

## Additional comments attached to email response

1. There is a need to ensure the terminology and nomenclature within the document is aligned with existing studies such as the LSCA, RCA and AONB Guidance.
2. The document should include a Glossary to assist with definitions of terms, a list of acronyms and should be written in as plain an English as possible to assist the lay reader. An additional issue was the layout of the document, as both a PDF file and a Word file (to make Track Changes and Comments on), was difficult for the reader to understand at times as the formatting became disordered and out of line.
3. The structure of the relevant sections of the report should be closely aligned to the LSCA and RCA. This will assist readers of all the documents and hopefully reduce the possibility of misinterpretation of issues. In summarising the various Character Areas whether rural or residential there is important detail that is missed and this needs attention.
4. The Design Code should use the LSCA and other reports as a base, referring to them throughout (noting relevant sections / paras, ideally), and not repeat info which isn't useful to the future Design Code, e.g., we don't need to know about the details of the history of Malvern Water, but we do need to highlight the importance of the springs & other water features / courses, and explain in the Design Code how they would be dealt with if development could potentially affect them. The aim is to highlight the features / factors / qualities which are of high value (nationally / locally / in the parish), and which future development would need to respect / reflect / factor in / protect / enhance, etc.
5. There should be reference to the proposed designations and policies within the draft NDP. This should include (a) an overview of local and proposed designations, as they can be hard to find (see / ref draft NDP and LSCA & figures), and (b) focus on features / factors of high parish / neighbourhood value which are unlikely to be designated / protected and are rarely identified in developers' / LPAs' studies (see draft NDP)
6. In addition, the DC should provide the evidence to support the proposed design (and other related) policies and, where deemed necessary, propose amended or additional policies.
7. It would be useful if the DC included examples of negative features and elements in the parish. There are obviously sensitivities around this but the DC should allude to, at the very least, certain local examples which are not considered to work in the parish. An example of this should be the development of Oaklands (see attached photograph showing building in white render which is mentioned in the document at comment PH74). It's good to have the summary of positive qualities at the end of that section, and presumably negative ones will be incorporated into the 'Issues to be addressed in design codes' list at the end (S3.8), generally and/or specifically. The AONB's *Guidance on Respecting Landscape in Views* has examples in which are very relevant to the Wells, but it isn't included as a source of ref in the DC which it should be (along with some of the other key guidance docs on lighting, colour, views etc - see Track Changes document).
8. Conversely, the DC should also provide examples of where and why new development has fitted in and does work. In addition, good examples of restoration/refurbishment should also be highlighted.