

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
 RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1	✓		✓		✓		
2	✓		✓		✓		
3	✓		✓		✓		Q4 - First class job!
4	✓		✓		✓		
5	✓		✓		✓		
6	✓		✓		✓		Q1 - But relationship to the built form is too restrictive. Q4 - 'Localism ' in name only - too many constraints in National and Herefordshire planning regulation hierarchy to allow sufficient freedom for truly local planning decisions
7	✓		✓		✓		
8	✓		✓		✓		
9	✓		✓		✓		Q4 - 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
10	✓		✓		✓		Q4 - It is a very clear well written thought out plan, given the problems associated with the flood risk
11	✓		✓		✓		
12	✓		✓		✓		
13	✓		✓		✓		
14	✓		✓		✓		
15	✓		✓		✓		
16	✓		✓		✓		
17	✓		✓		✓		
18	✓		✓		✓		
19	✓		✓		✓		
20	✓		✓		✓		Q4 - Good presentation - thanks! Agree with all
21	✓		✓		✓		
22	✓		✓		✓		Q3 - 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. <b>Under review</b>
23	✓		✓		✓		Q1 - 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.
24	✓						Q4 - Why is the Eastern approach (Leo) looked on as being more 'soft' than the South Western approach (Pem)? <b>Remove 'soft'</b>

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
 RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
25	✓		✓		✓		
26	✓		✓		✓		
27	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q4</b> - 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
28	✓		✓		✓		
29	✓		✓		✓		
30	✓		✓		✓		
31	✓		✓		✓		
32	✓		✓		✓		
33	✓		✓		✓		
34	✓		✓		✓		
35	✓		✓		✓		
36	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q4</b> - Think a very good draft, well thought out
37	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	<p><b>Q1</b> - 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 is also quite 'generic' and would not prevent the worst kind of development (ie a large, suburban estate). The introduction &amp; justification is negative in tone &amp; focuses on what can't be done. <b>Intro &amp; Rationale amended to reflect this.</b> <b>Q2</b> - Again the Vision &amp; Objectives are generic &amp; almost weightless. There is no mention of positively facilitating opportunities for growth (housing &amp; enterprise). The objectives seem quite 'qualified'. Is it worth mentioning that the ENDP would aspire to excellence &amp; 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. <b>Head of Neighbourhood Planning for Herefordshire Council (NPHC) recommended not allocating sites but use current criteria approach.</b> <b>Q3</b> - Protected views - No.3 hedge is so high you can't see the open area <b>Being checked.</b> No.1 view should be brought in, why protect Swandrift (not important building). <b>View is of entry to village, Swandrift can be seen for some distance away as the start of the village. Local green spaces</b> - what about church, motte &amp; churchyard <b>Already protected by listing</b> and its setting; the whole area around Dovecot/river could be protected <b>River bank included as green area.</b> Protected views should include the important clusters of architecture! Extend the arc on No.2 to include behind Mary J's. <b>Consider extending.</b> Policy E2 (a) Eardisland is a 'cluster' village and so 'street frontage building lines' are inappropriate &amp; unworkable. <b>Amended but not considered a cluster village.</b> Back land development would be fine in some circumstances. <b>As shown in E9.</b> Other E2 policies could do with more detail &amp; clarification to</p>

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
 RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
37 cont.							aid developers/landowners. E1 (n) Please reconsider 'ARTIFICIAL' alternatives. UPVC etc is NOT appropriate. <b>Cannot preclude alternatives, eg slate unobtainable and alternative acceptable; remove 'artificial'</b> . I'm happy to run through all the policies and make suggestions if needed. Q4 - no point mentioning the UDP - <b>Will be removed now Core Strategy adopted &amp; available</b> 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? <b>Extra added to local evidence before E9/10</b> . 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). <b>Already in E12</b> . Do you need to provide an idea of where open countryside begins to stop development spreading too far. This would be easy to do. <b>Already done by Settlement Boundary as recommended by NPHC</b> . I would be keen to support exceptional development (housing, enterprise, community) & to make the village vibrant, exciting & positive. The policies & tone are very negative. <b>Some policies changed to positive</b> . 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. <b>Checked with consultant &amp; will be checked with NPHC</b>
38	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	<b>Q1</b> - 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. <b>NPHC recommended not allocating sites but use current criteria approach</b> . <b>Q2</b> - 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'. <b>Q3</b> - 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. <b>Some policies changed, some use language of higher level policies</b> . <b>Q4</b> - 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. <b>Development is supported</b>
39	✓	✓		✓		✓	<b>Q1</b> - There must be positive sites within the boundary of the village. <b>Q3</b> - No suggestion of what Eardisland does need to progress. <b>Q4</b> - 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. <b>Possible sites within the Settlement Boundary are not protected by views</b>
40	✓	✓		✓		✓	<b>Q1</b> - There must be positive sites within the boundary of the village. <b>Q3</b> - No suggestion of what Eardisland does need to progress. <b>Q4</b> - It would appear that there are not enough areas within the village boundary due to

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
40 cont.							protection areas being allowed!! Let's stay with the boundaries, develop & enhance our village.
41	✓			✓		✓	<p><b>Q1</b> - With qualification! There is a large, perhaps negative, emphasis on the constraints. But the constraints are clear so it should be possible to identify &amp; allocate sites as there are some adjacent to the settlement boundary. <b>See previous comments.</b> So the emphasis seems to have been on where you <u>can't</u> build, not where you can. Notwithstanding this, I believe a criteria-based approach is appropriate. But the criteria currently are too generic &amp; should be more specific to generate the best possible housing quality &amp; mix. <b>Q2</b> - I find the objectives too static &amp; 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. <b>Now added.</b> This links to the criteria needing to be more explicit so that development can be embraced positively. <b>Q3</b> - These policies refer to the UDP which is obsolete, so presumably they will need to be rewritten to reflect the Core Strategy? <b>Yes now it is adopted.</b> 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. <b>NDP cannot say what business is put forward.</b> Very narrow, not innovative, missed opportunity. <b>Q4</b> - From the start some of the people involved appear to have seen this as an opportunity to 'protect' their homes against development &amp; 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. <b>Any landowner is enabled to put forward land for development by this criteria approach.</b> (F21 &amp; 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. <b>Housing need data added policy amended</b></p>
42		✓		✓		✓	<p><b>Q1</b> - Your remit was to identify areas for growth &amp; housing and not to protect the 'status quo'. <b>Q2</b> - How can you achieve objectives 3 &amp; 5 if you will not identify or permit sites to be considered <b>See previous comments-</b> so much endeavour, for so little result, what a pity! <b>Q3</b> - Policy E1 (b), (h) and (j) negative criteria <b>(b) &amp; (j) use language of higher level policies, (h) justifiable to have views, wording amended</b> - unhelpful to positive stance. Protected view is not more important than housing. <b>Q4</b> - Sadly vested interests have won, over the organic growth of our village. <b>The criteria approach will actually facilitate organic growth, as and when sites are put forward which meet the criteria and local and national policies.</b> The obsession with non-existent flood risks is dangerous and negative. <b>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</b></p>
43	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q4</b> - A progressive plan which the village needs
44	✓		✓		✓		
45	✓		✓		✓		

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
 RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
46	✓		✓		✓		
47	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q4</b> - 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
48	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q4</b> - The land behind Roselyn is unsuitable it is a flood plain
49	✓		✓		✓		
50	✓		✓		✓		
51	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q3</b> - 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. <b>Q4</b> - 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. <b>Addressed</b> . 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
52	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q3</b> - 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. <b>Q4</b> - 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. <b>Addressed</b> . 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
53	✓		✓		✓		<b>Q3</b> - 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. <b>Q4</b> - 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. <b>Addressed</b> . 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
54	✓		✓		✓		

Eardisland NDP Community Consultation 9-10 October 2015  
RESPONSES AND COMMENTS. (Steering Group responses in RED)

No.	Q1		Q2		Q3		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
55	✓		✓		✓		
56	✓		✓		✓		
57	✓		✓		✓		