housing provision within the SWDP, a revised distribution of this provision between the sub-areas and subsequently, amendments to existing site allocations and the allocation of new sites within the various sub-areas.

1.6 Notwithstanding the considerable technical evidence and representations provided in respect of the land at Cales Farm, indicating that the site provides a suitable, achievable and sustainable site for accommodating growth within Malvern, the SW Councils have resisted allocating this site within the Proposed Modifications. Whilst
we welcome the efforts to increase the overall housing provision in the Proposed Modifications, October 2014, and understand that the accommodation of Malvern Hills needs must be met in significant part outside the district or in the wider Worcester Area, we consider the proposed distribution strategy is ‘unsound’ for the following overarching reasons:

i) It is not ‘Positively Prepared’ in the sense that the Proposed Modifications to the Plan fail to provide a strategy that best meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the area as it does not maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of the Malvern Hills District where they are arising when sites are available and deliverable, and notwithstanding the constraints in the district as a whole;

ii) It is not “justified” as the distribution of the housing requirement to the sub-areas does not fully reflect the evidence base. The apportionment of housing provision has been based on assumptions on the capacity of the respective sub-areas to accommodate growth, this in turn has been informed by an assessment of potential available sites which we consider to be flawed. Therefore, incorrect assumptions on the capacity of the sub-areas have been derived and this has influenced the distribution strategy which is undermined as a result. Therefore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives (including the potential allocation of alternative sites such as land at Cales Farm).

iii) It is not ‘consistent with national planning policy’ as the modifications to the proposed allocations do not provide a robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

1.7 These representations set out where policy specific ‘Proposed Modifications’ are not ‘positively prepared’ or not ‘justified’ and therefore why the Plan remains ‘unsound’.

1.8 In summary the flaws to the distribution strategy contained within the Proposed Modifications are as follows:

a) The overall housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area (Policy SWDP 3, table 4b) is not reflective of the capacity of the sub-area, when taking into account the availability of other alternative, additional sites. Therefore, the ability of the Malvern Hills District to further meet its own needs, has not been accurately reflected and addressed within the changes to policy SWDP 3. Therefore, the increase in the level of housing that is re-directed to WWA and Wychavon (to 3,000 units) is not considered ‘sound’ when capacity does exist
within the Malvern Hills District that would enable more growth to be met where needs are actually arising.

b) Taking account of the level of housing provision that is re-directed to the other sub-areas, the decision to include new and increased allocations within these sub-areas, when additional capacity exists in the Malvern Hills District to further meet local needs where they are arising, has misinformed some judgements on such allocations. This includes the new allocation of Swinesherd Way (300 units) within the WWA, when there is capacity in Malvern for the district to accommodate more of its own need where it is arising. Therefore, the allocation of such new sites is undermined by a flawed evidence base regarding the true capacity of the Malvern Hills District.

c) Whilst the general increase in housing provision within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is supported, the distribution of housing provision within the Malvern Hills District is not considered to be the most appropriate strategy when assessed against other alternatives. We fully support a) accommodating as much of the Malvern District housing needs as possible within the district where the needs are arising; and importantly, b) directing the growth requirements to the Malvern urban area in the first instance and to most sustainable sites at the Malvern urban areas. In light of this approach we consider that the priority should be to pursue the allocation of a new strategic site at Cales Farm ahead of, but potentially in addition to:

i. Increasing the capacity of existing allocations – the North East Malvern allocation has been increased by 100 units without amending the site boundary and the QinetiQ site by 50 units. We presume that this will lead to an increase in density and this should only be pursued once other available and deliverable sites within the District and importantly, at the Malvern urban area, have been included in the Plan.

ii. Pursuing a number of smaller new allocations within Malvern itself – whilst these allocations do help to accommodate more of Malvern’s need within its own district, they would lead to a more piecemeal form of development including in unsustainable locations. Neither Brook Farm Road, Poolbrook (PM168 – 77 dwellings) nor the former allotments site (PM164, 81 dwellings) should be favoured ahead of more appropriate sites such as at Cales farm. There is a risk of attributing considerable growth to come forward from these allocations and also having a separate substantial requirement for delivery through windfall, resulting in an overreliance on a high number of smaller scale sites. There is not
considered to be sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that the level of windfall development can be achieved. To ensure the proposed housing supply within Malvern is robust and deliverable it is essential that there is a balance in the housing provision from small, medium and more strategic sites, both brownfield and greenfield. This will help ensure flexible delivery throughout the Plan period and a more balanced approach to phasing of growth, strengthening the ability to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing land. Where additional, larger sites are available within Malvern, these should be allocated as a priority with smaller sites supplementing the supply.

iii. Pursuing new village allocations within the Malvern Hills District

including for instance new sites within Tenbury Wells (PM183, 35 dwellings) and Upton-upon-Severn. This is contrary to Policy SWDP 2 which seeks to focus growth on the main urban areas. As set out above, whilst we support the objective to accommodate as much of Malvern’s need within the District as possible, it is essential that exploiting all available capacity within and adjacent to the urban area of Malvern prior to pursuing allocations elsewhere within the District.

1.9 The land at Cales Farm is considered to be a more sustainable alternative to the above Proposed Modifications of the overarching growth and distribution strategy. With a capacity of at least 350 units and being under the control of a single landowner, it is capable of being delivered early in the plan period. It provides a flexible and readily available site that can help expedite housing delivery. It will also enable a significant amount of growth to be delivered in a comprehensive and consolidated manner, having regard to the successful development of the adjacent land, and would deliver generous green infrastructure. It would help define a sympathetic edge to the Malvern urban area, ensuring that the setting of AONB is protected. Focusing growth to the urban areas, including Malvern is a key priority of the SWDP, and the capacity of the town (and immediately adjacent sites) should be maximised prior to directing additional development to village locations within Malvern Hills, or outside of the district itself or could indeed suggest a modest increase in overall provision across the plan to accommodate such capacity. It is imperative that housing provision seeks where possible, to meet needs where they are arising.

1.10 The allocation of Cales Farm would enable more of the Malvern Hills’ housing needs to be met where they are arising, thus reducing a little the pressure for growth to be re-directed to other sub-areas or other parts of the District. It would enable a more sustainable form of development, well related to the town and adjoining site, and would help meet wider objectives associated with focusing growth to the urban areas.
1.11 Notwithstanding the above, having an additional site which can deliver approximately 350 dwellings will provide flexibility in the supply for the Malvern Hills District and the added security of more comprehensive development. This should be considered a crucial component of Malvern’s housing supply, which is then supplemented by the smaller allocations and windfall sites.

1.12 The following section of the report sets out in more detail where the Proposed Modifications are not considered sound in light of their divergence from the alternative approach set out above.

2 REASONS WHY THIS PART OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT IS UNSOUND

Policy SWDP 2
Proposed Modification Reference: PM2

2.1 This amendment incorporates text stating that the Development Strategy will “provide for and facilitate the delivery of sufficient housing to meet objectively assessed needs to 2030.” We consider that this change is not fully justified insofar as the approach to housing provision set out in Policy SWDP 3 does seek to re-direct a higher proportion of the Malvern Hills District need to other sub-areas than is required. Further capacity exists on sustainable sites within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. This is discussed further in respect of the amendments to Policy SWDP 3 and SWDP 52 and only when these policies are revised to reflect the additional growth that can be accommodated within the Malvern urban area (within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area), will be new statement in Policy SWDP 2 be considered sound.

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 9

2.2 Whilst we support the general increase in the Proposed Modifications to the level of housing provision in Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) to 5,600 from 4,900, this increase is not considered to be sufficient. Whilst we acknowledge that the full, objectively assessed need of Malvern Hills cannot be accommodated within the district’s boundary, we strongly consider that there is additional capacity within / adjacent to the Malvern urban area to meet housing needs that arise locally. Importantly, and in the context of the objectives of Policy SWDP 2 to focus growth at the urban areas including Malvern, there is known capacity immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern (at Cales Farm). As this has not been pursued as an allocation
to contribute towards the potential supply in the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area, the amendment to attribute 5,600 units to this sub-area is not fully 'justified' as the modification does not represent the most appropriate alternative when assessed against other available alternatives, and as such does not meet objectively assessed local needs to the extent that is possible.

2.3 Furthermore, the subsequent iteration published in the ERRATA to the Proposed Modifications to reduce the Malvern Hills provision from 5,900 to 5,600, which we assume was based on updated information on existing commitments, has resulted in a greater reduction of Malvern Hills’ need being met within its own district. When additional / alternative sites are available within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area, the provision for Malvern Hills set out in table 4b, which is based on the available ‘supply’ (table 4e) is not considered to be an accurate reflection of the supply that would be available if other sustainable, deliverable sites were allocated.

2.4 The land at Cales Farm has the capacity to deliver at least 350 dwellings with associated generous green infrastructure, without impacting upon the AONB. This site is well positioned adjacent to the existing development at North Site and has the potential to provide an integrated scheme and create a consolidated edge to the urban extent of Malvern. Taking into account the capacity of this site, it is considered that the supply of housing in the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area is at least 5,950, so more akin to the figure set out in the initial Proposed Modifications Document published (of 5,900).

Change required to make the Plan sound

2.5 In order to make Policy SWDP 3 sound in respect of Table 4b, the ‘AREA SUBTOTAL’ for Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) Area should be increased from 5,600 to 5,950. This change would result in a lower re-direction of Malvern Hills District’s housing need by 350 units. This change would ensure that the objectively assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’.

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 12

2.6 The HLM representations in response to PM 9 object to the level of housing provision attributed to the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area on the basis that there is available capacity at Cales Farm for at least 350 units. This would increase the level of the Malvern Hills housing need that can be met, not only within the district where it is arising, but immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern,
consistent with Policy SWDP 2. The allocation of Cales Farm would increase the
capacity of the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area to 5,950 units (as a
minimum). Therefore, as amended in the Proposed Modifications, Table 4e is not
considered ‘sound’ as the available ‘SUPPLY subtotal’ fails to meet the objectively
assessed needs of Malvern Hills and underestimates the capacity of the sub-area.
The urban capacity allocations should be increased to reflect the allocation of Cales
Farm, and subsequently the overall supply subtotal should be increased accordingly.

2.7 Notwithstanding our support for an overall increase in the total housing provision within
the Malvern Hills sub-area, we consider that there is currently an overreliance on small
scale allocations and windfall sites as a proportion of the current total. To ensure a
robust, flexible and balanced supply of housing, which can deliver a ‘wide choice of
homes’ in accordance with Paragraph 50 of the NPPF, it is considered essential to
allocate the land at Cales Farm to balance the range of supply to include an additional
medium / large scale, greenfield sites.

Change required to make the Plan sound

2.8 The ‘urban extension’ row of table 4e should be amended to reflect the proposed
allocation of land at Cales Farm with a capacity of at least 350 dwellings, increasing
this figure from 800 to 1,150 units. Subsequently, the ‘SUPPLY subtotal’ in table 4e
should be amended to 5,976 units. This change would ensure that the objectively
assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites,
therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales
Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that
all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable
strategy, thus making the plan fully ‘justified’.

Policy SWDP 3
Proposed Modification Reference: PM 13

2.9 Footnote (B.) to table 4e refers to an amended discount of 5% on commitments for
planning permissions not being implemented. We support the inclusion of such a
discount, and also strongly advocate the role of large scale urban extensions to deliver
housing growth given their ability to plan comprehensively in a coordinated manner
and deliver significant infrastructure. However, our experience of large scale
development is that in order to determine the appropriate infrastructure requirements
and achieve the best possible scheme, a long term commitment over the plan period is
required for such sites. Taking this delay on early delivery into account we consider
that a 5% discount is insufficient to reflect the level of growth attributed to urban
extensions in the SWDP. To ensure that this PM is ‘effective’ i.e. that it can ensure the
objectives of the Plan can be achieved, a discount of 10% should be applied. This level of discount would in turn require an increase in overall housing provision to ensure a flexible supply. The allocation of Cales Farm would help secure this additional provision and build sufficient contingency into the identified housing supply.

**Change required to make the Plan sound**

2.10 The footnote should include a discount of 10% on commitments. Subsequently, Cales Farm should be allocated to address the associated reduction in overall supply when taking a 10% discount into account. This change will ensure the Plan is ‘effective’ by applying a more realistic contingency and helping to secure the required housing provision as set out in Policy SWDP 3.

**Policy SWDP 3**

Proposed Modification Reference: PM 22

2.11 Taking account of the HLM representations in respect of PM 9 and PM 12 which indicate that further capacity is available within the Malvern Hills District, and importantly adjacent to the urban area of Malvern, we do not consider that the modification to re-direct 3,000 units to other sub-areas is ‘sound’ in helping to meet the full, objectively assessed need of the Malvern District when other sites are available within the District.

2.12 PM 22 indicates that the ‘Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area target has been based on supply consistent with a scale of growth in the sub area which reflects the need to respect key natural and environmental assets…Other material considerations were taken into account such as site availability…’ This statement is not considered to be fully ‘justified’ as further growth could be accommodated in the sub-area without any negative impacts on natural and environmental assets.

2.13 The site at Cales Farm has been promoted through the SWDP process and it was noted in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (2012) that it was not taken forward due to landscape sensitivities. Furthermore, the ‘Schedule of potential housing sites considered and rejected following the Objective Assessment of Housing Need (summer 2014)’ indicates that Cales Farm was discounted at this subsequent stage due to **access and landscape issues**, and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2012) also dismissed the site. In light of all of the evidence put forward by Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Consolidated Rank Properties, which demonstrates that the site is well positioned adjacent to the North Site and can be accessed both through this current development site and from Sayers Avenue, and that it does not have an impact on the AONB, we do not consider that an accurate
assessment has been undertaken and therefore the SA underpinning the Proposed Modifications is flawed.

2.14 In light of the lack of evidence to dismiss the site at Cales Farm on either access or landscape grounds, the flawed assessment of this site means that this site is a) able to be delivered without harm to natural and environmental assets and b) available. Therefore, the text in PM22 is inaccurate given the availability of this site to deliver additional capacity in Malvern Hills.

2.15 PM22 goes on to state that the re-direction of 3,000 units from Malvern Hills is necessary due to limited opportunities for urban growth within the district. For the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, this statement is not ‘justified’ as sustainable alternatives are available. The allocation of Cales Farm could help accommodate further housing growth within the Malvern Hills district, and the flawed assessment of this site has resulted in an incorrect derivation of the actual available capacity of this sub-area.

Change required to make the Plan sound

2.16 It is essential that a re-assessment of Cales Farm is undertaken. The site has a robust access solution and does not impact upon the AONB. Therefore, the level of growth to be re-directed should be amended accordingly to take account of the fact that this site can accommodate further housing growth within Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. The level of housing to be de-directed should be reduced to 2,700.

2.17 This change would ensure that the housing needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable strategy, thus making the plan ‘justified’.

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations

PM164

2.18 PM 164 allocates a new site – land at Lower Howsell Road (former allotments) for 81 dwellings. The allocation of this site ahead of more sustainable, suitable alternatives including Cales Farm is considered ‘unsound’. The allocation of this site increases the reliance on smaller scale sites, resulting in an even high proportion of the Malvern Hills supply coming from one type of development. We object to this allocation and consider that the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued ahead of this site to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites.
Change required to make the Plan sound

2.19 The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above the allocation of this site. Currently, this allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. This allocation should only come forward once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of allocating additional smaller scale sites.

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations
PM168

2.20 PM 168 allocates a new site – Land off Brook Farm Drive Poolbrook for 77 dwellings. The allocation of this site ahead of more sustainable, suitable alternatives including Cales Farm is considered ‘unsound’. The allocation of this site increases the reliance on smaller scale sites, resulting in an even high proportion of the Malvern Hills supply coming from one type of development. We object to this allocation and consider that the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued ahead of this site to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites.

Change required to make the Plan sound

2.21 The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above the allocation of this site. Currently, this allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. This allocation should only come forward once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of allocating additional smaller scale sites.

SWDP52 – Malvern Allocations
PM172

2.22 Reasoned Justification paragraph 1 of Policy SWDP 52 relates to the directions of growth outside of the Malvern town boundary. The modifications reflect the new and amended allocations both within the development boundary and immediately adjoining it. The figures provided in PM172 are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do
not reflect the opportunity presented by the Cales Farm site to provide further housing growth, also immediately adjoining the development boundary.

2.23 In allocating more small scale sites to increase the ‘urban capacity’ of Malvern, this has in turn increased the proportion of Malvern’s overall supply that is provided through small scale sites. Therefore, the allocation of Cales Farm should be pursued as a priority to ensure a more balanced, flexible supply of deliverable sites within and immediately adjoining the development boundary of Malvern, rather than applying an even greater reliance on small scale sites.

2.24 Furthermore, the revised figures in PM172 reflect the amended allocations at North East Malvern and the Qinetiq site. Whilst we support the overall increase in supply within Malvern, we consider that the development opportunities of all available and deliverable sites (including Cales Farm) are maximised as a priority before the capacity of existing sites is increased or other less suitable sites introduced by PM164 (Land off Lower Halsell Road (former allotments) – 81 dwellings) and PM 168 (Land off Brook Farm Drive Poolbrook – 77 dwellings). It is important to maintain a flexible supply of housing land, with a balance of small, medium and large brownfield and greenfield sites.

2.25 There are serious flaws in the assessment of the Cales Farm site undertaken through the Sustainability Appraisal (2012) and the SHLAA (2012) which do not accurately reflect opportunities and constraints of this site despite the high level of technical information that has been submitted during the SWDP process. This site is sustainable and deliverable and does not have a negative impact on the AONB or present access issues. It could contribute at least 350 units to Malvern’s housing supply and therefore should be allocated as part of the SWDP. The figures provided in PM 172 should reflect the allocation of this site which would help meet a greater proportion of Malvern’s objectively assessed housing needs within its own district.

**Change required to make the Plan sound**

2.26 To ensure Policy SWDP52 is sound PM172 should reflect the contribution that the allocation of Cales Farm would provide to the Malvern supply. This would result in at least an additional 350 (approx.) units immediately adjacent to the development boundary of Malvern. This change would ensure that the objectively assessed needs of the district are met as far as is possible in terms of available sites, therefore ensuring the plan is ‘positively prepared’. In pursuing an allocation of Cales Farm this would also reflect an accurate assessment of this site and demonstrate that all alternative options have been fully considered in reaching the most sustainable strategy, thus making the plan ‘justified’.
SWDP53 – Malvern Technology Centre (Qinetiq)
PM173 (and associated PM174 & PM175)

2.27 This PM increases the capacity of the existing allocation at Qinetiq by 50 dwellings which we consider to be ‘unjustified’ in the absence of an accurate assessment of other available sites. In accordance with paragraph 50 of the NPPF the SWDP should seek to provide sites to deliver a wide range of homes. This requires a balanced mix of sites of all scales, both brownfield and greenfield, to ensure a flexible housing supply. Cales Farm presents a more sustainable, suitable alternative to increasing the capacity of existing allocations by helping to balance the housing supply, particularly if the latter would result in an increase in density. Ensuring a strong portfolio of sites is essential in maintaining a secure housing land supply. Therefore, Cales Farm should be allocated ahead of pursuing an increase in capacity at the Qinetiq site.

Change required to make the Plan sound

2.28 The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above increasing the allocation at this site. Currently, this increased allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. Such an increase of capacity should only be pursued once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy ‘justified’ Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of increasing this allocation.

SWDP56 – Development at North East Malvern
PM176 (and associated PM178 & 179)

2.29 This PM increases the capacity of the existing allocation at North East Malvern by 100 dwellings which we consider to be ‘unjustified’ in the absence of an accurate assessment of other available sites. In accordance with paragraph 50 of the NPPF the SWDP should seek to provide sites to deliver a wide range of homes. This requires a balanced mix of sites of all scales, both brownfield and greenfield, to ensure a flexible housing supply. Cales Farm presents a more sustainable, suitable alternative to increasing the capacity of existing allocations by helping to balance the housing supply, particularly if the latter would result in an increase in density. Ensuring a strong portfolio of sites is essential in maintaining a secure housing land supply. Therefore, Cales Farm should be allocated ahead of pursuing an increase in capacity at the North East Malvern site.
Change required to make the Plan sound

2.30 The allocation of Cales Farm should take precedence above increasing the allocation at this site. Currently, this increased allocation does not reflect an accurate assessment of all alternative and available sites. Such an increase of capacity should only be pursued once the opportunities at more suitable and sustainable sites have been maximised. To make this policy 'justified' Cales Farm should be allocated in the first instance, demonstrating that all available and suitable alternative sites have been fully considered ahead of increasing this allocation.

Conclusion

2.31 In summary, the overall increase in housing provision within the SWDP Proposed Modifications is welcomed, in particular the increase within the Malvern Hills (excluding WWA) sub-area. It is paramount that as much of Malvern’s own need is met locally as is possible, taking account of the availability of suitable sites.

2.32 Fundamentally, the objections to the Proposed Modifications on behalf of Hallam Land Management relate to the flawed assumptions on the capacity of the Malvern Hills District, specifically the contribution that Cales Farm can make to the supply. The site at Cales Farm has been subject to an incorrect assessment as part of the SWDP process and as such there is a lack of evidence to support its dismissal as an allocation.

2.33 The allocation of this site would have multiple benefits in terms of delivering sustainable, comprehensive development which should take precedence over a) allocating further small scale sites; b) increasing the capacity of existing allocations; c) pursuing additional allocations in village locations; and d) re-directing Malvern’s needs outside of the district. This site is considered essential to build in flexibility into Malvern’s housing supply, ensuring a balanced mix of large, medium and small scale brownfield and greenfield sites without an over reliance on any one type of development.

2.34 The suggested changes to the Proposed Modifications require that the Cales Farm site is re-assessed in terms of its ability to accommodate housing growth for Malvern and that the overall supply and distribution of sites within this sub-area are reviewed accordingly. Allocating this site should be prioritised ahead of the alternative options (set out in the paragraph above) for delivering a higher housing provision and in failing to do this the Proposed Modifications are not ‘positively prepared’ or ‘justified’ as they do not consider all alternative options, are informed by a flawed evidence base, and do
not meet the full objectively assessed need of Malvern district when taking account of all available and suitable sites.