

Eardisland Neighbourhood Development Plan

Report of the Community Consultation Event Friday 9 and Saturday 10 October 2015

2 days of Community Consultation were held in Eardisland Village Hall on 9-10 October 2015 to receive feedback and views on the following changes to the Plan: new draft using a Criteria-Based Approach; the Vision and Objectives; the rewritten Policies and Parish Actions; and to gain general comments on the Plan and the process.

Flyers advertising the changes made to the draft NDP and details of the event were sent to every household in the parish magazine in July and September. In addition notices advertising the event were placed on the village website and parish notice boards. A poster was placed at various locations round the parish and those who responded by email to the previous consultation event were contacted by email to encourage them to comment in this consultation. It was recognised that not everyone would be able to attend the event. Therefore all the flyers, notices and posters gave the option for people to download a response form from the website or contact the Parish Clerk for a form, either to be returned directly to the Clerk by 3 days after the event.

In total, parishioners from 31 houses responded, out of 243 houses within the parish, giving a response rate of 12.7%. of these, 27 out of 31 households had also responded to the previous consultation event. 49 people attended the event, which included 3 who live outside but own land in the parish. 9 people responded by email or post. 57 individual Forms were returned in total. Not all Consultation Forms were fully completed, so the results are based on the data provided.

The results shown below give the responses to the specific questions.

1. *The Due to environmental constraints, the NDP is unable to identify and allocate suitable sites for development within/adjacent to the Settlement Boundary.*

Therefore the NDP's policies are written with strict criteria to be met by all new development wherever it is in the Parish.

Development should be as near to the built form as flood constraints allow and planning applications will be considered in relation to their conformity to the criteria in the NDP policies, as well as to national and local policies.

Do you agree with this Criteria-Based Approach to planning for the Eardisland NDP?

56 out of 57 respondents answered 'Yes' to this question, though 4 also responded 'No' and made comments shown below. The responses to the comments are **marked in red**:

- But relationship to the built form is too restrictive
- However in the previous consultation we were asked what size development we thought appropriate. This appears to be missing from this draft. I am concerned about inappropriately large developments
- We agree with the principle of a 'criteria' plan however not for the reasons given. Due to 'environmental 'constraints' it would be very easy to say where houses could/should be located but no effort has been put into positively facilitating growth. The criteria are also quite 'generic' and would not prevent the worst kind of development (ie a large, suburban estate). The introduction & justification is negative in tone & focuses on what can't be done **Intro & Rationale amended to reflect this**
- But there are suitable sites, though a criteria based approach would be good. This is a very negative approach just identifying sites not suitable but making no effort to identify positive sites alongside the boundaries. **Head of Neighbourhood Planning at Herefordshire Council (NPHC) recommended not allocating sites but use current criteria approach**
- There must be positive sites within the boundary of the village (x2 people)
- With qualification! There is a large, perhaps negative, emphasis on the constraints. But the constraints are clear so it should be possible to identify & allocate sites as there are some adjacent to the settlement boundary. **See previous comments.** So the emphasis seems to have been on where you can't build, not where you can. Notwithstanding this, I believe a criteria-based approach is appropriate. But the criteria currently are too generic & should be more specific to generate the best possible housing quality & mix
- Your remit was to identify areas for growth & housing and not to protect the 'status quo'

2. Do you agree with the Vision and Objectives for the NDP?

52 out of 57 respondents 'Yes', of whom 2 responded 'No' as well and 1 person did not respond to this question. Comments made and responses to the comments (marked in red) are shown below:

- Again the Vision & Objectives are generic & almost weightless. There is no mention of positively facilitating opportunities for growth (housing & enterprise). The objectives seem quite 'qualified'. Is it worth mentioning that the ENDP would aspire to excellence & high quality opportunities to improve the village? It is a plan for the future but sounds so negative - especially to outsiders who might want to live/work here. **Head of Neighbourhood Planning for Herefordshire Council (NPHC) recommended not allocating sites but use current criteria approach**
- These are very static styles of vision. Surely this is an opportunity to look to the future of our village and promote and encourage good housing of every type. To ensure businesses & people want to work, live & visit. Where is the POSITIVE! See 3.6 'plan positively'
- I find the objectives too static & looking to maintain the status quo. It appears to be trying to look at restricting development, seeing this as a threat, rather than an opportunity. There is very little about proportionate growth being achieved, how important this is for Eardisland and how to do it. **Now added**. This links to the criteria needing to be more explicit so that development can be embraced positively
- How can you achieve objectives 3 & 5 if you will not identify or permit sites to be considered **See previous comments** – so much endeavour, for so little result, what a pity!

3. Do you agree with the rewritten Policies and Parish Actions of the NDP?

50 respondents out of 57 said 'Yes', 6 said 'No', 1 person did not respond to this question. Comments made and responses to the comments (marked in red) are shown below:

- I am concerned that there is no protection for the views and vistas at the west end approach to the village. The restriction on the density of new houses seems to have been removed from the plan. This is extremely worrying. **Under review**
- Protected views - No.3 hedge is so high you can't see the open area **Being checked**; No.1 view should be brought in, why protect Swandrift (not important building). **View is of entry to village, Swandrift can be seen for some distance away as the start of the village**. Local green spaces - what about church, motte & churchyard **Already protected by listing** and its setting; the whole area around Dovecot/river could be protected **River bank included as green area**. Protected views should include the important clusters of architecture! Extend the arc on No.2 to include behind Mary J's. **Consider extending**. Policy E2 (a) Eardisland is a 'cluster' village and so 'street frontage building lines' are inappropriate & unworkable. **Amended but not considered a cluster village**. Back land development would be fine in some circumstances. **As shown in E9**. Other E2 policies could do with more detail & clarification to aid developers/landowners. E1 (n) Please reconsider 'ARTIFICIAL' alternatives. UPVC etc is NOT appropriate. **Cannot preclude alternatives, eg slate unobtainable and alternative acceptable; remove 'artificial'**
- Eleven of the policies begin with either DOES NOT, DO NOT, WOULD NOT or WILL NOT. Has nobody got an enthusiastic, positive approach to the development of Eardisland. **Some policies changed, some use language of higher level policies**
- No suggestion of what Eardisland does need to progress (x2 people)
- These policies refer to the UDP which is obsolete, so presumably they will need to be rewritten to reflect the Core Strategy? **Yes now it is adopted**. But, more than that, again it is all very negative. There is not a suggestion of what Eardisland does want in terms of new business opportunities except tourism. **NDP cannot say what business is put forward**. Very narrow, not innovative, missed opportunity
- Policy E1 (b), (h) and (j) negative criteria **(b) & (j) use language of higher level policies, (h) justifiable to have views, wording amended** - unhelpful to positive stance. Protected view is not more important than housing
- Whilst we generally agree with the policies and actions, we feel that there is an element of 'arm twisting' from council/government which have pressured the NDP to compromise. An example is the reduction of the number of protected views down to 4 (x3 people)

4. Do you have any other comments about the NDP?

Comments made and responses to the comments (marked in red) are shown below:

- First class job!
- 'Localism' in name only - too many constraints in National and Herefordshire planning regulation hierarchy to allow sufficient freedom for truly local planning decisions
- Difficult to see how there could be any other approach to development in the village given the constraints imposed by the flood risk & and the requirement to maintain the village's unique identity
- It is a very clear well written thought out plan, given the problems associated with the flood risk
- Good presentation - thanks! Agree with all
- Why is the Eastern approach (Leo) looked on as being more 'soft' than the South Western approach (Pem)? **Remove 'soft'**
- Very much better than v1 but A) might new legislation over-ride? B) to meet the housing target land 'adjacent' (meaning?) to the devt area is clearly going to be needed
- Think a very good draft, well thought out
- No point mentioning the UDP - **Will be removed now Core Strategy adopted & available** more focus on the Core Strategy & NPPF. There is no mention of housing needs data (of all types not just affordable). What housing types would the village like/need? **Extra added to local evidence before E9/10**. Might be worth specifically supporting self build /custom homes (as

recommended in the Core Strategy). Perhaps suggest that all development proposals should demonstrate pedestrian & cycle connections to the services within the village (to limit unnecessary car use & improve cohesion). **Already in E12.** Do you need to provide an idea of where open countryside begins to stop development spreading too far. This would be easy to do. **Already done by Settlement Boundary as recommended by NPHC.** I would be keen to support exceptional development (housing, enterprise, community) & to make the village vibrant, exciting & positive. The policies & tone are very negative. Some policies changed to positive. I also have concerns that the policies are not active enough & still allow the village to be developed in the wrong way because the interpretation is open ended. **Checked with consultant & will be checked with NPHC**

- Let's support development and aim for the very best we can get. There are already constraints that can be used to prevent the wrong developments in the wrong place. **Development is supported**
- It would appear that there are not enough areas within the village boundary due to protection areas being allowed!! Let's stay with the boundaries, develop & enhance our village. **Possible sites within the Settlement Boundary are not protected by views** (x2 people)
- From the start some of the people involved appear to have seen this as an opportunity to 'protect' their homes against development & to use the flooding argument to do this. Whilst the flooding is an issue, it appears to be overstated as there are areas that could positively be used for development. **Any landowner is enabled to put forward land for development by this criteria approach.** (F21 & F22) There doesn't seem to be any evidence base for what housing is required, how much, what aspirations for design, density, community cohesion etc. **Housing need data added, policy amended**
- Sadly vested interests have won, over the organic growth of our village. **The criteria approach will actually facilitate organic growth, as and when sites are put forward which meet the criteria and local and national policies.** The obsession with non-existent flood risks is dangerous and negative. **This is not the view of EA and those marooned in times of flood. The flood risk map is an external fact of life freely available to developers and prospective house buyers, as well as to insurers**
- As a property that is marooned but not flooded, has enough credence been given to this fact within the NDP, I know can be a very emotive issue, but Eardisland is located within the floodplain of the R Arrow
- The land behind Roselyn is unsuitable it is a flood plain
- It represents a great effort by the committee in whom we have confidence. However, it arguably contains a number of subjective judgements which developers, objectors and counsellors/council officers could exploit to their advantage. For the uninitiated it is quite a complicated document and when we read it we noticed a few points arguably contradictory. **Addressed.** Might it be an idea to double check for these. Might it also be an idea, if not exercised already, to examine if recent (and not so recent) planning applications to see if it (the NDP) can be effectively applied (x3 people)

It can be seen from the comments that a group of respondents believe that a 'Call for Sites' process and allocation of sites within the Plan is the only way forward. However the Parish Council believes that the right way for Eardisland is to continue with this Criteria-Based Approach NDP, without allocation of sites and therefore allowing ANY landowner or developer to put forward a site so that it can be judged against the criteria, as well as national and local policy. This approach is that recommended to the Parish Council by both Herefordshire Council's Head of Neighbourhood Planning and the consultant planning employed by Eardisland.

Although all meetings are open to the public and regularly advertised and articles have been published in every relevant parish magazine, with Bulletin Boards also posted round the parish, public interest and participation has been low. It is strongly hoped that parishioners will use the formal Regulation 14 consultation to raise any further points for consideration, so that amendments can be made and they will then support the NDP at referendum. The Steering Group are grateful to those who attend meetings and events and provide feedback.

The Steering Group for the Eardisland Neighbourhood Development Plan