

No.	Consultee	Comment	Policy	Response
1	NATS Safeguarding Team	No comment	N/A	N/A
2	National Highways	It is considered that the proposed amendments will not have any detrimental impact on the safe operations of the SRN (Strategic Road Network). In light of the above, we do not have any concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan and do not have any comments to make at this stage.	N/A	N/A
3	Environment Agency	Given the absence of specific site allocations, the neighbourhood plan is unlikely to have significant environmental impacts.	N/A	N/A
4	Alcester Bowls Club	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the neighbour development plan and for adopting the bowling green as a local green space. (NE3).Following a committee meeting of Alcester Bowls Club last night, we are writing to state that we fully support the plan.	NE3	
5	Canals & River Trust	We advise that we have no waterways, assets or land interests within the area covered by the Plan and as such we have no comment to make.	N/A	N/A
6	The Coal Authority	The area to which this consultation relates is not located within the defined coalfield. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.	N/A	N/A
7	Resident A	support all the proposed changes to the Alcester Neighbourhood Development Plan including the proposal to designate a further 8 areas of local importance as Local Green Spaces ( LGS 12-19).	NE3	N/A
8	Warwickshire Bat Group	It seems to be a very well considered document, recognising the unique character and assets of your town. As the chair of the Warwickshire Bat Group I really only have one comment to offer: You have recognised the value of the natural environment and green spaces and I would urge you to ensure that improving access to them does not lead to their deterioration. Construction of a bridge and new cycle routes could potentially damage or reduce habitats that are used by wildlife, including bats. The Arrow Valley Nature Reserve is used by several species of bats, including the relatively uncommon Leisler's bat. Bats, being nocturnal, can be deterred by artificial lighting and I would ask you to ensure that any additional lighting is minimised and "bat friendly". Guidance on this can be found in this document: <a href="https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/08/bats-and-artificial-lighting-at-night-llp-guidance-note-update-released">https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/08/bats-and-artificial-lighting-at-night-llp-guidance-note-update-released</a>	Projects	Advice noted with thanks.
9	Resident B	I agree to all the changes		N/A
10	Resident C	I agree to all the changes		N/A
11	Resident D	L G S 12 Oversley Green. I agree that this area should be designated a LGS/Local Green Space	NE3	N/A
12	Resident E	Newsletter form completed - all changes agreed		N/A
13	National Gas	National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area	N/A	N/A
14	Resident F	Newsletter form completed - all changes agreed		N/A
15	Warwickshire County Council	I shared the draft across all service areas and have had a number of comments.		
		The first is from my colleagues in Social Care who has concerns about the proposed deletion of HB5, which is to 'support the development of specialist housing' with the justification of 'evidence indicates that there is no local need'. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) for Warwickshire Indicates that there is substantial unmet need for people needing different types of housing, and this theme has also been highlighted in the both the Ageing Well and Learning Disability Joint Strategic Needs Assessment's. Colleagues are currently working on demand modelling to help provide some context so I do recognise that there is something about how potential needs are articulated but what we do know broadly is that housing options for vulnerable adults who may require specific accommodation is a challenge so I am unsure why with the evidence that has been published that the Town Council have come this conclusion. Need may be low in rural communities; however, to do away with the policy that just states where identified, it would be supported seems really unhelpful, questionable based on publications, and slightly discriminatory.	HBE 5	Agreed. HBE 5 reinstated adding the words "in principle" to policy. Evidence supplied by WCC added to justification
		I have also had comments regarding the Town Centre and Economic Policies. I hope the following suggestions for change are helpful.		
		HBE9 Public Realm (p27) – we suggest the order of the text is changed so it leads with the main point regarding the provision of high quality public realm. Also suggest a slight addition to the text as below: “New residential and town centre developments should respond to opportunities to provide a high quality of public realm, recognising its role in enhancing and improving places and connecting new developments with existing uses / neighbourhoods, and related street furniture such as litter and dog bins, benches and noticeboards that will enhance the sense of place in Alcester.”	HBE9	Agreed
		EC1 Development within a Town Centre (p32) – fully support	EC1	Noted with thanks
		EC2 Supporting employment on brownfield sites (p37) – suggested addition to text, as below: “Proposals for employment uses on brownfield Sites within the Neighbourhood Area will be supported subject to ensuring the the environment and amenity of neighbouring uses is protected, and the size and scale is appropriate to its location.”	EC2	Agreed.

		EC5 Support for Commercial Development (p37) – suggested amendment to second paragraph (re-order so greater emphasis on the impact on the town centre and removal of word adequate), as below: “Any proposals for retail development outside the Town Centre, whether on greenfield or brownfield sites, will be subject to an impact assessment in relation to the Town Centre and will only be supported where it can be shown that the impact to on the Town Centre’s vitality and viability is not adversely affected and should be accessible by adequate footpath and cycle links and public transport.”	EC5	Agreed.
		Finally I have received the following comments from the Flood Team.		
		From reviewing the associated documentation, the proposed policy changes do not relate to flood risk and drainage which is detailed under policy NE5. I have detailed come comments in relation to this policy below:	NE5	
		It should be explicitly state that any application which meets the requirement of a 'major development' will be reviewed and commented on by Warwickshire County Council (WCC) as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Warwickshire. Any development not meeting the criteria of a 'major development' would be classed as a minor development will be reviewed and commented on by Stratford District Council (SDC). Criteria for major development can be found HERE		Add to explanation in policy NE5.
		It is stated that for 'brownfield developments sites, developers are expected to achieve a substantial reduction in the existing runoff rate and, where possible reduce the runoff rate to the equivalent greenfield rate'. The LLFA are supportive of this but it may be worth considering expanding on this point to say that the LLFA requirement is for a minimum of a 50% betterment to be provided on existing runoff rates on brownfield sites should the greenfield rate not be possible.		Add to explanation in policy NE5.
		It is stated that 'all proposals, in areas requiring a flood risk assessment must demonstrate flood risk will not be increased elsewhere'. This point could be expanded to state that flood risk assessments should also include details of how flood risk from all sources affects the proposed development. It should assess whether the development type is appropriate for the proposed location and whether the site’s flood risk is too great for the development. The flood risk assessment should also detail whether the sequential and exception test should be applied.		Add to explanation in policy NE5.
		It is stated that 'All developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems and permeable surfaces. Where ground conditions are evidenced as unsuitable an alternative drainage solution will need to be agreed with the local planning authority and water authority'. Not all sustainable drainage features rely on suitable ground conditions for infiltration and therefore regardless of the ground conditions, sustainable drainage features will be required under local and national policy.		Agreed.
		You could include an additional point that encourages new developments to open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity and biodiversity; and the creation of new culverts should be kept to a minimum. New culverts will need consent from the LLFA and should be kept to the minimum length.		Noted but outside policy NE5.
		Section 6.5.42 mentions the SuDS hierarchy as a list of preferred drainage options when reviewing planning applications for which the LLFA supports the inclusion off. The policy however states 'the preferred SuDS options are.....'. This should be re-worded to say 'The preferred outfall options are.		Agreed.
		Section 6.5.42 should be expanded to state connections to foul sewers will not be accepted and that connections made to third party assets will require engagement and permission from the asset owner.		Agreed.
		It may be beneficial to include both the pluvial and fluvial flood risk maps. Link has been included HERE		Agreed. Link to maps to be added.
		It may be beneficial to include a link to the WCC Local Guidance for Developers. Link has been include HERE.		Agreed. Add to evidence to NE5.
16	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan		N/A
17	Resident G	Newsletter form completed - all changes agreed		N/A
18	Resident H	Newsletter form completed - all changes agreed		N/A
19	Clt Tom Ballinger	Thank you for inviting me to be a consultee – I have reviewed and happy with Alcester Town Councils proposed amendments		N/A
20	Resident I	All changes agreed. Policy HBE 5 - specialist accommodation - how about making this specialist provision encouraged in terms of day care provision etc.	HBE5	HBE 5 to be reinstated. Add wording to include daycare provision.
21	17 no. Residents	Newsletter form completed - all changes agreed		N/A