

HONEYBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting

held at Honeybourne Village Hall, Harvest Close, Honeybourne WR11 7RH
on Tuesday 8th September 2026 at 7:15pm

Members present: Cllrs H Jobes (Chair), B Dubb (Vice-Chair), A Attridge, C Clear, G Clelland, S Sidwell,

J Mellor and S Walsh

In attendance: Parish Clerk, Linda Stanton
District Cllr J Ciotti (arrive 7:40 pm – departed 8:30pm)
3 members of public

Prior to commencement of formal business, the Chairman made an opening statement to those present, explaining that Honeybourne Parish Council is a statutory consultee on planning matters and not the decision-maker, this responsibility resting with Wychavon District Council as Local Planning Authority; that comments carrying most weight with Wychavon are those addressing material planning considerations rather than general support or objection; and that the Council can only comment on matters formally referred to it for consultation. The Chairman further explained that points raised during Open Session would be heard by members and could inform discussion, but would not automatically be incorporated into the Council's formal response, and that residents wishing to submit their own comments to Wychavon District Council were free to do so directly via the planning portal. The Chairman noted that two planning applications — Buckle Street (W/26/01732/OUT) and Stratford Road/Mickleton Road (W/26/01627/RM) — were on the agenda, on which the Council had taken professional planning advice.

26/769 Apologies

Apologies were received and accepted from the following members:

Councillor	Reason
A Mathias	Personal

26/770 Declarations of Interest

Councillors were reminded that to ensure transparency and retain public confidence in the council's decisions they are required to —

- a) Keep their Register of Interests form up to date;
- b) Declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI) and any Other Disclosable Interests (ODI) in agenda items and the nature of those interests.

The following declarations of interest were made:

Cllr	Item	Interest
H Jobes	26/778 (a) – Schedule of payments: Payment to Village Hall	ODI- Village Hall Trustee
G Clelland	26/778(a) – Schedule of payments: payment to Limebridge Rural Services	ODI – personal friend
G Clelland	26/778(b) – Schedule of payments	ODI- personal friend

26/771 To consider any dispensations

There were no requests for dispensation.

26/772 Open Session

- a) Members of the Public.

Councillors raised queries, having seen recent national news regarding changes to local authority planning committees, as to whether the Buckle Street application might in consequence be taken out of Wychavon District Council's determination and decided by central government. District Cllr Ciotti, not being a member of the Planning Committee, was unable to confirm the position. The Clerk noted for the record that the national changes in question (the National Scheme of Delegation, in force from 31st October 2026) affect only whether such applications are decided by a Wychavon officer or by Wychavon's Planning Committee; the decision remains one for Wychavon District Council in either case, and is not transferred to central government.

A councillor asked District Cllr Ciotti whether, given the number of objections recorded on the planning portal, the application would be referred to Wychavon's Planning Committee. She was unable to confirm this with certainty, but considered it most probable that it would be.

b) Supporting organisations, e.g. South Worcestershire Policing Team.

None present.

c) Worcestershire County Councillor — H Robson

Cllr Robson submitted her apologies by email in advance of the meeting and was not in attendance.

d) District Councillor J Ciotti presented her report which was circulated to members in advance of the meeting. **(Appendix 1 page 689)**

Open Session having concluded, the Chairman proposed that the order of business be varied so that items **26/785(b)(i) and (ii)** be taken next, ahead of the remainder of the agenda, so that residents attending for those items were not kept waiting until the end of the meeting.

Resolved:

To vary the order of business to bring forward items 26/785(b)(i) and (ii) to follow Open Session.

26/785 b) Members to respond to planning applications

Ahead of consideration of the planning items, the Chairman reminded members of paragraphs 7–9 of the Council's Code of Conduct: that where a matter directly relates to the well-being of a close associate — for example, where a member of a councillor's family had personally submitted comments on the Wychavon District Council planning portal on either application — this should be disclosed, and the member should consider whether they were able to take part in the discussion and vote, or whether it was more appropriate to declare the interest and withdraw from the meeting for that item. The Chairman advised that this was a decision for each member individually, and not one the Chairman or Clerk could make on a member's behalf; that where an interest had been declared, the safer course was generally to withdraw, since remaining could leave a member's position open to challenge; and that any member who was genuinely unsure was welcome to contact the Monitoring Officer for advice ahead of a future meeting.

Cllrs A Attridge, J Mellor and S Walsh each declared an interest on this basis, namely that a member of their family had submitted comments to Wychavon District Council on this application. The three councillors left the meeting at 7:35pm, prior to discussion and vote of the item.

The Chairman summarised the Council's planning consultant's comments on the application **(Appendix 2 – pages 690 - 697)**, highlighting that: the site is not allocated for housing and lies outside Honeybourne's defined development boundary; Honeybourne Station does not meet the NPPF's definition of a "well-connected" station, so the proposal cannot rely on station-based policy to justify development in the countryside; no need for the additional 220 homes has been demonstrated, Wychavon having confirmed a five-year deliverable housing

land supply; the railway forms a clear boundary to the village, beyond which development would read as a separate estate rather than a natural extension; the scheme, at 220 homes, would increase the village by around 24% and is three times larger than any local development in the past 15 years; the site's access relies on a narrow, signal-controlled railway bridge, with the proposed footway improvement narrowing the road and leaving cyclists sharing a constrained lane with other traffic; the route is unlikely to make cycling a realistic alternative to driving, and the primary school lies around a 25-minute walk away; and the applicant has not committed to the proportion of single-storey homes required by the Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman noted that the Council is not opposed to future housing, and is already reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan and assessing potential sites, but considers development should come forward through that plan-led process rather than a large speculative application. On this basis, the Council's planning consultant recommended that the application be **refused**.

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
i. W/26/01732/OUT	Land at OS 1184 4484, Buckle Street, Honeybourne	Outline Planning application with all matters reserved except access for up to 220 dwellings and associated green space and biodiversity enhancement

Cllrs A Attridge, J Mellor and S Walsh, having earlier declared an interest and withdrawn from the meeting, took no part in the discussion or vote on this item.

Resolved: To approve the Council's response to planning application W/26/01732/OUT... (5 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions)
--

Cllrs A Attridge, J Mellor and S Walsh returned to the meeting at 7:50pm.

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
ii. W/26/01627/RM	Land at Stratford Road/Mickleton Road, Honeybourne	Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for up to 40 dwellings

The Chairman summarised the Council's planning consultant's comments on the application (**Appendix 3 pages 698- 708**). The consultant's comments noted that the Council objects to the application as submitted, but considers the scheme could be supported were the following addressed: the layout sits too close to the Mickleton Road boundary, with insufficient open space and landscaping to preserve the openness of that junction; the proposed housing mix includes too many four and five-bedroom homes and not enough smaller homes, contrary to Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan Policy H2, contributing to a cramped layout; the proposed diversion of the Public Right of Way is less direct, safe and attractive than the route shown at outline stage; further landscaping and tree planting is needed in public and shared areas rather than concentrated in private gardens, with some proposed species being non-native; and the house-type elevations read as standard estate housing rather than reflecting Honeybourne's character, contrary to the Wychavon Design Code SPD (adopted 24th June 2026) — specifically Must 101 (local distinctiveness), Must 109 (window and door composition), and Must 113/Should 114 (materials) — alongside Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan Policies H4 and H5 and NPPF Policy DP3. The Chairman noted that the planning consultant's design comments were supported both by the Wychavon Design Code and by his own professional judgement.

Resolved: That the Council's response to planning application W/26/01627/RM (Land at Stratford Road, Honeybourne), as drafted by the Council's planning consultant, be approved for submission to Wychavon District Council.

26/773 Adoption of Minutes of Previous Meeting

- i. The minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on 14th July 2026 were presented for adoption.
- ii. The minutes of the Confidential Meeting held on 14th July 2026 were presented for adoption

Resolved:

- i. That the minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on 14th July 2026 be approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.
- ii. That the minutes of the Full Council Confidential Meeting held on 14th July be approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman

26/774 Chairman's Report (for information only)

The Chair had no report to give

Noted:

That the Chairman's report be noted

26/775 Parish Clerk's Report (for information only)

The Clerk presented her report. Members noted the updates on ongoing matters as follows:

Item	Subject	Update
a)	Business Plan — Amendment	Following the amendment requested by Council on 14th July 2026, the Business Plan has been updated to incorporate reference to the cemetery capacity survey within the cemetery bullet point, and has been circulated to Councillors.
b)	Honeybourne Village Fete — 18th July 2026	The Council provided the site to the organiser for the event. The site was returned to the Council in good order following the event.
c)	Churchyard — St Ecgwins	The dead trees within the churchyard have been removed.
d)	Resident Noise Complaint — Motorsport Activities	Following referral to Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS), the resident has been provided with an Alleged Nuisance Diary to record instances of noise. The resident has since advised the Clerk that planning permission for the rallying use of the site was originally granted in 2003 (ref W/03/00455/CU) with conditions on operating hours, and that a Planning Enforcement investigation (ref W/ENF/25/0288) found the current operating hours have been in place for more than 10 years and are therefore immune from enforcement action; any further extension of hours or days of use would require fresh planning consent. The resident has been advised to raise any ongoing noise concerns directly with Planning Enforcement, and to keep a record of any further noise, as this would provide evidence for WRS should the matter need to be pursued further. The resident thanked the Council for looking into the matter.
e)	Weston Road — Horse Riding Signage	A resident raised concerns regarding horse riders emerging from a stables entrance directly onto Weston Road, a busy road with vehicles frequently travelling at speed. As the Council has no authority to install road signage itself, the Clerk referred the matter to Worcestershire County Council's Highways/Traffic Management team, providing the location and confirming this relates to regular, ongoing use of the road by horses from the stables (rather than occasional riding from private homes), in order to meet WCC's policy requirements for considering signage. A response from WCC Highways is awaited.
f)	Bidford-on-Avon (BID.1) Development — Resident Enquiry	To note that a resident raised concerns regarding the potential impact on Honeybourne of the proposed Bidford-on-Avon development, particularly HGV traffic being displaced onto the B4085 via the proposed

		new bridge/link, construction traffic, and additional pressure on Honeybourne Station parking. The Clerk confirmed the Council had already submitted representations on cross-boundary highway impacts as part of the SWLP Regulation 19 consultation, and advised the resident accordingly. At the resident's request, their name and identifying details have not been included in this report.
g)	Railway Bridge, Stratford Road — Graffiti	The Clerk reported graffiti (spray paint tagging) on the stone retaining wall approaching the railway bridge on Stratford Road to Network Rail, including photographic evidence. Network Rail confirmed the matter has been logged with the relevant team, noting it is not treated as urgent. The Clerk has referred the matter appropriately; no further action is required from the Council.
h)	High Street — Speeding Concerns	A resident raised concerns regarding vehicle speeds on the High Street, particularly outside the Thatched Tavern, following an incident in which a dog was struck by a vehicle travelling at speed. The Chairman responded, explaining that the Parish Council has no authority to set or amend speed limits, this being a Worcestershire County Council (Highways) matter, and confirmed that no traffic survey has been undertaken specifically in relation to speed on this stretch. The Chairman has asked the resident's permission to forward his email to WCC as part of a formal request for them to assess speed and safety on the High Street; a response is awaited. The resident has also been advised to report the specific incident to West Mercia Police, given a driver failing to stop after hitting an animal on a road is an offence.
i)	Broken Drain Cover — Harvard Avenue	A resident emailed the Clerk on 27th July 2026 reporting a broken drain cover on the green between 18 and 20 Harvard Avenue, having previously contacted both Wychavon District Council and Rooftop since May 2026 without resolution, and noting a fall had already occurred. The Clerk forwarded the report to Rooftop immediately upon receipt, and kept the resident updated on progress. Rooftop confirmed the land and repair responsibility rests with them (not Wychavon), that the original job (logged in June) had been incorrectly marked complete during a change of contractor, and that the repair has now been logged as an emergency job for completion within 48 hours.
Noted: That the Clerk's Report be noted.		

26/776 Correspondence and Circulations Received

a) Joint Statement — Leaders of South Worcestershire District Councils — Local Government Reorganisation	To note a joint letter from the Leaders of Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council confirming that, from April 2028, local government services will be delivered by a new South Worcestershire Council and a new North Worcestershire Council, replacing the existing county and district councils. Elections for the new unitary councils will take place in May 2027, with the existing councils continuing to operate and shape the transition in the interim.
b) West Mercia Police	Monthly Fraud Bulletin –August 2026, circulated to members for information
c) CALC — Wychavon Area AGM and SWDPR Briefing	To note the minutes of the Wychavon Area CALC AGM held 30th June 2026, including a presentation from Wychavon's Planning Policy team on the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review (SWDPR) 2021–2041, adopted 26th March 2026, and confirmation that Neighbourhood Plan reviews remain eligible for grant funding of up to £10,000. To further note CALC's forthcoming Local Government Reorganisation briefing session on 15th September 2026.

d) Worcestershire County Council — Digital Phone & Broadband Switchover	To note information from Worcestershire County Council's Digital Infrastructure and Connectivity Team regarding the digital switchover of phone and broadband services, explaining how upgrades are being phased by provider and household circumstances, and noting that landline services not migrated by January 2027 may be moved to a Digital Voice-only service.
e) Worcestershire County Council — Temporary Road Closure, Mickleton Road (for information)	Members noted that a temporary closure of part of C2274 Mickleton Road took place between 17th and 28th August 2026 for WCC carriageway patching works, as notified under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The closure has now concluded.
f) Worcestershire County Council — Advance Notice of Temporary Road Closure, Stratford Road	Members noted advance notice from Worcestershire County Council of a proposed Temporary Closure Order affecting part of C2049 Stratford Road, from its junction with Mickleton Road (C2274) to its junction with Chapel Road (C2114), to allow Network Rail to carry out bridgeworks maintenance, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Exemptions apply for access to land or premises with no other form of access, and to allow the works to be undertaken; emergency vehicle access will be maintained, subject to vehicles stopping to allow works to be moved clear. The alternative route is via Stratford Road (part), Chapel Road, Front Street, Pebworth Road, Buckle Street and Station Road (and vice versa). The maximum duration of the Order is 18 months; the anticipated duration of the closure itself is 3 nights (20:00–06:00), commencing 5th October 2026.
Noted: That the correspondence be noted	

26/777 Worcestershire CALC — Local Government Reorganisation Event, 15th September 2026

The Clerk advised members that, following the Government's recent pause and review of Local Government Reorganisation, notification had been received from Worcestershire CALC on the day of the meeting that this event had been cancelled. Members noted that no further action was required.

26/778 Finance

a) Schedule of Payments - August 2026 (for ratification)

The Clerk presented the schedule of payments for August 2026.

Invoice no	Payment Method	Supplier	Description	Net £	VAT £	Gross £
808899387	Direct Debit	British Gas	Pavilion power and heating	65.17	3.25	68.42
M015	Standing Order	British Telecom	Regular charge (1 st July –31 st July 2026)	36.95	7.39	44.34
INV127997124	Direct Debit	Water Plus	Pavilion water	11.08	-	11.08
488739901	Direct Debit	Lloyds Bank	Accounts Maintenance Fee for PC – Community Account no: xxxxx608 (10 th May - 9 th June 2026)	4.25	-	4.25
IVO04638743	Direct Debit	SSE Energy Solution	Unmetered footway lighting	86.21	17.24	103.45
CLP0435878	BACS	Wychavon District Council	Annual emptying of dog bin -Grange Farm Drive – PC noticeboard	100.00	20.00	120.00
SB20260187	BACS	PKF LittlejohnLLP	External Audit fee -review of AGAR for year ending 31 st March 2026	420.00	84.00	504.00
July	BACS	J Hyde	Handyman work	241.00	-	241.00

July	BACS	J Hyde	Lengthsman work	158.70	-	158.70
SI- 10840	BACS	Security 4 Systems	Monthly IT Support	77.50	-	77.50
Tax month 5	BACS	Worcestershire Pension	Pension	788.72	-	788.72
Tax month 5	BACS	Staff salary	Staff salary	2371.29	-	2371.29
Tax month 5	BACS	HMRC	HMRC	957.53	-	957.53
3860	BACS	Limebridge Rural Services	• Grounds Maintenance • Removed 3 dead trees at churchyard Back filled ground shrinkage at the Leys	2225.00	445.00	2670.00
SIN158592	BACS	Fairview Trading	Brush and sandpaper	4.88	0.98	5.86
SIN158784	BACS	Fairview Trading	Everbuild Professional Sealant Gun Soudal Fix All High Tack White 290ml	12.87	2.57	15.44
SI-479	BACS	Andrea Pellegram Ltd	Work in July to prepare the call for sites (CFS) including CFS letter, website text, identify landowner contacts, obtain land registry titles, /calls/meetings with HPC, emails and calls with Wychavon DC on housing requirement and CFS.	1400.00	280.00	1680.00
6190405937	BACS	Lyreco	Printer inks and stationery	476.06	95.21	571.27
1/26	BACS	*Dawn Lodge Associates-Quantity Surveyors	Professional fee	750.00	150.00	900.00
LCO01652	BACS	Clear Insurance	Insurance premium £1880.73 Insurance premium tax £225.69 Admin fee £55.00	1880.73	-	2161.42

Pre-paid Debit card

Invoice/Receipt No	Date	Supplier	Description	Net £	VAT £	Gross £
367828	15 th Jul 2026	The Thatched Tavern	Refreshments for councillors	91.67	18.33	110.00
CG1460	20 th July 2026	Village Hall	Refreshments for councillors	31.50	-	31.50
IEN2026042501140	26 th Jul 2026	Adobe Systems	Subscription	16.64	3.33	19.97
	4 th August 2026	Lebara	Mobile phone	4.17	0.83	5.00

Resolved:

That the schedule of payments for August 2026 be ratified. (5 For, 0 Against, 2 Abstentions)

*Dawn Lodge Associates – Reinstatement valuation survey (Pavilion)

Quantity surveyor's fee for the triennial reinstatement cost assessment of the Pavilion, undertaken to establish the current rebuild cost for insurance purposes (buildings sum insured).

Cllrs H Jobes and G Clelland, having earlier declared an interest, took no part in the discussion of, and abstained from voting on, this item.

b) Schedule of Payments — September 2026 (for approval)

The Clerk presented the schedule of payments for September 2026, for approval.

Invoice no	Payment Method	Supplier	Description	Net £	VAT £	Gross £
805791682	Direct Debit	British Gas*	Pavilion power and heating	75.57	3.77	79.34
M016	Standing Order	British Telecom	Regular charge (1 st Aug –31 st Aug 2026)	36.95	7.39	44.34
INV13236464	Direct Debit	Water Plus	Pavilion water	14.04	-	14.04

491312560	Direct Debit	Lloyds Bank	Accounts Maintenance Fee for PC – Community Account no: xxxxx608 (10 th Jun - 9 th Jul 2026)	4.25	-	4.25
IVO474989	Direct Debit	SSE Energy Solution	Unmetered footway lighting	94.64	18.93	113.57
Gwp0437567	Direct Debit	Wychavon District Council	Annual Garden Waste Bin	55.00	-	55.00
LCO01652	BACS	Clear Council Insurance	Insurance- additional Building Premium £138.83 Insurance premium tax: £16.66	155.49	-	155.49
August	BACS	J Hyde	Handyman work	211.30	-	211.30
August	BACS	J Hyde	Lengthsman work	212.50	-	212.50
SI- 10869	BACS	Security 4 Systems	Monthly IT Support	77.50	-	77.50
Tax month 6	BACS	Worcestershire Pension	Pension	788.72	-	788.72
Tax month 6	BACS	Staff salary	Staff salary	2371.49	-	2371.49
Tax month 6	BACS	HMRC	HMRC	975.33	-	975.33
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural Services	Monthly Grounds maintenance	825.00	165.00	990.00
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural Services	Wildflower meadow annual cut, cuttings removed	1250.00	250.00	1500.00
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural services	Supply and erect orange net fence, The Leys Playing Field (safety)●	285.00	57.00	342.00
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural services	Crack filling to Playing Field and Play Area fence, The Leys – health and safety	1400.00	280.00	1680.00
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural services	Cemetery – cutting back vegetation along the ditch and removing arisings	920.00	184.00	1104.00
3906	BACS	Limebridge Rural Services	Monthly Grounds maintenance	825.00	165.00	990.00
INV - 10492	BACs	Sharp Alarm & Security Systems Trading as VCT Security Systems Ltd	Annual service of CCTV	110.00	22.00	132.00
INV-4794	BACS	BWP Creative Ltd	Website hosting and support for PC website	262.20	52.44	314.64
wrp0438498	BACS	Wychavon District Council	Lottery license for Christmas raffle	20.00	-	20.00
6190407757	BACS	Lyreco	Soft drinks for PROW volunteers 48 cans of sprite and coke	45.14	9.03	54.17
SI- 488	BACS	Andrea Pellegram Ltd	NDP Review work – Preparation of vision and objective	880.00	176.00	1056.00
SI-483	BACS	Andrea Pellegram Ltd	Preparation of planning comments for W/26/01732/OUT relating to land at Buckle Street	2280.00	456.00	2736.00
SI-484	BACS	Andrea Pellegram Ltd	Preparation of planning comments for W/26/01627/RM relating to land a Stratford Road	1800.00	360.00	2160.00
013/2026/2027	BACS	Equals Money	Top up pre-paid card	250.00	-	250.00
Pre-paid Debit card						
Invoice/Receipt No	Date	Supplier	Description	Net £	VAT £	Gross £
IEN2026048684193	26 th Aug 2026	Adobe Systems Software	Monthly subs	16.64	3.33	19.97

-	2 nd Sept 2026	Lebara	Mobile phone	4.17	0.83	5.00
Resolved: That the schedule of payments for September 2026 be approved. (7 For & 1 Abstention)						

**TNUoS RIIO-3 Charge (£0.96) — national grid transmission charge set by Ofgem/NESO, not a British Gas charge.*

Nuclear RAB Levy (£0.27) — government levy under the Nuclear Energy (Financing) Act 2022 to help fund new nuclear power stations (e.g. Sizewell C), administered by the Low Carbon Contracts Company.

**Note: temporary orange net fencing and crack filling to the Playing Field and Play Area fence were carried out at The Leys as a health and safety precaution, following further ground shrinkage due to the exceptionally dry weather this summer.*

Cllr G Clelland, having earlier declared an interest, took no part in the discussion of, and abstained from voting on, this item.

c) Bank Reconciliation — July 2026 – (ratification)

The Clerk presented the bank reconciliation for July 2026, for ratification, this having been carried out under the delegated authority granted to the Clerk at the Full Council meeting of 14th July 2026 (Minute 26/759(f)), during the Council's summer recess.

Bank Reconciliation at 31/07/2026		
Cash in Hand 01/04/2026		117,618.46
ADD		
Receipts 01/04/2026 – 31/07/2026		120,630.23
		238,248.69
SUBTRACT		
Payments 01/04/2026 – 31/07/2026		94,402.10
Cash in Hand 30/06/2026 (per Cash Book) A		143,846.59
Cash in hand per Bank Statements		
Petty Cash 30/06/2026	0.00	
Lloyds Business Bank Instant 31/07/2026	135,501.02	
Lloyds Treasurers Account 31/07/2026	8,196.80	
Prepaid Debit Card Equals 31/07/2026	148.77	144,846.59
Less unrepresented payments		
Plus unrepresented receipts		
Adjusted Bank Balance B		143,846.59
A = B Checks out OK		
Resolved: That the bank reconciliation for July 2026 be ratified.		

c) Bank Reconciliation – August for approval

The Clerk presented the bank reconciliation for August 2026, for approval.

Bank Reconciliation at 31/08/2026		
Cash in Hand 01/04/2026		117,618.46
ADD		
Receipts 01/04/2026 – 31/08/2026		120,910.91
		238,529.37
SUBTRACT		
Payments 01/04/2026 – 31/07/2026		106,315.77
Cash in Hand 30/06/2026 (per Cash Book) A		132,213.60
Cash in hand per Bank Statements		
Petty Cash 30/06/2026	0.00	
Lloyds Business Bank Instant 31/08/2026	125,572.13	
Lloyds Treasurers Account 31/08/2026	6,517.81	

Prepaid Debit Card Equals 31/08/2026	123.66	132,213.60
Less unrepresented payments		
Plus unrepresented receipts		
Adjusted Bank Balance B		132,213.60
A = B Checks out OK		
Resolved: That the bank reconciliation for August 2026 be approved.		

d) Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) 2025/26 — Conclusion of Audit

Members **noted** that the external auditor, PKF Littlejohn LLP, had completed its limited assurance review of Sections 1 and 2 of the AGAR for the year ended 31st March 2026, certified 20th July 2026. The external auditor's opinion stated that the information in Sections 1 and 2 of the AGAR was in accordance with Proper Practices, and that no other matters had come to the auditor's attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements had not been met. No other matters were raised.

Members further **noted** that the Notice of Conclusion of Audit, together with the AGAR and the external auditor's report, was published on the Parish Council's website on 23rd July 2026, in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, and will remain available for public inspection there for five years as required.

e) Street Lighting Electricity Supply Contract — Ratification of Delegated Decision

Members noted that the Clerk, under delegated authority granted in consultation with the Chairman at the Full Council meeting of 9th June 2026 (Minute 26/747), had accepted a 24-month fixed electricity supply contract with West Mercia Energy for the Council's unmetered street lighting supply, commencing 1st February 2027, at a total estimated annual cost of £1,862 (excluding VAT and CCL), following comparison against an SSE benchmark rate of £2,127 and a subsequently received ESPO/Total Energies comparator of £1,999–£2,006 per year (**Appendix 4 pages 709 - 710**).

Resolved:

That the Clerk's decision be ratified.

f) Pavilion Insurance — Triennial Reinstatement Valuation and Revised Premium

Members noted that, as required every three years, an independent reinstatement cost assessment of the pavilion had been commissioned from Dawn Lodge Associates (Chartered Quantity Surveyors, RICS), following a site inspection on 21st July 2026. The assessment recommended a revised base sum insured of £479,423.89 (excluding VAT), an increase from the current policy figure of £421,680, reflecting rises in rebuilding costs since the last review, and confirmed to include fixtures and fittings. Members noted that the full assessment is retained by the Clerk and has not been listed as a background paper, as it discloses detailed financial information relating to the Council's affairs, and that, in the opinion of the proper officer, the public interest in withholding this information (Local Government Act 1972, s.100D(4), Schedule 12A paragraph 3) outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

Members further noted that the Council's main insurance premium for the current year had already been paid in full, and that, following confirmation from the insurer (Clear Councils/Ecclesiastical) of the revised premium reflecting the increased sum insured, ahead of the 1st September 2026 renewal, the Clerk had authorised payment of the additional premium of £155.49 under the delegated authority granted in consultation with the Chairman.

Resolved:

That the Clerk's decision be ratified.

26/779 Committee and Working Group Reports

a) NDP Review Steering Group

- i. Members received and **noted** the minutes of the NDP Review Steering Group meeting held on 16th July 2026, previously circulated to all Councillors.
- ii. Members received and **noted** the minutes of the NDP Review Steering Group meeting held on 25th August 2026, previously circulated to all Councillors.

26/780 Neighbourhood Development Plan Review

a) Call for Sites

Members considered ratification of the exercise of delegated authority by the NDP Review Steering Group at its meeting of 16th July 2026 (under delegated authority granted by Full Council on 9th June 2026, Minute 26/745(c)), namely: approval of the ED1 Call for Sites Selection Methodology, the landowner notification letter, and the website text; and confirmation of the Call for Sites consultation period, which opened 22nd July 2026 and closes 23:59 on 18th September 2026.

Resolved:

That the exercise of delegated authority by the NDP Review Steering Group, as set out above, be ratified.

b) Vision and Objectives

Members considered the revised Vision and Objectives for the Neighbourhood Development Plan Review, as recommended by the NDP Review Steering Group at its meeting of 25th August 2026, updating those adopted within the 2020 Neighbourhood Development Plan to reflect current national planning policy (NPPF) and the scope of the current review

Resolved:

That the revised Vision and Objectives for the Neighbourhood Development Plan Review be approved.

26/781 Governance — Adoption of Record of Processing Activities (ROPA)

Members considered the Council's Record of Processing Activities (ROPA), maintained by the Data Protection Lead (Parish Clerk) in accordance with Article 30 UK GDPR, setting out the categories of personal data processed by the Council, the lawful basis for each, and retention periods

Resolved:

That the Record of Processing Activities (ROPA) be adopted.

26/782 Environment and Community Wellbeing

a) Community Emergency & Resilience Plan

Members considered Worcestershire County Council's Community Emergency & Resilience Plan template, providing a framework for parishes to identify local risks, key contacts, volunteers, and community resources for use during an emergency. The Clerk advised members that this is not a statutory duty for Parish Councils under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, Honeybourne Parish Council not being a Category 1 or Category 2 responder under that Act, and that the template envisages a community-based Emergency Management Team of local volunteers (Coordinator, Deputy, and two further members), rather than being led or completed by the Clerk.

The Chairman noted that Worcestershire County Council holds contact details for the village hall and would make contact directly in the event of an emergency requiring its use, and the Clerk confirmed the Council would in any event be notified in the event of a genuine emergency.

Members discussed whether to progress this work and identify a councillor to lead it. Several members noted that they had existing work commitments; no councillor came forward to take on this role.

Resolved:

That consideration of the Community Emergency & Resilience Plan be deferred for 12 months.

26/783 South Warwickshire Local Plan — Regulation 19 Consultation — Confirmation of Submission

- a) Members considered ratification of the submission of the Council's representation to the South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) Regulation 19 Publication consultation, submitted on 21st July 2026 under the delegated authority agreed at the Full Council meeting of 14th July 2026 (Minute 26/764). Members noted that the consultation portal required the representation to be submitted separately against each of the four relevant policies and proposals (Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4, Proposal LMA, and Proposal BID.1), rather than as a single combined document; each submission cross-refers to the others, and none objects to the principle or quantum of housing proposed at Long Marston Airfield or Bidford-on-Avon, this being outside the scope of a Regulation 19 representation.
(Appendix 5 pages 711 - 716)

Resolved:

That the submission of the Council's representation to the SWLP Regulation 19 Publication consultation be ratified.

- b) Members noted that a supplementary representation was submitted objecting to Policy EC.7 (Employment and Road Freight) and Proposal LMA, on the grounds that Proposal LMA's Section F (Access, Highways and Public Transport Requirements) does not cross-refer to Policy EC.7 or require the site's Transport Assessment to address freight/HGV routing towards Honeybourne and the Vale of Evesham, arising from the 15 hectares of employment land proposed at the site. **(Appendix 6 pages 717 -722)**

Resolved:

That the submission of this supplementary representation, made under delegated authority to the Clerk and Chairman and submitted on 24th August 2026 ahead of the consultation deadline of 8th September 2026, be ratified.

26/784 Cotswold District Council — Regulation 19 Local Plan Consultation (Mickleton)

Members considered a proposed representation to Cotswold District Council's Regulation 19 Publication Version of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2026–2043, regarding the strategic housing allocation at Mickleton. Members noted that the Council had previously submitted a Regulation 18 representation on this site, raising Honeybourne Station capacity, parking, and footbridge investment as infrastructure concerns arising from Mickleton and Willersey growth, and that Cotswold District Council's own approved committee report continues to count Mickleton's proximity to Honeybourne Station towards its sustainability case, while the site's published infrastructure package and Site Development Framework make no reference to station, car park, or footbridge mitigation. The representation does not object to the housing numbers themselves, consistent with the Council's approach at Regulation 18. **(Appendix 7 pages 723 – 725)**

Resolved:

That the proposed representation to Cotswold District Council's Regulation 19 consultation be approved for submission, ahead of the consultation deadline of 5th October 2026

26/785 a) Planning

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
I. W/26/00521/RM	Land At (Os 1103 4392), Bretforton Road, Honeybourne	Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following grant of permission W/25/01580/OUT for the erection of up to 24 dwellings

		with detailed access (Amended plans)
Members ratified the Council's comments, submitted to Wychavon District Council on 9th August 2026 under delegated authority, confirming HPC's satisfaction with amendments to the scheme following earlier comments requesting revisions. The amendments included reinstatement of the community orchard, increased tree provision with more native species, reduction of plots 22 and 23 to 1.5 storeys, a new footpath connection to Public Footpath 515C, a new pedestrian connection at plot 4, reorientation of plot 11 to address overlooking concerns, and confirmation that the accessible housing provision (plots 7–12) met the intent of Policy H3. HPC confirmed it had no further comments or objections.		
Application Reference	Location	Proposal
II. W/26/01746/HED	Honeybourne Above Ground Installation, Gloster Ades Road, Honeybourne	Removal of up to 20 metres of hedgerow
Members ratified the Council's comments, submitted to Wychavon District Council on 6th August 2026 under the delegated authority granted at the Full Council meeting of 14th July 2026 (Minute 26/759(f)): "The Parish Council has no objection to the removal as described. We would ask that reinstatement of the hedgerow be secured once the associated temporary works are complete, given the access is described as temporary in nature. We would ask that reinstatement be carried out using good quality, well-established hedging stock (rather than the smallest whips), planted at a density sufficient to achieve effective screening and coverage within a reasonable timeframe, with any failures replaced during an appropriate establishment/maintenance period. We would be grateful for confirmation of the position on reinstatement/replanting, whether by condition attached to any consent or by written commitment from the applicant.		
Application Reference	Location	Proposal
III. W/26/01603/HP	43 Fallow Field, Honeybourne, Evesham, WR11 7TE	Demolish conservatory and erect single storey rear extension
Members ratified the Council's comments, submitted to Wychavon District Council on 23rd July 2026 under the delegated authority granted at the Full Council meeting of 14th July 2026 (Minute 26/759(f)): "The Parish Council have no objection to the planning application.		

Items 26/785(b)(i) and (ii) — Buckle Street and Stratford Road/Mickleton Road — were dealt with earlier in the meeting, immediately following Open Session, when the Chairman proposed and members resolved to vary the order of business.)

26/786 Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, s1(2), it was proposed that the public and press be excluded from the meeting to allow for discussion of confidential matters relating to items for which publication would be prejudicial to the public interest.

Resolved: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items.

The members of the public left the meeting at 8:30 pm, prior to the commencement of the confidential session.

- i) Staffing Matter
- ii) Correspondence Received

26/787 Items for Next Meeting

Members were reminded to notify the Clerk of items for discussion at the next council meeting by 15th September 2026.

26/789 Date and Venue of Next Meeting

The next Parish Council meeting is confirmed as Tuesday 13th October 2026 at 7:15pm at Honeybourne Village Hall, Harvest Close, Honeybourne.

Meeting Concluded : 21:08

Signed: Date:
Chairman, Honeybourne Parish Council

Council Members: H Jobes (Chairman), B Dubb (Vice-Chair), A Attridge, C Clear, G Clelland, A Mathias, J Mellor, S Sidwell and S Walsh
--

Appendix 1

September 2026 Report to Parish Councils from Wychavon District Councillor Judith Ciotti

Consultation on Dog Fouling and Control: a 10 week consultation is underway on a proposal to introduce new powers to help tackle dog fouling and encourage responsible ownership. Any resident can comment before October 5th on wychavon.gov.uk/consultations

WasteGuard is a new free online service launched to help residents avoid rogue waste carriers by getting quotes for disposal from licensed waste carriers who act responsibly. There are hefty fines for using rogue waste carriers if your waste is identified. Please see wychavon.gov.uk/environmental-crime/wasteguard

Wychavon Resilience Grants now open: Parish Councils are eligible for Community Building Energy Resilience small grants (e.g. energy audits, energy efficiency and carbon reduction measures) and for Biodiversity Improvement grants managed by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. For details and guidance see wychavon.gov.uk/community-and-living/wychavon-resilience-grants. You can also phone Tracy Perkins on 01386 565517

Wychavon Ward Budgets: each ward member has been given a one-off £10,000 budget to spend before November 30th 2027. There will be a simple online form to complete and once approved, the money will be paid straight into the organisation's account. The money is to be used for residents' benefit, contribute to the We are Wychavon plan, and not qualify for other Wychavon grants.

Hot weather: Although the extreme hot weather may be over for this year it is worth remembering that no BBQs are allowed on Wychavon land. We have had fires locally. We are all encouraged to help protect the Wychavon countryside. See the Government's Get Prepared for Emergencies advice: prepare.campaign.gov.uk/get-prepared-for-emergencies

Riverside Shopping Centre: Wychavon Planning Committee approved the demolition of the Evesham shopping centre on August 20th. A contractor will be appointed in October to prepare a plan for demolition of the Centre, the car park and 42 Bridge Street (Sports Direct) in early 2027 or earlier if businesses agree to leave sooner. Demolition isn't the end goal, re-generation is, and there is no intention to replace the empty shopping centre with an empty site.

Honeybourne community presentation to explore local Men's Club: Councillors are asked to help share details of a community presentation taking place in Honeybourne, where Andy from Andy's Man Club will explain how a local Men's Club could work and how men from the area could get involved in starting their own group. The presentation has been arranged to help engage local men and build interest in creating a safe, welcoming and non-judgemental space for men in and around Honeybourne, giving them somewhere informal to meet, talk if they want to, listen if they do not, and support each other. This work is supported through the Wellbeing in Wychavon Community scheme, developed through one of Wychavon's Wellbeing Promises to train people in communities and workplaces to champion mental health and wellbeing and signpost people to appropriate support. Men are less likely to ask for support early, so local, familiar spaces can play an important role in helping people feel able to take that first step before things reach crisis point. Event: Monday, 22 September 2026 at 7:15pm, Honeybourne Village Hall, WR11 7RH. There is no pressure for anyone to speak or commit to anything on the night.

South Warwickshire Local Plan: this is nearing its conclusion and Wychavon has been discussing cross-boundary impacts with Stratford District Council. Wychavon District Council will respond by September 8th, so this is the final opportunity to influence the Plan by sharing comments with WDC as soon as possible. Honeybourne Parish Council has responded.



Andrea Pellegram Ltd
6 Chesterton Park
Cirencester GL7 1XU
<https://www.pellegram.co.uk/>

Wychavon District Council – Planning Services
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Persnore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

1 September 2026

Dear Ms Desmond,

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION W/26/01732/OUT,
BUCKLE STREET, HONEYBOURNE**

This letter is prepared on behalf of Honeybourne Parish Council (HPC) to provide comments on Planning Application W/26/01732/OUT relating to Land at Buckle Street, Honeybourne. I am also supporting the Parish Council in undertaking its review of the made Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan (HNP), which includes to investigate the allocation of housing sites to address the housing requirements of the draft South Worcestershire Local Plan 2029 – 2049.

The description of the proposed development is as follows:

Outline Planning application with all matters reserved except access for up to 220 dwellings and associated green space and biodiversity enhancements.

This letter will demonstrate why it is the view of HPC that the development would appear contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is because there is no evidenced need for the proposal, it would fail to relate properly to the settlement, and there are several unresolved issues. HPC therefore objects to the application for the reasons below.

Page 690

1. Need for the Proposal

The site lies to the north of the Oxford railway and does not adjoin Honeybourne's development boundary, which ends on the southern side of the railway. The applicant acknowledges that the site is unallocated and lies within the open countryside. As a result, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy SWDPR 03 (D) of the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review (SWDPR), which states that proposals on land beyond any defined development boundary will be strictly controlled.

The applicant's justification is that Honeybourne is classified as a Category 1 village, and that the Council does not have a Five-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS). Whilst the planning statement predates National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on 17 August 2026, this would imply that Policy S5(1)(j) of that framework is engaged. This would mean that there is a housing supply of below five years and that the development should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the framework.

The Local Planning Authority published a report¹ in June 2026 indicating that it can demonstrate a 5YHLS of 5.48 years. It is also noted that the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review (SWDPR) was adopted on the 26th of March 2026, and the examining Inspectors concluded that the SWDPR would provide a 5YHLS on adoption, applying a 5% buffer². Annex A(3) of the NPPF confirms that a higher standard-method housing figure should not be treated as evidence of unmet need for five years following adoption of the plan. The applicant has not provided evidence to contest the Council's published figure. Accordingly, Policy S5(1)(j) of the NPPF should not be considered engaged for this application.

HPC also note that a review of its neighbourhood plan commenced in late 2025, and the Parish Council formally resolved to investigate the allocation of housing sites to meet the indicative housing requirement of the draft South Worcestershire Local Plan 2029–2049. The Council commenced a Call for Sites in July 2026 and invited the landowner to submit representations. It is considered that future housing delivered in Honeybourne,

¹ South Worcestershire Councils: Five Year Housing Land Supply Report Monitoring Period 2025/26 5YHLS Period 2026/27 - 2030/31 Published June 2026

² P. Lewis and E. Worthington, Report on the Examination of the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review, 12 March 2026, paragraphs 106 and 109, pp. 28–29.

particularly when of this scale, can and should be properly tested through the plan-making process³, rather than be pre-empted by a large scale speculative development.

As has been demonstrated by other responses, Honeybourne Railway Station does not meet the definition of a 'well-connected station' in Annex B of the NPPF and therefore NPPF Policy S5(h) is not relevant to this proposal.

The proposal therefore falls to be considered under Policy S5(4) and should only be approved in exceptional circumstances where its benefits substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including harm to countryside character and sustainable patterns of movement (discussed below). No such exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated, and accordingly, HPC consider that the proposal should be refused.

2. Settlement Character

Policy S5(1)(j)(i) of the NPPF requires a proposal to be physically well related to the settlement and be of a scale that can be accommodated taking into account proposed availability of infrastructure. NPPF Policy DP3(1), (2)(a), (d) and (g), and (3) state that development must respond to its context, create integrated communities, connect properly with the wider settlement and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. It says proposals should be refused where these principles are breached without clear justification. Policy H4 of the made HNP lists a number of design criteria relevant to the proposal, including to preserve or enhance the distinctive local character of the village and be of a scale and density appropriate to the local area.

The settlement character of Honeybourne can be read as having two distinct parts – an older south and younger north. This arrangement is due to the arrival of the railway during the mid-19th century, which encouraged significant housing growth mostly during the 20th century. Importantly, this growth extended the main built-up area northwards only as far as the railway, which, together with its established vegetation, provides a strong boundary to the village.

Although the site lies close to Honeybourne in distance, it is not considered to be physically well-related to the settlement. The railway and the associated boundary vegetation form a strong and readily perceived settlement edge, beyond which the site reads as open countryside. The constrained single-lane bridge and lack of pedestrian

³ See ED1: Site Allocation Methodology, HPC Call for Sites webpage ([link](#))

access also contribute to the sense of the site's disconnection from the settlement south of the railway. The proposed footway would provide a pedestrian connection, but this would not be considered sufficient to overcome this physical separation.

It is readily apparent that the character of the area changes noticeably on crossing the railway bridge, giving way to open countryside, a few scattered homes and commercial uses. It is considered that the proposal would significantly alter the character of the area, would merge the employment site with the village, and would read as a detached housing estate in countryside, rather than forming a logical extension of the settlement.

In terms of scale, Honeybourne is a village of approximately 930 homes⁴, suggesting that the proposal would represent a 24% increase in the overall size of the existing settlement. It is considered that this level of growth is inappropriate and fails to respond to the scale of the existing settlement or the rate of development that has occurred since 2011 (see below). The table below shows that the proposal would be three times the size of the largest scheme delivered in Honeybourne in the past 15 years.

For the above reasons, HPC considers that if Policy S5(1)(j) of the NPPF were engaged, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy S5(1)(j)(i) and Policy DP3(2) of the NPPF. The proposal would also be unlikely to preserve or enhance the distinctive local character of Honeybourne parish, and would be of an inappropriate scale, and therefore fails to comply with Design Policy H4(a), H4(b), H4(c) of the made HNP. Policy DP3(3) of the NPPF confirms that compliance with design policies in the development plan should be given substantial weight.

Site	Housing proposed	Application history	Current/final position
Land between Station Road and Dudley Road	Up to 70; final scheme 66	W/11/02531/OU refused, appeal allowed in 2012; W/12/00913/OU withdrawn; W/13/00183/RM 70 homes approved; W/13/01224/RM amendments approved; W/14/02318/RM revised 66-home scheme approved	66-home development permitted/built
Honeybourne Grange Farm/Fair	75 plus village hall	W/12/01020/OU approved; W/13/00182/RM withdrawn; W/13/01005/RM approved; later variations	75 homes permitted/built

⁴ The 2021 Census recorded 869 occupied households and 2,115 residents in the parish. Since the Census, 60 homes at Whitworth Gardens have been completed.

Acres, Weston Road		W/14/01068/OU and W/15/00838/RM approved	
Sheep Sales Field/Land off Station Road	Initially 44; final scheme 35	W/11/02686/PN refused and subsequently pursued at appeal; W/13/01784/PN withdrawn; W/13/02052/PN 35 homes approved	35-home development permitted/built
Land rear of High Street/49 High Street	14	W/13/00719/OU refused, appeal allowed; W/15/02324/RM approved; 17/01296/FUL later full application; 17/02147/OU condition variation approved	14 homes permitted
Land off Stratford Road – neighbourhood-plan allocation/Owl Homes	Outline up to 65; final scheme 60	20/01124/OUT approved; 21/00816/RM 60 homes approved; later variations W/22/02153/RM, W/22/02492/RM and W/23/02604/OUT approved	60-home development permitted/built
Land OS 1221 4441, Stratford Road	40	W/23/00919/OUT refused, appeal allowed in April 2025; W/26/01627/RM reserved matters submitted	Outline permission; reserved matters pending
Land OS 1103 4392, Bretforton Road	24	W/24/01690/FUL refused and appeal withdrawn; replacement W/25/01580/OUT approved; W/26/00521/RM reserved matters submitted	Outline permission; reserved matters pending

3. Access

Policy TR3(1)(a), (b) and (e) of the NPPF indicate that significant development must limit private-car travel and offer a genuine choice of alternative transport modes. Policy TR4(1)(a-d) of the NPPF indicates that walking and cycling should be prioritised, continuous footways and segregated cycle provision should be provided, and that conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles should be minimised. Policy H13 of the made HNP states that all new development must prioritise walking and cycling opportunities over the private car, and proposals which fail to do so will not be supported.

The site's connection to Honeybourne depends upon a single-lane railway bridge operating with alternating signal-controlled traffic. This bridge is used by a range of vehicles, including heavy goods vehicles, agricultural vehicles and buses. As there is no

continuous, safe and all-weather pedestrian connection to the village or station, it is proposed to reduce the vehicular running lane to approximately 3.7 metres and introduce a pedestrian footway. The proposed 2-metre footway is pedestrian-only and provides insufficient space for either a separate cycle track or an acceptable shared-use route. Cyclists would therefore have no alternative but to use the signal-controlled carriageway alongside other vehicles.

This arrangement is considered unlikely to make cycling an attractive alternative to the car. 3.7m falls within the 3.25–3.9m lane-width range identified by national guidance⁵ as particularly liable to encourage unsafe close overtaking of cyclists. The bridge crest, restricted visibility from the opposite direction, parapets, and changing signals are likely to increase risk of overtaking. The absence of recorded cyclist collisions near the site does not mean it can be concluded that the route would be safe, comfortable or inclusive. The applicant has not provided an assessment of the proposal against LTN 1/20 and therefore has not met the requirement of Policy SWDPR 06. The following comments are raised by HPC in respect of the route's performance against the LTN1/20 principles.

LTN 1/20 principle	Relevant issues	Comments
Coherent	Is the route continuous and easy to follow? Does it connect the site with key destinations? Is it suitable for people of all ages and abilities?	Buckle Street provides a continuous route towards the village and station, but there is no dedicated cycling provision at the site access, bridge approach or bridge itself. Cyclists would move directly from the development into general traffic, with no protected onward cycle facility.
Direct	Is the route direct? Are unnecessary diversions, delays and stopping points avoided? Are cyclists given appropriate priority?	The route is geographically direct and does not require a significant diversion. However, cyclists would pass through the signal-controlled arrangement and could be delayed within the same queues as motor vehicles. No separate priority or bypass is proposed which reduces the attractiveness of it as an alternative.
Safe	Are cyclists appropriately separated from motor traffic?	The bridge approach rises towards a restricted crest and channels users between dense vegetation, traffic islands and bridge parapets. Narrowing the live

⁵ Active Travel England, Guidance: Critical safety issues for walking, wheeling and cycling (3: Lane widths), Published 6 November 2025.

	Are conflicts with vehicles minimised? Can the route be used safely by children, older people and less-confident cyclists?	lane to approximately 3.7 metres would leave cyclists sharing it with cars, vans, buses, agricultural vehicles and HGVs. Google street view also demonstrates queuing and the presence of large vehicles. No protected cycle space or refuge is available.
Comfortable	Is there sufficient space to cycle without intimidation? Can cyclists pass or be passed safely? Are gradients, surfaces and proximity to traffic acceptable?	Cyclists would climb towards the bridge while sharing a constrained lane, with limited space and no means of separating themselves from following vehicles. This is unlikely to feel comfortable for less-confident cyclists, particularly when large vehicles are present.
Attractive	Would the route encourage people to cycle? Does it feel pleasant, legible and secure? Is it likely to be chosen instead of driving?	The route is dominated by traffic signals, queuing vehicles and the constrained bridge crossing. Although the proposed footway would materially improve pedestrian access, no equivalent improvement is offered to cyclists. The cycling route is unlikely to feel sufficiently attractive or inclusive to encourage a meaningful shift from car use.

In terms of pedestrian access, the proposed 2m footway across the bridge is a material improvement over the present absence of any footway, however, it is also considered necessary to make the development acceptable. Whilst the provision would enable access from the site to many key services on foot, including train travel, a supermarket, post office, and café, it is queried whether the school, being an approximately 25-minute walk from the centre of the site, can be argued to be considered in close enough walking distance that it would result in a meaningfully lower number of vehicle trips.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not provide a genuinely attractive choice of alternatives to the private car. Cycling has been treated as a residual consideration rather than prioritised as a safe, comfortable and attractive mode of travel. The bridge would remain a funnel for all movement into the village and, however short the journey, the route is considered unlikely to encourage a meaningful shift from car use. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Policies TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF, Policy SWDPR 06 of the Local Plan, and Policy H13 of the HNP, and highlights the site's

inherent disadvantage compared with potential development locations south of the railway that could connect more directly with the settlement.

4. Indicative Housing Mix

Policy H2 – Housing Mix

The housing mix, though only indicative at this stage, would be compliant with Policy H2 of the Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan as it would provide 41.7% of the scheme as one- and two-bedroom market homes, 30.3% of the market homes as three-bedrooms, and 28.0% of the scheme as four-bedroom homes or larger. This element of the proposal is supported, however it would need to be confirmed at the reserved matters stage.

Policy H3 – House types to meet the needs of our community

Policy H3 of the HNP requires the scheme to provide 20% of the scheme as single storey homes, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need or that this would make the scheme unviable. The applicant refers to adaptable and single-storey homes, but provides no committed number, distribution or house-type schedule. There is no commitment to provide at least 44 single-storey homes (20% of 220), and no evidence that the need has ceased or that the requirement would make the scheme unviable. The applicant should clarify in the application documents whether it is intended to meet this policy requirement of the made HNP.

Yours sincerely,

Nick Pellegram MRTPI



Andrea Pellegram Ltd
6 Chesterton Park
Cirencester GL7 1XU
<https://www.pellegram.co.uk/>

Wychavon District Council – Planning Services
Civic Centre
Queen Elizabeth Drive
Persnore
Worcestershire
WR10 1PT

4 September 2026

Dear Mr Hanly,

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION W/26/01627/RM,
STRATFORD ROAD, HONEYBOURNE**

I have been appointed by Honeybourne Parish Council (HPC) to provide comments on Planning Application W/26/01627/RM relating to Land at Stratford Road, Honeybourne.

The description of the proposed development is as follows:

Application for reserved matters approval (layout, appearance, scale and landscaping) pursuant to application W/23/00919/OUT for the erection of up to 40 residential dwellinghouses with access. Allowed at Appeal ref: APP/H1840/W/24/3346488

The proposal follows the approval of the appeal APP/H1840/W/24/3346488 which sought permission for the principle of development and access, with all other matters reserved.

HPC notes that the proposal was approved although there being identified conflicts with policies the made Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan (HNP). Accordingly, HPC consider that the reserved matters submission should respond properly to those issues, previously identified by the planning inspector. Where the submitted proposals have taken policy requirements into account, this is welcomed. However, there remain several areas where HPC consider that the scheme could be improved. HPC therefore objects to the application but considers that the scheme could be supported if the issues set out below are addressed.

1. Layout and Street Scene

The site is located at the junction of Stratford Road and Mickleton Road, in the easternmost part of the village. Views along Stratford Road relate broadly with the settlement, owing to the urban character experienced on the southern approach to the site and the residential and employment uses immediately northwest. Meanwhile, the dense vegetation and railway tunnel approaching the northern end of the site acts as a barrier to long distance views and is therefore a natural stopping point to the village.

Views along Mickleton Road are considered to have a much more rural character that is immediately perceivable upon reaching the junction with Stratford Road. This junction is also the connection point between PRow 527(C), National Cycle Route (NCR) 442 and NCR 41, all of which of which serve as connections into the surrounding countryside, including a direct route towards the Cotswolds National Landscape. As such, this view is frequently experienced by residents and visitors, and it is important that any scheme preserves and enhances that character as a key gateway out of the village. The properties on Mickleton Road, although not statutorily listed, are some of the oldest in the village and appear on mapping from OS Gloucestershire III.SE published in 1884.

Photo – Southeast view of junction of Stratford Road and Mickleton Road (Google SV)



Policy H4 of the made HNP lists several design requirements, including to (b) make a positive contribution to street scene and surroundings, and (e) ensure that development proposals, wherever sited maintain visual connections with the surrounding countryside and retain the impression of openness. Policy H5 of the made HNP also states that new

buildings must reflect established plot sizes in the local area and take account of the existing street scene. Policy H8 also concerns protecting the landscape by ensuring that proposals maintain and reinforce that character, including cultural heritage.

This in accordance with Policy DP3(1) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; published 17 August 2026), which states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. Policy DP3(3) of the NPPF also states that proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph DP3(1) or any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including locally specific policies), and that substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

In paragraph 15 of appeal decision APP/H1840/W/24/3346488, the inspector acknowledged that “the illustrative layout [did] not reflect the linear form of development within the village” however, that there would be “opportunity for generous areas of open space on the site boundaries that would soften the appearance of the proposed development” and that the “final layout, to better reflect the pattern of existing housing within the village, could be secured at the reserved matters stage.” It was concluded in Paragraph 19 of the appeal decision that the scheme including the illustrative layout conflicted with Policies H4, H5 and H8 of the made HNP.

Upon review of the proposed site plan (see following page), it appears that the layout has not been materially changed to address this issue. The Design and Access Statement focuses principally on how the development would be perceived from Stratford Road, including the use of single-storey properties in the south-western corner and the presentation of two dwellings at the site entrance as a gateway feature, but does not acknowledge the more sensitive issue of the appearance of development from Mickleton Road or the important transition from the village into the open countryside.

Alongside Mickleton Road, a hedge is in place along the edge of the application site. It is a short hedge and it is thin, at present affording little in the way of screening and softening of views into the application site. The application proposes to develop two homes along the Mickleton Road boundary. The first will be one-storey and will sit at the corner of Mickleton Road with Stratford Road. No comment is made about this in relation to Mickleton Road. The second home will be further down the Mickleton Road and will be a two storey Webb home design. This building would present a mostly blank two storey

wall adjacent to the road. The Landscape Plan proposal indicates the retention of the existing hedge as the main landscaping proposal on this boundary. HPC considers that, as things stand, this element of the proposal will not create a positive relationship with existing properties opposite the development, directly facing it.



Site plan proposed
at outline stage
(illustrative)

Ref. 4416-05
(16.01.23)



Reserved Matters
site layout plan
(proposed)

Ref. 2412-03
(16.04.26)

HPC considers that the layout should be revised to provide a meaningful area of open space and landscaping between proposed dwellings and the Mickleton Road boundary. This should aim to retain a sense of openness and visual connection with the countryside when looking east from the junction and provide a more respectful relationship with the properties on the opposite side of Mickleton Road. This would also respond directly to the Inspector's expectation that the reserved matters layout should better reflect the existing pattern of development and incorporate generous areas of open space at the site boundaries. In its present form, HPC considers that the layout does not comply with

Policies H4, H5 and H8 of the made HNP or the design requirements of NPPF Policy DP3. Unless these matters are addressed through a revised layout, this conflict are considered to attract significant weight against approval of the reserved matters application.

2. Mix and Density

The outline permission establishes that the site has a theoretical capacity of up to 40 dwellings. The Council's officer report calculated this as around 20 dwellings per hectare across the whole site, or around 30 dwellings per hectare once the 40% Green Infrastructure requirement was removed. The officer considered this acceptable in principle but stated that density would be considered fully at the reserved matters stage.

Paragraph 3.3 of the outline Planning Statement states that the illustrative layout contained 37 dwellings and used a "conservative mix" because the final housing mix was not known. It also recognised that the final scheme could contain a greater number of smaller homes or fewer larger homes depending on the evidence available at reserved matters stage. The illustrative plan also showed a number of relatively small house footprints.

Policy H2 of the made HNP provides a clear indication of the locally identified need for market housing, stating that at least 40% of dwellings should be 1 and 2 bedrooms, around 30% should be 3 bedrooms, and a maximum of 30% should be 4+ bedrooms.

Policy H4 also requires development to be of a scale, mass, density and height appropriate to the local area, to make a positive contribution to its surroundings and to maintain visual connections with the countryside and the impression of openness.

Policy H5 requires new development to reflect established plot sizes and take account of the existing street scene. The supporting text to these policies specifically warns against development which gives Honeybourne a suburban character through densities and layouts which do not respond properly to its rural setting.

The reserved matters application proposes the full 40 dwellings, compared with the 37 dwellings shown on the illustrative outline layout. However, this increase has been combined with a market housing mix that is weighted towards larger properties. Nine of the 24 market homes are four or five-bedroom properties, meaning 37.5% of the market housing is four bedrooms or larger, and is therefore not complaint with Policy H2 of the

made HNP. At the same time, the proportions of smaller and three-bedroom homes are both below the figures identified by Policy H2, and no 1-bedroom properties are proposed in the market element.

As a result, in addition to failing meet the requirements of Policy H2, the larger building footprints are considered to have resulted in parts of the scheme appearing noticeably more cramped than the illustrative layout considered at outline stage. This point has also been highlighted by several residents, including those of Mickleton Road.

In the Parish Council's view, the resulting layout does not provide the spacious and well-landscaped edge to the settlement that is expected. It fails to demonstrate that the scale, mass and density of development are appropriate to this location, as required by Policies H4 and H5. The housing mix and layout should therefore be reconsidered to provide a less cramped form of development and a better transition between Honeybourne and the surrounding countryside.

3. PRow Route 533(C)

Public Right of Way 533(C) currently crosses the application site and provides an important connection between Honeybourne and the surrounding countryside. Paragraph 17 of the appeal decision acknowledged there would be unavoidable harms to the footpath, which would require diversion through the development.

Policy H13 of the made HNP requires routes to be protected, enhanced, expanded and positively used within new development. The supporting text also recognises that the local footpath network provides direct routes through the village and an important connection with the open countryside.

Policy TR8 of the NPPF also requires development to protect and enhance public rights of way and to take opportunities to improve their quality and connections, particularly where this improves access to the countryside. Policy TR4 also requires walking to be given priority within new development and for routes to be safe and attractive, with conflict between pedestrians and vehicles kept to a minimum. Policy DP3 requires clear and well-connected pedestrian routes as part of good design.

The illustrative masterplan approved as part of the outline (see below) indicated that PRow 533(C) would be able to be diverted along the southeastern boundary and pedestrian footway up to the northern corner of the parcel. This would have maintained

a sense of connection with the adjoining countryside and a relatively straight alignment without the need to cross the road.



In comparison, the reserved matters route (shown below in dashed green) is considered to take users along a less optimum route, for the reasons below:

- Starting at the southern corner, heading north, the proposed route does not follow a realistic desire line, curving around the root protection areas of trees. HPC are concerned this will lead to informal paths and query whether it is possible for this section of the route to be within the tree root protection areas and using a no-dig path that would therefore protect the trees whilst allowing pedestrians to travel in a straight line.
- Leading up to the road, it seems odd that the route has been proposed to run in between the SuDS and SS, given that the outline application suggested that the route could cross the adjoining field access. The surface materials plan also does not state what surface material will be used for the field access, and HPC consider this should be clarified.
- Upon reaching the road, pedestrians would be required to cross the road twice, which may require stopping to wait for passing vehicles. The outline proposal is

considered more as it would be more direct, safer and quicker. As a result, HPC consider that the pedestrian footway along this site of the should be reinstated to prevent the formation of a desire line along the verge.



In addition, it is noted that pedestrians will also have the option of an alternative route, walking through the middle of the development and along the footway adjoining Stratford Road (see orange dotted line below), and therefore thought should be given to where these pedestrians are expected to re-join the PRoW. The drive of plots 26-29 previously included a connecting footway to the proposed diversion, but this has been removed in the proposals. HPC consider this should be re-added to ensure the proposal makes walking and use of the PRoW as attractive as possible.



4. Landscaping and Trees

The outline scheme and subsequent appeal decision placed considerable importance on landscaping as a means of reducing the impact of development in this location. Policy H4 of the HNP similarly requires appropriate green space, structural planting and boundary treatments, while Policy H9 requires large developments to demonstrate how landscaping has shaped the proposal.

While the submitted layout includes a number of proposed trees, HPC considers that the development would benefit from a stronger framework of tree and hedge planting within public or communal areas. This is because, following occupation, trees planted within private gardens would be maintained by individual householders rather than through the management of the development's public landscape areas, and their long-term retention is therefore less certain. Where possible, the planting of trees directly adjacent to parking spaces should be avoided as it is considered likely to discourage their retention.

This concern is reinforced by the Highway Authority, which has requested a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan focused on strengthening existing hedgerows and providing additional native trees, shrubs and planting. The Council's Drainage Engineer has also expressed disappointment that greater use has not been made of above-ground SuDS, which could provide further opportunities to integrate drainage, landscape and

biodiversity rather than concentrating these functions within large attenuation ponds which reduce the amount of useable open space.

Policy H9 expects new development to incorporate suitable native trees and hedges and, for large developments, to demonstrate how landscaping has shaped the proposal. While the scheme includes a number of appropriate native species, the proposed tree palette also includes non-native ornamental trees and a substantial number of named cultivars rather than native local-provenance stock. This sits uneasily with the LEMP, which describes the proposed tree planting as “Native Tree” and states that native planting should be of local provenance. HPC therefore requests that the tree palette is reviewed to increase the use of locally appropriate native species identified in Policy H9, particularly within publicly managed and structural landscape areas.

HPC also notes that the planting schedule labelled “Leicester Native Shrub Mix” includes *Ligustrum ovalifolium* (oval-leaved privet), which is not a native British species. The applicant should either replace this with an appropriate native species, such as *Ligustrum vulgare*, or clarify why it is included within a native planting mix.

5. Design

HPC is also concerned about the detailed appearance of the proposed dwellings, particularly type 657, 800, 850 and 1158. While the use of simple forms and materials is not objected to in principle, the elevations shown in the reserved matters submission appear to read as standard estate house types rather than buildings designed to reflect the character of Honeybourne.

The mentioned house types have front elevations which lack balance, variety and visual interest. The arrangement of doors and windows often appears awkward, with openings not lining through clearly and with upper floor windows set uncomfortably close to the eaves. This gives some of the elevations a cramped and poorly proportioned appearance. There is also limited relief or detailing within the façades, with little to break up large areas of brickwork or provide a stronger sense of rhythm and composition.

Policies H4 and H5 of the Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan require development to make a positive contribution to the street scene, to respond to local character, and to be of an appropriate scale, mass and design quality. The Wychavon Design Code SPD (adopted 24 June 2026), also states that design must demonstrably respond to local distinctiveness in form, scale, materials and detailing (Must 101), and must be well

composed, coherently arranged and appropriately scaled, with a solid-to-void ratio that contributes positively to character (Must 109). Must 113 and Should 114 also concerns the need to use durable, high quality materials, that are appropriate to the context of the area and, where relevant, draw on local palettes. NPPF Policy DP3 similarly requires development to respond positively to the character of its site and surroundings. In HPC's view, the submitted house types, particularly the attached units, do not yet meet those expectations and should be improved through revised elevations, stronger proportions, and more thoughtful detailing.



6. Concluding remarks

I trust that the above comments will be given full consideration in the overall assessment of the proposal. Please may I request that HPC are kept informed of any updates or decisions regarding this application, should the Parish Council wish to provide further comment.

Yours sincerely,

Nick Pellegram MRTPI

Street Lighting Electricity Supply Contract — Report on Exercise of Delegated Authority

(Minute 26/747)

Purpose

To report to Full Council, for ratification, the acceptance of a new electricity supply contract for the Council's unmetered street lighting, exercised under delegated authority.

Summary of Annual Cost Comparison (excluding VAT)

Supplier	Estimated Annual Cost
West Mercia Energy (accepted)	£1,862
ESPO / Total Energies (comparator, received after signature)	£1,999 – £2,006
SSE (benchmark, 24-month)	£2,127

West Mercia Energy remains the most cost-effective option.

Background

The Council's previous contract with SSE Energy Solutions for the unmetered street lighting supply (MPAN 1490080003300) expired 31st January 2027. At the meeting of 9th June 2026, Full Council resolved (Minute 26/747) to delegate authority to the Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman, to obtain and accept the most competitive quote from a suitable supplier for this contract, with the decision to be reported to Full Council for ratification at the next available meeting.

Following enquiries with several suppliers and brokers, a 24-month fixed-term contract was accepted with West Mercia Energy (WME), a public-sector energy procurement body owned jointly by Shropshire Council, Worcestershire County Council, Telford & Wrekin Council, and Herefordshire Council. WME already supplies a number of other town and parish councils, as well as Wychavon District Council. As WME procures energy on behalf of a large number of councils, they are also able to secure more competitive wholesale rates than the Council could obtain alone.

The contract is estimated to cost approximately £1,742 per year (excluding VAT) for energy and standing charges, fully inclusive of WME's management fee. In addition, a Meter Administrator charge of £120 per year (confirmed by WME's supplier) applies to unmetered supplies of this type, giving a total estimated annual cost of approximately £1,862 (excluding VAT). The Meter Administrator is a distinct, technical role separate from WME's contract and billing management: it involves maintaining the certified inventory record of the Council's street lighting assets (numbers, wattages and connected load) with National Grid, which is what determines the charge for a supply with no meter. This is a mandatory function for any unmetered supply, regardless of chosen energy supplier, and is typically incorporated within the unit rate rather than itemised separately; as part of due diligence, a direct quote for Meter Administrator services was obtained for comparison (Power Data Associates, indicative annual fee of approximately £3,740 for a single MPAN), confirming that the arrangement offered via the electricity supplier represents significantly better value for a council of this scale. SSE were only able to offer a 12-month renewal and could not match the Council's requirement for multi-year budget certainty.

For comparison, an indicative 24-month benchmark rate was separately obtained for SSE, giving an estimated annual cost of approximately £2,127 (excluding VAT). This benchmark was obtained via a broker enquiry only, for comparison purposes, and was not pursued as a contractable option, as the broker concerned had provided inconsistent information during a separate quotation process and is not considered a reliable route for the Council to contract through. WME's rate was therefore found to be marginally lower than this benchmark, in addition to being the only option able to offer the fixed 24-month term required directly and reliably.

The quoted rate does not include the Climate Change Levy (CCL), a statutory HMRC tax collected by suppliers on business energy use, which is passed through at cost in addition to the unit rate. Although the

Council's own consumption falls below the individual de minimis exemption threshold, this does not apply here as CCL is assessed at portfolio level for supplies purchased through WME, in line with industry rules for unmetered supplies. At the current CCL rate of £0.00801 per kWh (rising to £0.00827 per kWh from 1 April 2027), this is estimated to add approximately £45 per year to the cost of the contract. CCL is a mandatory tax with no relief available to the Council, as reduced rates only apply to specific energy-intensive sectors under a Climate Change Agreement, which is not applicable to Council operations.

The Council has experienced billing and procurement difficulties with this supply over the past year, including a billing error by SSE, arising from an outdated inventory record held by the industry body responsible for unmetered supplies. This was actively pursued by the Clerk as soon as it was identified; however, resolution took some time, as SSE did not initially identify which body was responsible for correcting the record, and this was only established once the Clerk obtained the supply's UMS certificate, confirming the National Grid Unmetered Supplies team as the responsible party. The matter was then resolved directly with the network operator and SSE, with a full refund received, as reported to Full Council on 14th July 2026. Separately, issues were also encountered with a previous energy broker. WME, as a government procurement body, was chosen in part to provide greater assurance around the switching process and to reduce the risk of similar issues recurring. WME also provide a fully managed service, covering billing and supplier liaison, at no additional cost beyond the quoted rate — appropriate given the Council's limited in-house capacity to manage this directly. By contrast, the SSE benchmark rate used for comparison does not include any equivalent management service, and would require the Clerk to manage the account, billing, and any supplier queries directly.

Obtaining quotes for this supply proved considerably more difficult than anticipated. Several direct suppliers declined to provide a quote at all, as the small scale and unmetered nature of the supply was not attractive to them. Enquiries were also made through the ESPO procurement framework, another public-sector procurement body (used, among others, by Warwickshire-area councils); however, a comparable quote could not be obtained through this route within the Council's required timeframe. WME, as a public-sector procurement body already familiar with unmetered supplies of this type, was ultimately the most reliable route available to secure a competitive, multi-year fixed-term contract.

Further Comparator Received Following Contract Signature

Subsequent to the acceptance of the WME contract, a further quotation was received from Total Energies via the ESPO framework, for a 24-month fixed-term contract from 1 February 2027 (excluding VAT and CCL). This was reviewed for due diligence purposes to confirm the value of the decision already taken.

The ESPO/Total Energies quote gave an estimated annual cost of approximately £1,999 (non-green tariff) to £2,006 (green tariff), compared with the WME contract's estimated annual cost of approximately £1,862, inclusive of the Meter Administrator charge. Although the ESPO quote's unit rates were marginally lower than WME's, this was outweighed by a substantially higher standing charge (approximately £477 per year, compared with £244 per year under WME). WME therefore remains the more cost-effective option by approximately £137 to £144 per year.

In addition, the ESPO/Total Energies offer did not include an ongoing billing or supplier-liaison management service, which would have required the Clerk to manage the account and any supplier queries directly. This is in contrast to the WME contract, which includes a fully managed service at no additional cost. This further quotation is retained on file as additional evidence supporting the original decision.

Recommendation

That Full Council ratifies the Clerk's decision, taken under delegated authority in consultation with the Chairman, to accept a 24-month fixed electricity supply contract with West Mercia Energy for the unmetered street lighting supply, commencing 1 February 2027, at a total estimated annual cost of £1,862 (excluding VAT, including the confirmed Meter Administrator charge), compared with an indicative benchmark SSE rate of £2,127 per year for an equivalent term, and a subsequently received ESPO/Total Energies comparator rate of approximately £1,999 to £2,006 per year for an equivalent term.

Honeybourne Parish Council

South Warwickshire Local Plan – Regulation 19 Consultation Representations as Submitted – Confirmation to Councillors

Covering note

Further to Minute 26/764 (Full Council, 14 July 2026), this note confirms that the Council's representation to the South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication consultation has now been submitted, and sets out the text of each of the four submissions in full for the record.

In line with Minute 26/764, and with no further amendments notified by the 21 July deadline, the representation was submitted as previously circulated, under the delegated authority agreed at that meeting.

The consultation portal (OpusConsult) required the representation to be submitted separately against each of the four relevant policies and proposals, rather than as one combined document. All four were submitted on the evening, 21 July 2026, between 19:56 and 20:56. Each makes the same core case – that the Plan's evidence base does not assess the cross-boundary highway impact on Honeybourne of two separate, unassessed corridors (Campden Road/B4035 via Aston Subedge, and Honeybourne Road/B4085 via Bidford-on-Avon) – and each cross-refers to the other three so the connection is clear to the Planning Inspector. None of the four representations object to the principle or amount of housing proposed at Long Marston Airfield or Bidford-on-Avon, as this is outside the scope of a Regulation 19 representation.

Section commented on	Page	Portal ref. (ID)	Time submitted
Policy ID.3 (Infrastructure Protection)	154	109176	19:56
Policy ID.4 (Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass)	156	109177	20:07
Proposal LMA (Long Marston Airfield New Community)	331	109179	20:24
Proposal BID.1 (Bidford-on-Avon)	339	109182	20:56

Automated acknowledgement emails have been received from South Warwickshire Local Plan (warwickdc@oc2.uk) for all four submissions and are retained on file. This completes the action required under Minute 26/764. Confirmation of the submission will be brought to the Full Council meeting on 8 September 2026 for ratification. The full text of each submission, exactly as submitted, follows below.

1. Policy ID.3 (Infrastructure Protection) — page 154, ID 109176

Type: Object

Legally compliant? Yes

Sound? No

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Wish to appear at examination? No

Representation Summary:

Honeybourne Parish Council objects to Policy ID.3. Two schemes generate traffic into Honeybourne with no cross-boundary highway assessment: the Stratford Bypass corridor (Policy ID.4) connects via Campden Road/B4035 into the village; and the new BID.1 bridge (Policy ID.3, Part D) would materially increase capacity on the B4085/Honeybourne Road corridor, currently constrained by Bidford Bridge's 10-tonne weight limit. Neither impact is assessed. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council raised this at Regulation 18 stage; it remains unresolved. Not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with NPPF effective co-operation (paras 24-28).

Change to plan:

That Policy ID.3 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan be amended to include an assessment of cross-boundary highway impacts on the Worcestershire road network arising from both the Campden Road corridor and the Honeybourne Road/B4085 corridor, with appropriate interim mitigation identified pending delivery of the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass and the BID.1 river crossing.

Full text:

Honeybourne Parish Council (Wychavon District, Worcestershire) objects to Policy ID.3 insofar as it fails to assess cross-boundary highway impacts on Honeybourne arising from two separate schemes. First, the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass corridor safeguarded under Policy ID.4 (addressed in our separate representation on that policy) terminates at the B4632 Campden Road, which continues as a through-route via Aston Subedge and the B4035 into Honeybourne. No assessment of consequential or displaced traffic on this route, or on the wider Worcestershire network, is presented in Policy ID.3 or its supporting evidence. Second, Policy ID.3 Part D newly proposes: "BID.1 - Delivery of a link between B439 Stratford Road, and B4085 Honeybourne Road, through BID.1. This link will include the proposed new bridge and is intended to reduce traffic through the village centre and over the existing Bidford Bridge." The B4085 continues into Worcestershire as Honeybourne Road - described by Warwickshire County Council as "a key Vale of Evesham traffic route regularly used by residents and commuters from both Warwickshire and Worcestershire." The existing Bidford Bridge carries a 10-tonne weight limit to protect its Grade I listed fabric; an unrestricted new bridge at BID.1 would materially increase, not merely redistribute, traffic capacity on this corridor into Honeybourne. AECOM's Concept Masterplan Report for this site (May 2026) confirms a new river crossing is anticipated but describes it only as a "potential requirement... subject to consideration of bridge/river crossing constraints" - not a confirmed, located or assessed scheme. Neither corridor's cross-boundary impact is assessed in the Plan's evidence base. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council both raised materially similar concerns in their Duty to Co-operate responses to the Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation; the SWLP's own Statement of Compliance confirms these remain "ongoing" at Publication stage. We consider Policy ID.3 is not justified or effective in this respect, and that the evidence base does not demonstrate the effective co-operation required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), paragraphs 24-28, notwithstanding the abolition of the formal statutory Duty to Co-operate in early 2026. This representation should be read alongside our related representations on Policy ID.4, Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1, which together set out a single case concerning unassessed cross-boundary highway impact on Honeybourne.

2. Policy ID.4 (Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass) — page 156, ID 109177

Type: Object

Legally compliant? Yes

Sound? No

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Wish to appear at examination? No

Representation Summary:

Honeybourne Parish Council objects to Policy ID.4. The Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass, required to deliver Proposal LMA (10,300 homes), safeguards a corridor terminating at Campden Road - which continues via Aston Subedge/B4035 into Honeybourne. No cross-boundary impact assessment is provided for this connected route. LMA's core phases are not tied to Bypass delivery, and Honeybourne's only mitigation is unfunded rail safeguarding. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council raised this at Regulation 18 stage; it remains unresolved. Not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with NPPF effective co-operation (paras 24-28).

Change to plan:

That Policy ID.4 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan be amended to include an assessment of cross-boundary highway impacts on the Worcestershire road network via the Campden Road corridor, with interim mitigation identified pending Bypass delivery.

Full text:

Honeybourne Parish Council (Wychavon District, Worcestershire) objects to Policy ID.4. The parish, though outside the SWLP area, is directly affected by the scale of growth proposed at Long Marston Airfield (Proposal LMA: minimum 10,300 homes, at least 4,500 by 2050) and by the transport provisions intended to support it. Policy ID.4 safeguards a corridor for the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass, which the policy justification confirms is required to deliver Proposal LMA. The corridor terminates at the B4632 Campden Road south of Clifford Chambers, within Warwickshire. Campden Road continues as a single, continuously-named road towards Chipping Campden; the direct road connection into Honeybourne branches off this corridor at Aston Subedge via the B4035, continuing as Honeybourne Road and then Weston Road into the village. The Bypass does not extend into, or provide any assessed mitigation for, this connected route, despite Campden Road forming the only through-route linking Long Marston/Stratford traffic to the roads serving Honeybourne. The Policy ID.4 justification itself acknowledges that "highway modelling has shown that there is insufficient capacity for further significant development south of Stratford-upon-Avon town." No equivalent assessment is presented of consequential or displaced traffic impacts on the Worcestershire road network. Proposal LMA, Section F (Access, Highways and Public Transport) addresses connectivity to Honeybourne solely through safeguarding land for restoration of the former heavy rail line between Honeybourne and Stratford-upon-Avon (consistent with Policy ID.3). This is a long-term, unfunded aspiration; no interim road-based mitigation is identified. Proposal LMA, Section B (Timescale) further confirms that core phases (500 dwellings) are not dependent on Bypass delivery, and that development across the wider site may proceed sooner than the Bypass opening (anticipated 2035) if the Highways Authority is satisfied - leaving open the possibility of substantial development proceeding in advance of the principal highway mitigation being in place. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council, in their Duty to Co-operate responses to the Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation, each raised materially similar concerns regarding cross-boundary trip rates and pressure on roads and station car parking around Honeybourne. The SWLP's own Statement of Compliance confirms these matters remain "ongoing" at Publication stage. We consider the Plan is not justified or effective in this respect, as the evidence base does not demonstrate that cross-boundary highway impacts arising from Proposal LMA have been adequately assessed or mitigated, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for effective co-operation between authorities (NPPF (2024), paragraphs 24-28). This

representation should be read alongside our related representations on Policy ID.3, Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1.

3. Proposal LMA (Long Marston Airfield New Community) — page 331, ID 109179

Type: Object

Legally compliant? Yes

Sound? No

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Wish to appear at examination? No

Representation Summary:

Honeybourne Parish Council objects to Proposal LMA. Its transport mitigation for Honeybourne relies solely on unfunded rail line restoration; no interim road mitigation is identified. Core phases are not tied to the Stratford Bypass, which itself provides no assessed mitigation for the connected Campden Road/B4035 corridor into Honeybourne. This compounds with Proposal BID.1's unassessed new river crossing, generating a second unassessed route into the village. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council raised this at Regulation 18 stage; unresolved. Not justified, not effective, inconsistent with NPPF effective co-operation (paras 24-28). Does not object to housing quantum.

Change to plan:

That Proposal LMA (Section F) be amended to include assessed interim road-based mitigation for the Campden Road/Honeybourne Road corridor, pending delivery of the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass and any rail-based solution.

Full text:

Honeybourne Parish Council (Wychavon District, Worcestershire) objects to Proposal LMA. The parish is directly affected by the scale of growth proposed at Long Marston Airfield: a minimum of 10,300 homes, with at least 4,500 to be delivered by 2050, together with the transport provisions intended to support this new settlement. Proposal LMA, Section F (Access, Highways and Public Transport Requirements) addresses connectivity to Honeybourne solely through safeguarding land for restoration of the former Stratford-Honeybourne heavy rail line, consistent with Policy ID.3. This is a long-term and currently unfunded aspiration. No interim, road-based mitigation is identified for Honeybourne or the connecting rural lanes in the meantime. Proposal LMA, Section B (Timescale) confirms that core phases of development (Phase 1A/1B, 500 dwellings) are not dependent on delivery of the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass (Policy ID.4), and that development across the wider site may proceed sooner than the Bypass opening (anticipated 2035) "if it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority." This leaves open the possibility of substantial development proceeding in advance of the principal highway mitigation being in place, with no corresponding safeguard for the Worcestershire road network. The Bypass corridor itself (Policy ID.4, addressed in our separate representation) terminates at the B4632 Campden Road, which continues as the only through-route linking Long Marston/Stratford traffic to the roads serving Honeybourne via Aston Subedge and the B4035. No assessment of this connected route's cross-boundary impact is presented anywhere in the evidence supporting Proposal LMA. This is compounded by the cumulative effect of growth proposed elsewhere in the Plan: Proposal BID.1 (Bidford-on-Avon, addressed in our separate representation) proposes a new, unrestricted river crossing generating a second direct road connection into Honeybourne via the B4085. Two separate strategic allocations therefore generate traffic converging on Honeybourne via two separate, unassessed corridors - a pattern in the evidence base, not an isolated gap. Worcestershire County Council and Wychavon District Council both raised materially similar concerns in their Duty to Co-operate responses to the Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation regarding Long Marston Airfield's impact on the Vale of Evesham road network; the SWLP's own Statement of Compliance confirms these remain unresolved at Publication stage. We consider Proposal LMA is not justified or effective in this respect, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for effective co-operation between authorities (NPPF (2024), paragraphs 24-28). For the avoidance of doubt,

this representation does not object to the principle or quantum of housing proposed at Long Marston Airfield, which is outside the scope of a Regulation 19 representation. This representation should be read alongside our related representations on Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4 and Proposal BID.1.

4. Proposal BID.1 (Bidford-on-Avon) — page 339, ID 109182

Type: Object

Legally compliant? Yes

Sound? No

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Wish to appear at examination? No

Representation Summary:

Honeybourne Parish Council objects to Proposal BID.1. A new highway scheme (Policy ID.3, Part D) proposes an unrestricted bridge on the B4085/Honeybourne Road corridor, replacing the existing Bidford Bridge's 10-tonne weight limit and materially increasing traffic capacity into Honeybourne. AECOM's own evidence confirms a river crossing is anticipated but only tentatively, not confirmed or assessed. No cross-boundary impact assessment exists. This compounds with the separate, unassessed Campden Road/B4035 corridor linked to Proposal LMA. Not justified, not effective, inconsistent with NPPF effective co-operation (paras 24-28). Does not object to housing quantum.

Change to plan:

That Proposal BID.1 and Policy ID.3 be amended to include an assessment of the cross-boundary highway impact of the Honeybourne Road/B4085 corridor and the precise location and design of the proposed new river crossing, with appropriate mitigation identified.

Full text:

Honeybourne Parish Council (Wychavon District, Worcestershire) objects to Proposal BID.1. The parish is directly affected by the scale of growth proposed at Bidford-on-Avon (minimum 2,225 dwellings) and by the associated highway scheme intended to support it. The Publication Version proposes a new highway scheme under Policy ID.3 (Infrastructure Protection), Part D: "Delivery of a link between B439 Stratford Road, and B4085 Honeybourne Road, through BID.1. This link will include the proposed new bridge and is intended to reduce traffic through the village centre and over the existing Bidford Bridge." The B4085 Honeybourne Road continues into Worcestershire as a through-route into Honeybourne, and is described by Warwickshire County Council as "a key Vale of Evesham traffic route regularly used by residents and commuters from both Warwickshire and Worcestershire." Warwickshire County Council's own published information confirms the existing Bidford Bridge - a Grade I listed, scheduled structure - carries a 10-tonne weight limit (emergency and public vehicles exempt), imposed to protect the historic fabric from heavy vehicles. A new, unrestricted BID.1 bridge would therefore materially increase the traffic capacity of this route into Honeybourne, rather than simply redistributing existing traffic away from the village centre as the policy wording suggests. AECOM's Concept Masterplan Report for this site (May 2026), the technical evidence underlying Proposal BID.1, confirms in Section 3.1 a "potential requirement for a single link road... as well as consideration of bridge/river crossing constraints." This confirms that a new river crossing is genuinely anticipated in the Council's own site-specific technical evidence, but only in tentative terms - not as a confirmed, located, or fully assessed scheme. Neither the Plan nor its evidence base presents any assessment of the cross-boundary highway impact of this route on the Worcestershire road network. This sits alongside the unassessed impact of the separate Campden Road/B4035 corridor connected to Proposal LMA and Policy ID.4 (addressed in our separate representations on those provisions). Two separate strategic allocations - Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1 - therefore generate traffic converging on Honeybourne via two separate, unassessed corridors, a pattern in the evidence base rather than an isolated gap. We consider Proposal BID.1 is not justified or effective in this respect, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for effective co-operation between authorities (NPPF (2024), paragraphs 24-28). For the avoidance of doubt, this representation does not object to the principle or quantum of housing proposed at Bidford-on-Avon, which is outside the scope of a Regulation 19

representation. This representation should be read alongside our related representations on Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4 and Proposal LMA.

Honeybourne Parish Council

South Warwickshire Local Plan – Regulation 19 Consultation

Supplementary Representation (Submitted 24 August 2026) – Employment and Road Freight (Policy EC.7 / Proposal LMA)

Covering Note

This supplementary representation to the South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation was submitted on 24 August 2026, in addition to the Council's four representations already submitted on 21st July 2026 (Minute 26/764). It concerns a distinct ground of objection — the treatment of employment-related freight and HGV movements under Policy EC.7 and Proposal LMA — rather than the highway capacity/cross-boundary issues addressed in the earlier representations. It was submitted against both Policy EC.7 and Proposal LMA, under the delegated authority agreed for the original four representations.

Evidence

Evidence 1 – Andrew Ford's covering email, Wychavon District Council (21 July 2026)

Source: Email from Andrew Ford, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Policy Team, Wychavon District Council, to the Clerk

“Wychavon District Council will be providing a formal response to the consultation, but we would encourage the parish council to also make representations to the process.”

Evidence 2 – Policy EC.7 (Employment and Road Freight)

Source: SWLP Regulation 19 Publication Version, Chapter 4.4, Policy EC.7

“New employment development should improve sustainable transport access to the site, enabling access for all users including pedestrians and cyclists where possible. Development should aim to reduce the carbon impact of freight and employment related vehicle movements... Development proposals that would result in a significant increase in freight movements should provide adequate lorry parking facilities, including overnight lorry parking where required for the proposed usage. In accordance with the NPPF, all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement will be required to provide a Travel Plan, and the planning application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed. Freight vehicles will be expected to divert away from residential areas wherever possible.”

Link: <https://southwarwickshire.oc2.uk/document/168/5650>

Evidence 3 – the Plan's own justification for Policy EC.7

Source: SWLP Regulation 19 Publication Version, Chapter 4.4, paragraph 4.4.1

“Employment sites may have a negative impact on the road network where transport considerations are not taken into account from the earliest stage. In addition, the increasing demand for large-scale storage and logistics employment sites has resulted in a concurrent increase in road freight traffic to serve these uses.”

Link: <https://southwarwickshire.oc2.uk/document/168/5650>

Evidence 4 – Proposal LMA, Section F (Access, Highways and Public Transport Requirements)

Source: SWLP Regulation 19 Publication Version, Chapter 8.2, Proposal LMA

Section F requires the development to: contribute towards the Stratford-upon-Avon Bypass; “demonstrate safe vehicular access from the Campden Road, Station Road and Milcote Road”; provide mobility hubs; contribute towards bus service improvements; and safeguard land for a railway station and “restoration of a heavy rail line between Honeybourne and Stratford-upon-Avon”. No part of Section F references Policy EC.7, freight, or HGV movement.

Link: <https://southwarwickshire.oc2.uk/document/168/5776>

Evidence 5 – Wychavon District Council's Regulation 19 briefing note

Source: Wychavon District Council, South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation – Long Marston Briefing Note (Andrew Ford, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Policy Team). Held on Council file; not published online.

“It should be noted that Wychavon previously included a similar HGV control zone policy in SWDP (2016) but ultimately decided not to carry forward the policy as part of the SWDPR (2026) mainly due to the matter now being addressed through SWDPR 06 Transport. The retention of the Vale of Evesham Control Zone within the SWLP therefore represents a difference in planning policy between the neighbouring authorities.” ... “[I]t will be crucial to understand how the longstanding control zone would operate alongside the new settlement; whether supporting transport evidence has adequately addressed cross-boundary HGV movements; and if there are any potential implications for communities within Wychavon which have been identified.”

Evidence 6 – Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2, paragraph 5.1.5 (Freight)

Source: SWLP Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2, February 2026

“No material changes to the baseline regarding Freight have been identified since the publication of the IDP Part 1. Freight and logistics considerations in relation to the SRN [Strategic Road Network], particularly the implications on the M40, M42 and A46 Corridors, are addressed through the STA and are reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule where mitigation requirements have been identified.”

Link:

<https://www.southwarwickshire.org.uk/doc/214816/name/SWLP%20IDP%20Part%202%20Publication%20Version.pdf>

Representation as Submitted

Submitted against two policy locations on the OpusConsult portal: (i) Policy EC.7 (Chapter 4.4); and (ii) Proposal LMA (Chapter 8.2).

Type

Object

Legally compliant?

Yes

Sound?

No

Complies with the duty to co-operate?

No

Wish to appear at examination?

No

Representation Summary

Honeybourne Parish Council objects on a further ground, distinct from though related to our representations on Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4, Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1. Policy EC.7 relies on developer-submitted Transport Assessments to address freight/HGV impact, but neither EC.7 nor Proposal LMA's site-specific transport requirements (Section F) flag Honeybourne or the Vale of Evesham as a route requiring assessment. Without this, there is no assurance the issue will ever be tested. Not justified, not effective.

Change to Plan Sought

That Proposal LMA (Section F) be amended to cross-refer to Policy EC.7 and specifically require the site's Transport Assessment to address freight/HGV routing towards the Vale of Evesham and Honeybourne, arising from the 15ha of employment land proposed at the site.

Full Text

Honeybourne Parish Council (Wychavon District, Worcestershire) objects on a further ground, distinct from though related to our representations on Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4, Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1 above. This representation concerns the application of Policy EC.7 (Employment and Road Freight) to the specific circumstances of Proposal LMA.

The Plan's own justification for Policy EC.7 acknowledges the underlying risk: paragraph 4.4.1 states that "employment sites may have a negative impact on the road network where transport considerations are not taken into account from the earliest stage," and that "the increasing demand for large-scale storage and logistics employment sites has resulted in a concurrent increase in road freight traffic to serve these uses." Policy EC.7 addresses this risk by requiring that "freight vehicles will be expected to divert away from residential areas wherever possible," secured through a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment submitted with future planning applications.

Proposal LMA allocates 15 hectares of non-strategic employment land at Long Marston Airfield. Section F of that policy (Access, Highways and Public Transport Requirements) is otherwise detailed – addressing rail safeguarding, bus services and active travel – but does not reference Policy EC.7, and gives no indication that the site's Transport Assessment is expected to consider freight or HGV routing, still less its impact on the Vale of Evesham and Worcestershire communities including Honeybourne. Reliance solely on a future site promoter's own Transport Assessment, without any Plan-level requirement that it specifically address this route, provides no assurance that the impact identified at paragraph 4.4.1 will be tested at all in relation to this site.

This gap is consistent with the Plan's wider evidence base. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2 (February 2026), paragraph 5.1.5, confirms that freight considerations have to date been addressed only "in relation to the SRN [Strategic Road Network], particularly the implications on the M40, M42 and A46 Corridors" – not the Local Road Network into Worcestershire. Wychavon District Council's own Regulation 19 briefing note on this consultation confirms it will be "crucial to understand... whether supporting transport evidence has adequately addressed cross-boundary HGV movements" arising from Long Marston. On the evidence published, it has not.

We consider the Plan is not justified, as the risk identified at paragraph 4.4.1 has not been evidenced or tested at the one site in the Plan most obviously exposed to it; and not effective, as Proposal LMA contains no mechanism to ensure this occurs.

For the avoidance of doubt, this representation does not object to the principle or quantum of housing or employment land proposed at Long Marston Airfield, which is outside the scope of a Regulation 19 representation. This representation should be read alongside our related representations on Policy ID.3, Policy ID.4, Proposal LMA and Proposal BID.1.

Honeybourne Parish Council

Cotswold District Local Plan 2026–2043: Regulation 19 Consultation

Summary of HPC's Submitted Representation — for Councillors' Information

Summary

Following Full Council's approval on 8th September 2026, the Clerk has submitted Honeybourne Parish Council's representation to Cotswold District Council's Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan 2026–2043. As explained in the Clerk's report to Council, CDC's online consultation portal only accepts one topic per survey entry, so the representation was submitted as six separate entries rather than a single letter. All six have now been submitted and confirmed received by CDC (confirmation emails and unique submission identifiers held by the Clerk).

This document summarises what was submitted, for councillors' records. The full wording approved by Council is set out in the Clerk's report of 8th September 2026.

The Six Entries Submitted

Entry 1 — Paragraph 7.20 / Core Policy 19, page 119

Reference: Paragraph 7.20 / Core Policy 19, page 119

Submitted: 17:41 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

Paragraph 7.20 names “enhancing public transport connectivity, particularly to Honeybourne Railway Station” as a key consideration for the Mickleton allocation, now proposed at 1,387 dwellings in total. Honeybourne Railway Station lies outside Cotswold District, in Wychavon District (Worcestershire), and its car park is already at capacity — a constraint with no funded requirement to address it anywhere in the Plan. The NPPF (August 2026) defines a “well-connected station” as one within a top 80 Travel to Work Area by Gross Value Added, served by at least 4 trains per hour overall (or 2/hour in one direction). Official ONS data confirms Honeybourne lies within the Evesham Travel to Work Area, ranked approximately 144th of 228 UK TTWAs by GVA — well outside the top 80 — and the current timetable shows only around 1 train per hour in each direction for most of the day. Honeybourne Station therefore fails the NPPF's own definition of a “well-connected station” on both tests.

Modification sought:

That paragraph 7.20, Core Policy 20, and the Site 9 Development Framework include a specific, funded requirement addressing Honeybourne Station's capacity constraints, secured through developer contributions and/or evidenced cross-boundary agreement with Wychavon District Council, Worcestershire County Council and Network Rail.

Entry 2 — Core Policy 20, pages 122–123

Reference: Chapter 7, Core Policy 20, pages 122–123

Submitted: 17:46 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

Core Policy 20 sets out the strategic infrastructure package required to support growth in the North Cotswold Area (items a–f). None of these items address Honeybourne Railway Station, despite paragraph 7.20 relying on that station's connectivity to help justify the Mickleton allocation.

Modification sought:

That Core Policy 20 be amended to include a specific item addressing Honeybourne Station capacity, or that reliance on the station's sustainability credentials be removed from paragraph 7.20 if no such commitment is intended.

Entry 3 — Appendix B, Site 9 Mickleton Development Framework, page 42

Reference: Appendix B, Site 9 Mickleton Development Framework, page 42

Submitted: 18:18 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

The Movement and Public Transport requirements for Site 9 specify active travel routes toward Stratford-upon-Avon and bus service improvements to Moreton-in-Marsh, Stratford-upon-Avon, Chipping Campden and Evesham. None addresses travel to Honeybourne Station. Mickleton lies in Gloucestershire; Honeybourne Station lies in Worcestershire, and cross-county bus arrangements are not standard practice. The identified bus improvement to Evesham does not resolve this gap, as Evesham has its own railway station on the same line.

Modification sought:

That the Site 9 Development Framework include a specific, funded requirement addressing access to Honeybourne Station, or that CDC provide evidence of the mechanism by which the connectivity referred to in paragraph 7.20 is intended to be delivered.

Entry 4 — Core Policy 6: Infrastructure Delivery, pages 54–55

Reference: Chapter 4, Core Policy 6, pages 54–55

Submitted: 18:34 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

Core Policy 6 sets out the Plan's district-wide principle that new development must be supported by necessary infrastructure delivered in a timely way, specifically naming healthcare infrastructure such as GP surgeries as typically needing delivery ahead of, or alongside, new development under the Plan's stated 'infrastructure-led' approach. The absence of any Honeybourne Station-related requirement in Core Policy 20 or the Site 9 Development Framework is inconsistent with this general principle, which the Plan applies elsewhere.

Modification sought:

That Core Policy 20 and the Site 9 Development Framework be brought into line with the infrastructure-led approach set out in Core Policy 6, by including a specific, funded requirement addressing Honeybourne Station capacity.

Entry 5 — Core Policy 52: New Local Centres, and paragraph 11.48, pages 218–219

Reference: Chapter 11, Core Policy 52: New Local Centres, and paragraph 11.48, pages 218–219

Submitted: 19:59 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

HPC's Regulation 18 representation evidenced that GP surgeries in Broadway and Chipping Campden are already at or above the BMA's recommended patient-to-GP ratio, and that growth at Mickleton and Willersey would add further pressure. Core Policy 52 applies to the Mickleton strategic allocation and states, at clause (f), that new Local Centres should "provide opportunities, where appropriate to the scale and function of the Local Centre, for... health services... and other complementary uses" — a discretionary, non-committal reference, not a firm requirement. Paragraph 11.48 similarly describes "health and wellbeing services" only as something local centres "can provide," rather than a required provision.

Modification sought:

That Core Policy 52 be amended to include a firm, funded requirement for healthcare provision at the Mickleton Local Centre, given the evidenced GP capacity pressures in the surrounding area, rather than a discretionary reference to 'opportunities' for health services.

Entry 6 — NPPF Transitional Weight (Paragraph 7.20 and Core Policy 20)

Reference: Paragraph 7.20, page 119, and Core Policy 20, pages 122–123

Submitted: 18:39 on 9th September 2026

Comment:

CDC has confirmed that the Publication Local Plan is being examined against the December 2024 NPPF. However, the August 2026 NPPF's transitional provisions (Annex A) state that once its national decision-making policies take effect, adopted plan policies materially inconsistent with them may be given only limited weight in actual planning decisions — even where the plan was properly examined against the December 2024 Framework. The Mickleton allocation partly relies on Honeybourne Station's sustainability credentials as set out in paragraph 7.20, and the station does not meet the new NPPF's own definition of a “well-connected station,” failing both the Travel to Work Area/GVA test and the service frequency test set out in the Framework's glossary.

Modification sought:

That CDC demonstrate the Mickleton allocation's supporting policies will remain effective once decided against the August 2026 NPPF, not only against the Framework used at examination.

Note on the questions common to every entry

Each of the six entries was submitted answering “No” to CDC's standard question “Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound?” — consistent with the position set out in the Clerk's report that HPC's case rests on the Plan's soundness (in particular, that it is not “effective” or “justified” in relying on Honeybourne Station without a funded delivery mechanism), not on legal compliance. Each entry also answered “No” to the question of whether HPC considers it necessary to participate in examination hearing sessions, reflecting that the case has been made fully in writing and no decision to seek hearing participation was taken by Council.

For the full wording as approved by Council, see the Clerk's report of 8th September 2026. Confirmation emails and unique submission identifiers for all six entries are held by the Clerk.