

EDGMOND PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
2017-2031

REGULATION 15
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

June 2017

Edgmond Parish Council

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------|
| Introduction | page 3 |
| Pre – Regulation 14 Consultation and Engagement | page 4 |
| Regulation 14 Pre – Submission Consultation | page 5 |
| Appendix 1: Public Meeting 2 nd July 2016 – summary of responses | page 7 |
| Appendix 2: Summary of ‘drop-in’ session responses | page 13 |
| Appendix 3: Summary of questionnaire responses | page 18 |
| Appendix 4: Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Individuals, households and organisations from Edgmond Parish | page 20 |
| Appendix 5: Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Telford & Wrekin Council | page 75 |
| Appendix 6: Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England | page 79 |
| Appendix 7: Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gladman Developments | page 82 |

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement

INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement supports the Neighbourhood Plan Submission in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) regulations 2012. It contains the following:

a) Details of people and organisations consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan b) Details of how they were consulted c) A summary of the main issues and concerns raised through the consultation process d) Descriptions of how these issues and concerns have been considered and addressed in the proposed

Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (Localism Act 2011) require a Consultation Statement to set out the consultations undertaken for the Neighbourhood Plan. In accordance with these Regulations and the local planning authority's guidance on consultation, the preparation of the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan has involved residents, and other organisations with an interest in the parish in the preparatory stages for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Recent guidance from Department for Communities and Local Government (10 Sept 2013) states that:

'the consultation statement submitted with the draft Neighbourhood Plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the Plan proposals.'

This Statement sets out details of events and consultations. It lists the activities in which the local community has been involved and the on going work of volunteers. The aim of the consultations in Edgmond has been to ensure that there is as widespread as possible understanding of the reasons for and content of the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan.

This Statement demonstrates that there has been extensive community engagement which has informed the community of the progress and content of the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan. Also the Neighbourhood Plan has been included as an agenda item at all Parish Council meetings and minutes of these are publically available on request of the Edgmond Parish Clerk.

Designation of Neighbourhood Plan Area

Not all Parish Councils have chosen to produce a Neighbourhood Plan, however, in October 2015 Edgmond Parish Council decided that this was an important right to exercise, and applied to be designated a Neighbourhood Planning body for the whole area covered by the Parish (Figure 1). The Parish Council submitted its application to Telford & Wrekin Council for designation of its Neighbourhood Area in June 2016. After a formal six week consultation which began on 19th July and ran until 31st August 2016, Telford & Wrekin Council resolved in September 2016 to support the Neighbourhood Area application made by Edgmond Parish Council and confirmed that the area shown in the application should be designated as a Neighbourhood Area. A formal notice was published on the 26th September 2016 that confirmed the designation. No responses were received during the consultation period.

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Following the decision to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and the application to be designated a neighbourhood plan area the Parish Council set up a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The first

meeting of the Steering Group took place on 7th June 2016 and has continued to meet regularly during the process with regular attendance by Planning Officers from Telford & Wrekin Council. Notes of the Steering Group meetings are available on the Edgmond Parish Council website or can be obtained on request from the Parish Clerk.

PRE- REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Being such a small community, we were able to collect many more of the concerns and ideas of residents and stakeholders during face to face discussions than would be possible in a larger community. Following discussions at Parish Council Meetings, the process to produce a Neighbourhood Plan started with a public meeting to gather initial views and to identify the areas to be considered for inclusion in Edgmond Village Hall on the 2nd July 2016. A summary of the comments made at this meeting are contained in Appendix 1.

Following the approval of the Designated Area, three additional public drop-in sessions were held in September 2016 during which further comments were listed for consideration in the Plan and we started to add 'meat to the bones' of our guidance document.

Eight key themes were identified for public consultation and these formed the basis of the September drop-in sessions.

- Housing
- Green Spaces
- Employment
- Community Safety
- Rights of Way
- Roads, Pavements & Street Lighting
- Traffic & Transport
- Community Amenities

Summaries of the 'drop-in' session responses are contained in appendix 2.

After September, these eight themes were further condensed into five main headings for relevant planning policies to be effective. This took into consideration the overlap of themes and related issues.

1. Housing
2. Natural and Heritage Assets
3. Employment/Economy
4. Infrastructure
5. Harper Adams University

The aim is for the Neighbourhood Plan to be focused and concise and to concentrate on those issues that can be influenced by town and country planning legislation. Other broader issues or those that aren't controlled through planning legislation will be part of a broader Action Plan linked with the existing Parish Plan.

Building on these five main headings and the responses from the drop-in sessions, a questionnaire was drafted demonstrating how these themes could be translated into planning policies and asking

whether people agreed or disagreed with the suggested draft policies. Around 500 questionnaires were circulated to all known businesses and households in the parish and around 230 responses were received. A summary of the questionnaire responses is contained in Appendix 3.

Following this extensive initial public engagement and evidence gathering a draft Neighbourhood Plan along with its supporting evidence and environmental screening statements was prepared for Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation.

REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

The Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation ran from Monday 16th January 2017 for a period of 6 weeks, closing at 5pm on Monday 27th February 2017.

The Draft Plan and accompanying Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessments Reports was made available on the Parish website www.edgmondparishcouncil.co.uk and was emailed to residents and other interested parties on request.

Paper copies of the Plan could be viewed at Edgmond Village Hall, Edgmond Primary School, the Village Shop and the Parish Church. Paper copies of the SEA and the HRA screening reports could also be made available on request.

The Draft Plan and accompanying reports could also be viewed on the Telford & Wrekin Council website.

In addition all households received a newsletter publicising the Regulation 14 consultation and inviting responses via e-mail or hard copy to the Parish Clerk.

The neighbouring local Councils of Tibberton & Cherrington PC, Newport TC, Lilleshall PC and Waters Upton PC were contacted via e-mail; no responses were received.

The following statutory bodies and organisations were also consulted at this stage: Telford & Wrekin Council, the Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England, Arriva, Severn Trent Water, EON, Western Power, British Telecom.

This Regulation 15 Consultation Statement summarises all statutory and non-statutory consultation undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders on the pre submission draft Plan. In particular, it describes how concerns have been addressed and what changes have been made to the Plan as a result of the consultation.

A range of representations were received from 41 respondents to the draft Neighbourhood Plan including a number of expressions of support as well as objections to, and comments on, policies. 36 representations were received from households, individuals and organisations in Edgmond Parish. These are detailed in Appendix 4 showing how they have been addressed and whether or not the Plan has been amended. There was a great deal of repetition amongst the responses however they have all been addressed individually.

Many of the responses received at the regulation 14 stage were concerned with the draft Plan's approach to Edgmond's rural character and context. Consequently a decision was taken by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to commission additional technical evidence base work focussing on landscape character assessment to address these concerns and strengthen the Neighbourhood Plan approach.

Separate representations were received from Telford & Wrekin Council (Appendix 5), the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England (Appendix 6), and Gladman Developments (Appendix 7).

APPENDIX 1
EDGMOND PARISH COUNCIL

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Notes of the community drop in session held in Edgmond Village Hall on 2nd July 2016 at 5pm.

Amenities and Employment

Love the chip van on a Thursday evening

Is the cafe at HAU available for all?

Amenities are excellent for the size of the village

Increase the age diversity on the children's play area (8 – 12 yrs)

Protect the playing field

Great village shop!

Love the play area, MUGA and playing field

We have great sports facilities, these must be protected

Edgmond should grow as a place for people to come and experience the countryside

Tennis Court?

Hairdresser

Organisations and businesses which encourage enjoying the environment should be supported

Could we have a satellite GP surgery from Lyndon Hall or Wellington Road surgeries

Village Hall fairly fully used

Children's play area – needs space for older children

Love the shop

The village shop and post office are excellent, well stocked, friendly and helpful

Noticeboard needed at the top end of the village – should have a list of events in the village included

Don't support posters on lampposts – untidy

Traffic by school is horrendous and dangerous for road users, pedestrians and school children

We could do with a Dr Surgery

Ensure sufficient school places available for children in the Parish

The amenities are excellent, consider at Senior Citizens Club

Green Areas and Open Spaces

The field at the centre of the village, opposite the shop, is a unique feature and should be retained as such

Children's Play Area – go up to 12 year olds

Edgmond School should remain a rural school with a rural outlook, the children should be taught in a setting surrounded by nature

The school benefits from the green space next to it

Keep the green field at the rear of Newport Road

Need to keep the trees, and field opposite the shop

Playing Field is a well used amenity, but the Pavilion building needs urgent attention

Flowers on the corner of High Street / Robin Lane good but the container is not picturesque

Church field and land along High Street opposite the shop – valued green spaces

Could flowers be planted near the Edgmond village name signs?

The field in the centre of the village should be a village green with small children's play area for all ages to enjoy

The recreation field must be maintained

Keep the beautiful open views to the Wrekin

Field opposite the shop adds character to the village

Good to have benches, need more

Keeping essential farm land in and around Edgmond is important

More benches needed, especially in Newport Road

Children's play area needs upgrading and moving to a better location

Need a bin outside of the shop

No more houses on green spaces

More litter picking needed

Keep the trees around the village and particularly around Edgmond Hall and the Church

The flowers outside the shop look beautiful

Housing, Development and Structures

Infill housing only

Possibly bungalows

Mixed housing only, 2 / 3 bedrooms, some affordable

Infill only, 1 – 3 max on a site, within current boundary only

Must protect playing field from development

Infill should be no more than 2 houses on any one site

Maximum of 10 dwellings to be built in any one year

Protect the existing village boundary at all costs

Does the Village Hall need the whole of the field, why not use it for old peoples bungalows?

Any new housing must be thermally efficient, zero emissions, high build quality, water capture

I would ideally like to see new housing in the village restricted only to infill, however if there is ever a time when more housing is proved to be needed, I would favour this being on the B5062 and not within the village.

I favour mixed housing, social 1st time buyers and only a few larger family homes.

I am in favour of business development as long as there is no nuisance from noise or smell etc that will affect neighbours to the site.

Any new housing must be sympathetic to those existing properties around them

Limited infill must mean 1 – 3 only

Organic growth only – no large developments

Limited infill only within the existing settlement boundary of Edgmond

Limited infill within existing village boundary only

I would definitely not like to see houses on the field opposite the shop. This is a unique open space and should be preserved

Some starter homes and retirement homes would be desirable

Houses should be in keeping with the style of the village

No large developments

We do need more 1 -2 bed houses, starter homes and sheltered accommodation

We do not need more 4 and 5 bedroom homes

I think the village would benefit from a bit more infill than 2 or 3 houses, perhaps 10 – 12 per year throughout the village to help keep the pubs and shops etc and these would be better on the outside of the village not in the middle.

Green spaces in the village are high value – church field, Egremont Meadow, Manor House, playing field etc – must not be developed

Local Character

Beautiful Church, grounds, walls, trees – must be protected

Any blue plaques in the village?

Only have appropriate development in the conservation area

Keep conservation free of new building

Keep all local characteristics such as war memorial, water well, sandstone walls etc in good condition and have a plan for maintenance and restoration

Keep all stone walls, rights of way, benches etc in good condition – a feature of our village

Ensure upkeep, retention and maintenance of water pump, war memorial etc.

It is very important to keep the local character of Edgmond, anything that keeps this must be looked after

Keep listed buildings listed

Can we protect more trees (TPOs)

ARE there more buildings, structures, walls etc that should be 'listed'

I would like a guarantee that the war memorial, water drinking trough and sandstones walls have to be kept – they are our heritage

The green field and trees opposite the shop are essential to the character of the village

More information on the conservation area is needed and what it means to those who live in Edgmond

Street lights are good but only in the right places

War Memorial needs a maintenance plan

Water fountain should belong to the village and have a maintenance plan

Any new build, or renovation or extension must be in keeping with the character of the village and the buildings around it

Keep all local features

Love the uniqueness of the field opposite the shop

No new modern signs

Getting Around

Bus service too limited

Speed of local residents travelling through the village

Lack of footpaths

Rights of way are important and need to be maintained

Buses through the village are a concern

Lack of pavements

Bus service to Newport in commuting hours is woeful

More affordable public transport needed

A fit for purpose bus service needed

The footpath network is good and rights of way generally well maintained and sign posted

Footpaths need regular maintenance to prevent them becoming overgrown and slippery

HAU need to organically grow but the increased traffic could kill village life as we know it

A lot of HGVs go through village and use inappropriate narrow roads where no pavements

Extend the cycle routes

The B5062 footpath always needs maintenance between the Lamb and Marsh Road

Speed is a problem in Shrewsbury Road (where no pavements)

More use of the little red bus

Water supply poor and extremely hard

Need regular drain cleaning on all roads – cheaper in the long run than major repairs

Signage for cycle route hit and miss, nothing along Summerhill and Newport Road

Cars parking on pavements

Footpath lighting needs improving

Little red bus ideal for Edgmond

Speeding in High Street, School Road and Hillside

Potholes in Stackyard Road

Poor road condition and verges

Rights of Way are sometimes too overgrown

New Rights of Way diversions welcomed

Arriva bus ok

A voluntary car scheme would be useful

Cars travel too fast at Brockton

All sorts of vehicles use High Street, the road at Summerhill is too narrow for the number and size of vehicles

Rights of Way signs need to be clearer

Footpaths on 5062 rough

Raised ironworks in paths are dangerous

Bus timetables either not available or wrong

Marsh Road speeding an issue

Tractors in Marsh Road cause concern

Tractors on B5062 cause visibility problems

APPENDIX 2

Summary of responses from community drop in sessions, 22nd, 23rd, 24th September 2016

| Area in Our Plan | Comment |
|---------------------|---|
| Community Safety | Edmond is safe |
| | There is a Neighbourhood Watch scheme if we want to be part of it |
| | Current HW scheme not working, a Good neighbour scheme exists informally |
| | Good Neighbour scheme would need advertising |
| | Neighbourhood Watch has never been effective, we support the Good Neighbour Scheme, we believe we do it anyway. |
| | Not aware of a NW scheme – good neighbour scheme sounds like a good alternative. |
| | Good neighbour scheme takes place already informally. It needs people to trust. |
| | I feel safe, NW is ineffective, it seems to have created a clic. We must promote our own use of 101 we don't need anyone to do it for us. The mobile police station is good and should be supported. Keep the good neighbour scheme informal. |
| Transport & Traffic | |
| | Buses are extremely valuable. HGVs volume are as a result of avoiding congestion in Newport – our roads can't cope with them and damage is occurring. |
| | B5062 like a motorway. When more diversions, the lanes are too narrow for cars and HGVs to pass |
| | No bus timetables at the bus stops. The bus often doesn't arrive or it is full. |
| | Can we have a pavement to Newport? |
| | The bus bombs along Newport Road – need a 20mph zone |
| | As a new member of the village, we could do with a 20mph speed limit, if only at certain times to coordinate with the school peak times. |
| | Bus service is fine for me |
| | How can we stop through traffic using our village as a short cut? Need to cut down the speed. Parents at school times speed, park illegally and block drives. What about traffic calming? |
| | There is certainly a problem with speeding through the village. |
| | Illegal parking on footpaths and in drives, particularly at school time. |
| | Traffic speed is dangerous throughout the Parish. |

| Area in Our Plan | Comment |
|------------------|--|
| | |
| | I don't use public transport but my children have in the past and it was a lifeline. A Sunday service would be welcomed. A safer cycling route to Newport would be important. |
| | Speeding is a real issue in the village. Public transport needs more frequency then more people would use it. |
| | A more frequent bus service would be welcome. |
| | Speeding on B5062 a real problem |
| | Marsh Road is really busy with big heavy traffic and no footpaths |
| | Traffic is already increasing because of the Cheney Hill and Newport developments. |
| Housing | |
| | There are more younger families in the village than older people, the schools draw them but then they leave |
| | To maintain a healthy community a few low cost houses should be built especially for local people. There is no support for large scale development. More residential for HAU students might be necessary. |
| | Encourage employment opportunities, training is available at TCAT and HAU. |
| | Small scale infil housing should be encouraged, but to keep the character of the village in our rural and agricultural environment is essential. |
| | Cannot support the 80 house application as it would dramatically change the nature of the village in terms of population. It would put pressure on all the existing services, facilities, amenities and infrastructure. |
| | Edgmond is already a large village, however it does have a charm which benefit from the green spaces within the built up area of the village. Don't use all infil plots for development. The danger of larger building developments is that it gives the village an urban feel. We never want to be a suburb of Newport. |
| | Only small developments in the existing village should be supported. |
| | I support infil development but no big estates |
| | Don't agree with development in the green fields around the village – single dwellings in the village should be encouraged. |
| | Whilst I know there is a need for more housing, it must be in keeping with the village. |
| | No big expensive houses needed, young people can't afford to live here |
| | Identify suitable locations for social housing on infil, not large developments – do not use green land – check the school, I think it is full. |
| | WE don't need new houses to sustain the po or school, both are sustained at present. I don't agree with the statement that new houses in the village will bring young people, it will depend on the houses. We do need |

| Area in Our Plan | Comment |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | houses in Edmond. We should aim to build more smaller homes for older and younger families. Any development must be in keeping with the character of the village – maybe terraced cottages would be good. Housing should be limited by number on any one site. The number built in one year must be limited. Infil is the obvious answer, but where? The Conservation Area could provide some land for careful infil. The field behind the Lion pub is a possibility as is the plot hidden behind homes in Robin Lane plus the Village Hall Field. We should restrict new housing to ensure that buy to let landlords do not buy them to rent them to students. A map to look at suitable housing locations would have been useful at the event. |
| | Accept we need some housing but must protect the essential and central green spaces these are the heart of our village and offer character |
| | Edmond needs to keep its rural and historical character, infil is acceptable but no bigger developments. |
| | I support small scale housing in the village as long as in keeping with the historic character and architectural style. We need to clearly define infil. |
| | Small developments of housing should be allowed with smaller houses for first time buyers and starter homes, centre of the village is ideal location with one or two on a plot |
| Employment | |
| | HAU cater for some but not much, could do with more local jobs |
| | We used to have 2 shops, one closed because of lack of business |
| | Small developments of places for employment opportunities – use redundant buildings. |
| | House small businesses in redundant buildings. Encourage home working and ensure the infrastructure and facilities are available to support it. Faster broadband speeds. |
| | HAU is an asset, we should support the development of the site. WE should support other smaller businesses. Conversion of farm and redundant buildings for small industrial units would be welcomed. |
| | |
| Roads, Pavements and Street Lighting | More pavements needed, some need to be wider for wheelchairs and pushchairs |
| | Street lights are an asset and must be kept. |
| | Street Lighting is an asset and helps towards the fear of crime and encourages a feeling of safety. LED are to be encouraged as they are cost effective and can be directed towards the pavements for security. |
| | I feel the new LED lights are too bright for a rural village, I think we should be looking at replacing the old lamp standards with downward facing luminaires, I am concerned about light pollution. WE don't support more lights. |

| Area in Our Plan | Comment |
|------------------|--|
| | Should there be a speed limit with street lighting – cars travel too fast |
| | The roads are in pretty good condition and pavements are adequate. AS with all villages with a school, there will be issues with inconsiderate parking and congestion at peak times. I think this is inevitable. A price worth paying for a successful school. Outside peak times I don't see that there is a problem. High Street parking is a natural form of traffic calming. I am concerned when I see enormous lorries going through the village. We have to be careful when encouraging business that we don't encourage inappropriate vehicles onto the village streets. The School Road rat run to HAU is a problem. I don't see that speed is the issue, its just that this narrow road shouldn't be taking so much commuter traffic. However, what is the alternative? |
| | We should keep most roads without pavements, makes it feel like a proper village. Some pavements are poor and unpleasant to walk on. |
| | Street Lighting an asset but don't need any more lights. |
| | Encourage more use of the walking bus |
| | Replace more sodium lights with LED. |
| Amenities | |
| | School is successful but it is not safe for the children to walk or cycle there |
| | Pubs, garage, po very important to the health of the community. Do we need two pubs? The village hall is well beyond its sell by date, the village deserves better. The school and nursery are important assets to the village. Inevitably the school draws in a large number of children from outside of Edgmond. |
| | Good amenities for a small village. Would never want the field to be built on as it is a lovely useful space off Shrewsbury Road. Would liked to have had a new village hall / pavilion on the playing field which could have been funded by some limited housing on the site of the existing vllage hall. |
| | Make sure enough school places for the children from the Parish. |
| | A village surgery is needed as a matter of urgency, could you use the disued chapel? It has good access, parking and should not be lost as a facility for the community. |
| | The bowling green is an exc ellent amenity, it is advertised? |
| Rights of Way | |
| | We must keep them all and have more if possible |
| | Some are hard to find and some poorly maintained. |
| | Use the footpaths often some are better maintained than others would like more circular walks – possibly towards Adeney. |

| Area in Our Plan | Comment |
|------------------|--|
| | It is not true to say that footpaths will only be available to walkers if people use them. Public rights of way can always be better maintained. The future could be to encourage the community to be more involved. Not all rights of way in Edgmond are available, this should be rectified. A leaflet of walks and rides would be good. |
| | Footpaths need proper maintenance and signs. Walkers cannot access some without great difficulty. |
| | A wonderful network of rights of way should be applauded. |
| | Footpaths are important and need to be managed, maintained and signposted better. Connecting footpaths to create circular walks are to be encouraged. |
| Green Spaces | |
| | I would question the need to retain the playing fields for football and cricket. This is an underused amenity. The Pavilion is dire and needs replacing. The whole idea of a village with these sorts of facilities is outdated. Sports pitches are available elsewhere. There are no local teams and haven't been for decades. I would move the children's play area and relocate near to the MUGA. Create a community space of half of the field and build houses on the rest. |
| | Need to keep a space between Edgmond and Newport |
| | The playing field is an asset and is underused yet beautifully maintained. The open centre of the village is special – can be protected by a legal order? The conservation area is essential, but needs a new Management Plan, some sympathetic housebuilding in the CA should not be ruled out. |
| | Green spaces essential in the village, need to identify the important ones and ensure they are never built on. |
| | Protect trees and hedges whether in the conservation area or not. Ensure planning applications are respectful of trees and hedges. Encourage more planting in hedgerows. |
| | Chetwynd Deer Park an important local asset – provided by good forward thinking. Edgmond should be proud of what is on offer around it. |

APPENDIX 3

Summary of responses from policy questionnaire

| | | Questionnaire summary |
|----|------------------------|---|
| H1 | Infill Housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs a definition of the 'main built-up area' 3 returns want NO new housing at all. 4 comments about the wording being too vague/ambiguous and the need to define numbers. 1 concern about <u>5</u> houses in <u>one</u> area being too many. 2 comments that this does not offer enough protection to the CA. |
| H2 | Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 comments questioning the validity of including cycle and pedestrian connections 2 requests to back up the CA protection by reiterating the LP policy. 1 comment that any development will see an adverse affect on traffic etc. Ambiguous How to enforce? |
| H3 | Type & Affordability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 concerns about whether this can be applied in perpetuity/policing and the definition of local connections. Should be a cap on this sort of development. 1 disagreement about any need for affordable housing. 3 comments about the need of housing for older people. One comment that the 10 'affordable' Park Homes still not built. One comment that there should be specific protection to prevent any further 'gypsy' caravan development. Must not be built on green land. 1 concern about HMO's. One question as to the meaning of 'exception to planning policy' 1 disagreement with allowing 'exceptions'. One question as to whether this means bungalows. |
| H4 | Ribbon Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does this need a separate policy - include in H1? |
| H5 | Brownfield land | |
| G1 | Green Spaces | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 concerns about future of field opposite shop and need to include it. 1 concern about field adjacent to Manor House 7 requests to exclude village hall field to allow for any future development 3 requests to include all greenfield land in the CA to prevent any building. 1 request to include the field between the school and Egremont House. 2 concerns about how this would restrict any future relocation of play area. |
| G2 | Ecology & Landscape | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define terms Make wording stronger - 'should' to 'must'. |
| G3 | Links & Connections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This relates to large scale developments only. Protect the line of the canal. Define meaning - footpaths/hedges/roads/pavements? Several concerns about the lack of pavements along the B5062. |
| E1 | Small Scale Employment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 concerns about vague/generic wording. |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 concern about ‘small’ development becoming ‘large’. • 1 concern to exclude main built-up area. |
| E2 | Tourism & Leisure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about generation of more traffic. • 1 concern about appropriateness of any ‘tourist’ facilities in the village. |
| E3 | Live-work units | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 concern about ‘back door’ development. • 1 concern that these rarely work as planned. • 1 disagreement with restricting. • 1 respondent didn’t understand the terminology |
| C1 | Community Infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks clarity |
| C2 | Developer Contributions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 comment about the need to monitor this. • 2 comments about this being like ‘bribery’. • What type of development does this apply to? • One respondent wants no such contributions. • Who decides? |
| C3 | Lighting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague • Consider the wavelength of the lighting to aid moths. • Several general comments about lighting: too much/too little/covered by ivy. |
| HA1 | Growth of HAU | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the boundary? • Development should not be restricted. • Who decides what is ‘exceptional’? • Should not allow ‘exceptional’. • Concern about how a dispute over development would be managed. • Many concerns over HAU traffic in different areas of the village. • One concern about light & noise pollution from HAU. • Concern that the restriction will not work and should be worded differently to emphasise the importance of the physical separation of village and University. |

APPENDIX 4

Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation: Individuals, households and organisations from Edgmond Parish

| Comments received | Page / Policy Reference | Suggested amendments |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Names and addresses have been removed, all original communications are available in the evidence base. There are some families where more than one response has been received. | | |
| <p>1</p> <p>It is obvious that a great deal of attention and diligence has gone into preparing a balanced, democratic and articulate document. It is sensitive to local opinion and requirements and allows proportionate development in keeping with the village environment.</p> <p>I commend it and approve of it.</p> | All | Noted. |
| <p>2</p> <p>Firstly, let me say that it is clear that a lot of hard work and effort has gone into the plan. Also, that these sorts of documents are far from easy to prepare.</p> <p>There is much good analysis and thinking in the plan. I think the consultation process is now an opportunity to sharpen the plan up. In particular, I think:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there needs to be greater focus on what is really key for Edgmond; - a need to avoid the pressure to try and cover all issues which can rather lose the emphasis on the most important. <p>I have seen the comments and analysis by PHE. I think these are incisive and I agree with them. I won't duplicate them individually but have reiterated the more important below with additional thinking from ourselves.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vision – agree with the PPHE comments. The Vision needs to be sharper and I agree with their emphasis. We want to keep Edgmond special. This should be the focus and I think their comments get this emphasis over well. 2. Special Character – again agree with PHE comments, though this can be difficult to summarise. But, again, their planning principles seem a good starting point in terms of what makes Edgmond special and what is really important. 3. Housing/Infill – I agree that the Plan’s position on infill could be more strongly worded. I think it should refer to the figure in the draft T&W local plan and make it clear that this is viewed as a maximum, and that what is being proposed in the NDP is very limited and small scale infill. There will inevitably be huge pressure to build in Edgmond and it seems to us that NDP needs to set down a very clear position here and be very careful not to provide hostages to fortune. 4. Design of New Housing; This is very difficult to legislate for and I’m not sure the policies really add much. Sadly, much of what is being built locally seems to be very poor in terms of design and appearance. It does seem to me that what is key is that in a village like Edgmond there should be a ‘high expectation of quality’ and this somehow needs to be conveyed. 5. Conservation Area; I agree with the PHE comments here. Additionally, I think there are some ‘special high quality areas’ outside of the Conservation Area and the Plan should emphasise the protection of such areas of particular attractiveness, quality or interest elsewhere in the parish also. | <p>14</p> | <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>“To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and and historic identity and by strengthening the resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit.”</i> Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES1 to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>There isn’t a useful figure in the Local Plan and any attempts to set maximum figures will fail at examination.</p> <p>Disagree. Policy RES3 seeks positive outcome in design terms from new residential development whilst RES4 already refers to “locally important buildings, structures and open spaces” and recognises the character of Edgmond and its rural setting.</p> |
|--|-----------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>6. Fewer Policies: again, I agree with PHE on this. Their example of cycle ways is I think correct. Also, I think the policy on Developer Contributions under the Community Policy Area also inadvertently strays into dangerous territory and potentially offers developers opportunities to tick boxes.</p> <p>7. Transport and Highways: One area where I think the plan is possibly lacking is on transport and particularly roads. I think the roads around Edgmond are becoming increasingly busy and dangerous; also the developments in Newport and elsewhere creates the danger of a 'rat run' through the village. In particular, therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to avoid more traffic and a 'rat run' through the village needs to be highlighted and avoiding this needs to be a key principle; • The road to the Red House is increasingly dangerous and I would have thought that some way of trying to reduce speed here is called for; | <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats <p>One way of reducing car traffic is of course to promote other forms of transport such as cycling and walking – see above.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with matters covered by town and country planning legislation through the planning process. These actions do not require planning applications and so cannot be</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In particular, Newport Road is a key pedestrian and cycle route to Newport. It is increasingly used by walkers, runners, cyclists etc. There is I think an urgent need to ensure speed limits are enforced; that speed signs are maintained; and possibly some form of traffic calming adopted to reduce opportunistic through traffic and the dangerous speed (well over the speed limit) at which traffic often travels along the road. <p>8. Affordable Housing and Housing Tenure; I agree with PHE here, and while I understand and appreciate the thinking behind this, I suspect it adds nothing and is a hostage to fortune the way the planning system works.</p> <p>9. Harper Adams: The University is hugely important for Edgmond. While I don't disagree with the principles set out and the PHE comments, I wonder if the tone could be more positive. Also, while I know this is difficult, I wonder if earlier and better discussion with them on planning issues might help with creating</p> | <p>delivered directly through policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. They can be influenced indirectly through promotion of alternative means of transport, preventing loss of local services, good design, and by appropriate negotiation to achieve s106 and CIL contributions for these items.</p> <p>This is one issue where the Neighbourhood Plan can present a positive approach to delivering Sustainable Development.</p> <p>Amend policy as follows:</p> <p>More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy—see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; |
|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>new local facilities and open space and whether this could in some way be incorporated in the NDP?</p> <p>We hope these comments are useful and wish you the best in the further refinement of the Plan.</p> | | <p>and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity.</p> <p>Agreed. NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, and recognise the strategic importance of HAU.</p> |
| <p>3</p> <p>I am not convinced that the Neighbourhood Plan makes it clear that Edgmond should remain a village and have no further building other than limited infill (ie: one or two houses to fill the gap between existing properties).</p> <p>We also need to remain separated from Newport to retain our village status, and Harper Adams University should be asked to consult with the village before extending any nearer.</p> <p>We are lucky to have open spaces and a Conservation Area within the village and these should be safeguarded within the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that they cannot be used in any other way than for enjoyment by the village.</p> | | <p>Noted. Amend policy RES1 to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Amend text on pg 6 as follows: Insert as additional text before last sentence in 1st para “<i>Edgmond, Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University are 3 independent settled areas, separated by Grade 2/3 agricultural land which is currently farmed</i>”</p> <p>Agree. Policy RES4 refers to the character, setting and appearance of the conservation area and policy G! seeks to protect other local green spaces.</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>I mostly agree with the intent of the Neighbourhood plan, although I don’t think it is strong enough to deliver what a lot of the village wants such as ensuring the rural character of the village is protected, such as preventing</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>large housing estates and preventing the merging of The university, Edgmond, and Newport.</p> <p>I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More evidence of the beautiful green farmlands surrounding the village and the rural feel of the village, and details of why they should be protected not just broad statements. • I think that spaces such as Egremont Meadow, Manor House Paddock and the open space which separates Edgmond and Harper Adams should be designated as protected as well. • I think there should be a more specific policy protecting land around the conservation areas which would protect the setting of the conservation area. • Only large housing estates deliver the affordable housing that is required, and that is not in keeping with the rest of the village. • Finally, I think that there should be tighter control over what the university is doing, especially in things like building new residential blocks and ensuring they are not built on green spaces and are built to the north of the B5061. | | <p>Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Policy RES2 seeks to prevent settlements and HAU joining together. Land cannot simply be designated as ‘special’ to avoid development.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single plots. The policy as worded does not ‘open the door’ to large housing schemes.</p> <p>Disagree. NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development”.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>I have been having a read through of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Edgmond and would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>1. I believe the plan should include more information on the history and character of Edgmond and why it is important that the village is protected. I have seen too many villages destroyed by developers and</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>many more being targeted by developers wanting to build 'housing estates' to make huge profits.</p> <p>2. I would like to see a clearly defined buffer zone to protect Edgmond and our conservation areas from these developers. I think it is incredibly sad that the identity of Church Aston is being lost as a result of several new housing estates on the edge of the village. These estates have in effect removed any boundaries between Newport and Church Aston. The same will happen to Edgmond unless we have a clearly defined buffer zone. The development at the bottom of Cheney Hill is a prime example of how developers are cleverly moving the town's boundaries further out and they will quickly absorb Edgmond unless we have a clear boundary.</p> <p>3. I would like the plan to include a very clear definition of what is meant by the term 'infill' by defining the size of a plot/type of plot that the term refers to as well as the number of houses and the standard and style of house. 'Infill' for a developer could easily mean 80 houses as opposed to one or two houses. It is also very important that the houses are of a style (design and materials) and standard that is in keeping with the village and it's history. I believe the two new houses down the road from me at the bottom of Robin Lane are a good example of a carefully considered infill.</p> <p>4. I would also like the plan to include more detailed information on development plans for Harper Adams University. The University has grown considerably and so too has the campus. What plans does the University have for more student accommodation and how will this affect the boundaries of Edgmond and Edgmond Marsh?</p> <p>5. I believe the number of policies should be reduced as developers will only use them to their advantage, claiming their plans meet village needs etc. We do not need another park e.g the recent application to build</p> | | <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES1 to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will <i>only will be</i> supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES1 to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will <i>only will be</i> supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Maybe but not for a Planning Officer or Planning Inspector.</p> <p>Disagree. NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development”.</p> |
|---|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>houses next to Egremont House with a park for villagers. We have a park and playing field already and lots of cycle routes and foots paths; with our rural location we do not need dedicated cycle lanes.</p> <p>6. I would also like the reference to moving 'local facilities' removed from the plan as I believe this refers to the Village Hall. We have a very lovely village hall that is loved by all and has indeed recently been saved by the village for the village. It is a charming traditional hall this is in keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>7. Finally I would like the Affordable Homes policy removed from the Neighbourhood Plan as the Affordable Homes scheme is for 10 houses or more and could therefore encourage larger scale building applications. I also believe this policy is an unnecessary duplication of the local plan</p> <p>Thanks very much for all time and support with this.</p> | <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a 'green light' to developers.</p> <p>Disagree. This does not refer to the Village Hall but any local community facility.</p> <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single plots. The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes.</p> <p>Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; |
|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. |
| <p>6</p> <p>Firstly I would like to thank the Parish Council for putting together a draft plan. Having read the details I would like to make the following comments,</p> <p>Firstly I am distressed at the number of inappropriate planning applications that have been around Edgmond recently and I feel very strongly that Edgmond should remain the special rural village that it is today and not become part of the Telford and Newport urban sprawl. I would like to see a more robust statement on why this beautiful village should be protected from urbanisation.</p> <p>At the village hall meeting with Telford and Wrekin planning officers, we were advised that Edgmond was not suitable for large housing estates and only small infills were appropriate. However there is no definition of infill and I think we need to be clearer about this and perhaps have a total cap? I have lived in the village for 25 years and have seen a small but appropriate growth over that time. The village should grow organically as it has been doing to allow for its rural character to be preserved. Edgmond is already doing its bit so i feel there is no need to add this as a policy.</p> <p>I believe any reference to Affordable Housing should be removed. I have looked into Telford and Wrekin's policy on</p> | | <p>Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES1 'Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village' to read as follows "In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will <i>only will be</i> supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>There isn't a useful figure in the Local Plan and any attempts to set maximum figures will fail at examination.</p> <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>so called affordable housing and found that these houses would be placed under a Telford Housing Association only after schemes of 10 plus houses have been built. Therefore it would be unlikely that an Edgmond resident would benefit which is what the majority of local people believe. I see no advantage to anyone to include the statement on affordable housing in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The amount of large scale building around Harper Adams needs to be seriously addressed. The amount of growth over the last ten years is staggering as is now encroaching on the rural area. I have heard talk of more student accommodation and hope that any new building will be within the existing campus. An example of a disastrous</p> | <p>plots. The policy as worded does not ‘open the door’ to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and NP policy RES2 seeks “suitable appropriate” schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>However Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for ‘exception sites’ (sites that are an ‘exception’ to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development” and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>build was the digester which must have caused more environmental damage than was claimed plus it was right on the B5062 instead of hidden away at the back of the campus. The rural area between the college and the village should be preserved.</p> <p>There is a reference in the plan about moving 'local facilities'. Does this refer to the village hall and if so I suggest that this is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan. The village turned out in force a year or so ago as the vast majority of people were strongly against any large new building replacing the existing village hall. Feelings in the village were so strong that the money required to upgrade and sympathetically extend the existing village hall has now been raised.</p> <p>I would be very careful with adding too many policies. I think sometimes people might state a cycle path would be nice without realising that a developer may use Neighbourhood Plan policies as a wish list with which he could comply.</p> <p>There are many cyclists and walkers that enjoy using the rural lanes in and around Edgmond because they are still rural. There are pathways in every direction and I submit that more are not required. Dedicated cycle lanes are not appropriate in a rural village.</p> <p>I shall look forward to reading the revised plan in due course and thank you all again.</p> | | <p>This does not refer to the Village Hall but any local community facility the loss of which maybe detrimental to the community.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats |
|---|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>Firstly my thanks to the Parish council for the time and effort in putting together the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>There are however some observations I'd like to make.</p> <p>I don't think there is enough comment on the excessive building by Harper Adams, they appear to be able to build at will, this is creating more traffic and the industrialisation of the village.</p> <p>It should be clear that we don't need any more/new facilities, we have a village hall and a more than adequate sports/playing field, we don't want developers thinking they can use new 'local facilities' as a way to get there foot in the door with regard to more housing.</p> <p>IT should be made clear that we are not against infill but this need to be defined more specifically i.e. 1 or 2 house not 8 or 10!.</p> <p>Finally the history and special nature of Edgmond as 'village' and not an outlying estate of Newport needs emphasising.</p> | | <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development” and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a ‘green light’ to developers.</p> <p>Policy RES1 specifically refers to 1-3 houses. However amend policy RES1 ‘Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village’ to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>1 I think that now more housing estates should be built in Edgmond,so it is distinct from the Newport and Telford.</p> | | <p>See policy RES1.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>I don't want it to end up looking like Newport. I have lived in Newport before moving to Edgmond.</p> <p>2 Edgmond should be kept rural, we should protect the open spaces in the heart of the village.</p> <p>3 Houses that are built should be limited to one or two per site , and built to a high standard.I think we need a tighter definition of infill.</p> <p>4 I think we should have a buffer zone around the Conservation Area.</p> <p>5 The need for Affordable homes needs to be should be removed, we have quite a few already in Edmond ie Mentone Crescent,Hillside,Playdale.I think the balance in Edgmond is about right.</p> <p>6 We don't need cycle paths etc , these things are only necessary with big areas of housing as a result of an estate.</p> | <p>Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Policy RES1 specifically refers to 1-3 houses. However amend policy RES1 'Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village' to read as follows "In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only <i>will be</i> supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF.</p> <p>Policy RES4 already refers to "locally important buildings, structures and open spaces"</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for</i></p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>7 The reference to moving local facilities which is the village hall needs removing. there was a referendum in the village hall not long ago which came heavily for keeping the existing village hall, it is being currently extended.</p> <p>8 Harper Adams is getting bigger and bigger the sports field are getting closer and closer. (I live in Marsh Road) as they build more and more hostels they will soon be up right up to our boundary. The rural spaces round HAAC need protecting farming needs larger and larger areas to remain viable. especially now we are leaving the E.U.</p> | | <p><i>pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats <p>There is no reference to moving local facilities. Policy C1 seeks to prevent the loss of community facilities.</p> <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development” and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
| <p>9</p> <p>On reading the draft plan, I would simply like to offer my full support and agreement. Being a resident of Edgmond for the last 25 years, I feel the points made and policies specified are accurate and appropriate.</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |
| <p>10</p> | | <p>See all previous responses.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>My views of Edgmond's Neighbourhood Plan are the same as PHE. I agree with them all and would like the parish council to take them on board as my view.</p> | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">11</p> <p>Also, I would like to give my own personal views on the NDP, aside from anything that the wider PHE group says. I hope you will record these as part of the consultation process:</p> <p>These are my views:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While overall policy on the Conservation Area is well worded, overall the NDP needs to say much more on what makes Edgmond special in terms of landscape and buildings. It needs both a have a landscape and urban design appraisal. This will then give any prospective developer a clear steer on what is and isn't acceptable. 2. The draft NDP makes numbers references to affordable housing, which is very dangerous. It is absolutely critical that these references are qualified to mean affordable housing only on infill sites and in accordance with the 'Local Exceptions' policy. Without this qualification, general references to affordable housing' can only mean the definition set out in the Local Plan - i.e. housing build on sites of 10 or more new houses, which must then be moving into the control of Housing Associations. Housing Association properties will most likely to allocated according to need, not locality, so this would not achieve what local people in Edgmond want. Nor does Edgmond have the employment opportunities or transport links that Housing Association tenants would need. | | <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and NP policy RES2 seeks "suitable appropriate" schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy –</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>3. Overall, the NDP needs to be strengthened in a number of areas, and shortened in others, to guard against creeping urbanisation. Specifically PHE has highlighted several policies that should be removed. For example, cycle routes and additional pathways are most likely to be built in and around large housing developments (the Gladman 85 being a good example), so references to these should be removed from the NDP. This would not stop the PC voting in favour of paths being built, on a case by case basis.</p> <p>In summary, whilst I recognise the hard work that's gone into the NDP and the impressive speed with which it's been produced, I can't support it in</p> | <p>see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a 'green light' to developers.</p> <p>However. Amend policy G3 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats |
|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| it's current form, as I think that overall it would probably weaken our position when we face further applications for new housing estates. | | |
| <p>12</p> <p>Harper Adams Development boundary – I notice that the boundary on the south side of the B5062 and to the west of the current developed area extends into open farmland and beyond the hedge which currently forms the boundary of the built area. I think it would be unfortunate if development extended this far to the west of the campus on the south side of the B road and suggest the boundary should coincide with the current hedge boundary.</p> | | The Plan sets the development boundary to coincide with the land in HAU ownership. See fig 5. |
| <p>13</p> <p>Firstly, I'd like to say that I think having a Neighbourhood Plan is a very good idea and I'm grateful for the efforts the Parish Council have put into this project.</p> <p>The first thing I've noticed about the plan is that the Vision statement could be somewhat stronger. It doesn't really seem to match up with the comments made and recorded as part of the drop in sessions, where lots of people have said that they want to keep Edgmond's rural character intact and that they don't wish to see large housing estate being built here. This is also my view - I want to see Edgmond retain it's rural look and feel and I think the Vision statement should be strengthened to make this much clearer. I think it's perfectly acceptable to build new houses on small infill sites, and there is actually quite a lot of house building already going on in Edgmond which most people don't seem to object to.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned that the inclusion of a policy that supports affordable housing will be an invitation to developers such as Gladman. The Local Plan makes it quite clear that affordable housing as defined in the planning world can only be built on housing estates above a certain size (I think 10 houses), plus they need to be transferred into the</p> | | <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>"To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and historic identity and by strengthening the resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit."</i></p> <p>The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>ownership of a housing association. So why on earth are we putting in a policy that could only be used to support large housing estates, which is precisely what people don't want?</p> <p>Finally, I would like to see much more information in the plan about what makes Edgmond special - it's history, key views in and out of the village and the like. When we recently faced an application for an estate by my house (Egremont House) it became clear that lots of people really valued the view of the fields opposite us, and the cows grazing right up the High Street. Surely the Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity to record these sort of things. There are lots of other lovely views in the village as well, both within the Conservation Area and outside it.</p> <p>I wish you the best of luck with getting the plan to a position when we can vote on it. My husband tells me this will be some time towards the middle of the year.</p> | | <p>NP policy RES2 seeks "suitable appropriate" schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy—see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. |
| <p>15</p> <p>I am writing to agree with all that has been written in your guidelines for Edgmond .i do not want any more estates built on any of the fields ..i want Edgmond to remain rural .</p> <p>i want buffer gaps between the university and the village and also between Newport and Edgmond .there has been far too much building already in the area and more than enough infill building in Edgmond ...thank you for the hard work you are putting in to prevent it changing its individual character ...its a village and should stay thus .</p> <p>Newport has already has more than its fair share of housing and still keeps on getting even more housing proposed ..so Newport could cater for anyone wanting to live in the Edgmond area. Edgmond should have no more building as we enough in the area already</p> | | Noted. |
| <p>16</p> <p>Under Key Issue 1, Housing, we fully support Policy Res 1, 2, 3 & 5. In addition we are particularly pleased that this Consultation Version of the Plan includes a specific policy, Policy Res 4, on the preservation and possible enhancement of the Edgmond Conservation Area. It seems to us</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>that this asset within our parish is crucial as it contains the significant historic buildings and spaces that constitute the rural heritage of our village.</p> <p>Consequently, Policy Res 4, Conservation of Edgmond's Historic Character is a most useful addition to the Plan but we consider that, having stated planning proposals will be supported by the Council which "retain...open spaces that contribute to Edgmond's rural character" and "retain or increase stone walls, tree cover and hedgerows as essential components of village character", we feel that the council should consider redrafting their final sentence in this Policy to make it explicit that "Proposals that fail to respond adequately to their context or that reduce the rural characteristics of the Conservation area will not be supported." In the south of the Conservation area between Forge Farm and Church Field and in the north between St Peter's School and Egremont House there are sandstone walls, hedgerows, trees and grassland which provide a rural context in which the significant built heritage is placed. It is our concern that without such an explicit steer at the conclusion of this Housing Policy some of these important rural heritage assets may be vulnerable.</p> <p>We fully support the Council's Policies for Local Amenity and Green Spaces, Employment, Movement & Transport and Community Amenities.</p> <p>Finally, we wish to thank all members of the Parish Councillor for the time they devote to supporting our community.</p> | | <p>Agreed. Amend final sentence of RES4 as suggested: ".....Proposals that fail to respond adequately to their context <i>or that reduce the rural characteristics of the Conservation Area</i> will not be supported"</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>17</p> <p>I would like to comment on my thoughts regarding what I would like to see as policy within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The main point is that Edgmond should be preserved as a rural village and not become a suburb of Newport or Telford.</p> | | <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>We should protect the village from development of large scale housing, I would like to see a no build buffer zone instigated around all sides of the village.</p> <p>Development should be limited to controlled infill with a cap on the total number of new houses allowed to be built..</p> <p>I like the special feel of the village the way it is, we don't need additional lighting, cycle paths or other suburbia policies that would detract from this rural feel of the village.</p> <p>I am all for affordable housing, there is plenty just a mile and a half away in Newport, supporting affordable housing within the village ticks a box for</p> | <p>Policy RES1 specifically refers to 1-3 houses. However amend policy RES1 'Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village' to read as follows "In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness where they help to meet local housing needs</p> <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a 'green light' to developers.</p> <p>However. Amend policy G3 as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas ● New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and ● Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats <p>The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>any large scale housing development applications. Therefor I would like to see the support of affordable housing removed from the plan.</p> <p>Harper Adams is a Agricultural University within the village and this should be kept in a rural setting and no become positioned surrounded by new houses.</p> <p>I hope that my points are considered.</p> | | <p>NP policy RES2 seeks “suitable appropriate” schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for ‘exception sites’ (sites that are an ‘exception’ to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development” and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">18</p> <p>Firstly thanks to you and all of the parish councillors who have committed time and effort into preparing the neighbourhood plan. Your efforts are much appreciated.</p> | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Please see below some comments on the draft plan:</p> <p>It would be preferable if the plan was tightened up / shortened to only reference policies that are specific to Edgmond. The Telford and Wrekin plan already covers more general topics such as cycle paths etc and it is hard to imagine these being implemented as a by-product of the small infill developments that the plan encourages. A Similar point applies to the policy on Affordable Homes which are only likely to result from large developments.</p> <p>The Parish Council and the Villagers vision for Edgmond should be strengthened to stress the importance of Edgmond maintaining its rural Character and the distinction between Edgmond, Edgmond Marsh and HAU. The buffer between these areas needs to be maintained.</p> <p>The support for limited infill of 1-3 houses is good but can the definition be tightened further to describe what infill actually means? Some means of capping and tracking the overall number of new houses that the village would support would be helpful.</p> | <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a 'green light' to developers.</p> <p>However; amend policy G3 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity; <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <p>The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and NP policy RES2 seeks "suitable appropriate" schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Policy RES1 specifically refers to 1-3 houses. However amend policy RES1 'Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village' to read as follows "In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only <i>will be supported</i> on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness where they help to meet local housing needs</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Is there any way to encourage higher aspirations for energy efficiency for new dwellings? Giving preference to homes designed to be certified as Passivhauses for instance? Brixham and other areas have put this forward in their neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Harper Adams has expanded significantly over the last 35 years that I've lived in Edgmond. HAU is beneficial to the area and should be supported and celebrated but not given carte Blanche. The boundary of HAU in the plan doesn't correspond with Field boundaries new development needs to avoid continuing the encroachment towards Edgmond Marsh and towards the village.</p> <p>I hope the above is helpful and constructive, thanks again for the efforts of all involved.</p> | | <p>This is an admirable aim however there has to be a very strong justification for this – building regs have been strengthened substantially recently – and it is always difficult to demonstrate sufficient evidence. There is as a potential clash with the conservation aspects of the NP. No change.</p> <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to “appropriately designed and located new development” and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">19</p> <p>We would like to comment on the latest draft of the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Our chief concern is that the Neighbourhood Plan would strictly oppose any development within the Conservation Area., especially Egremont House Meadow or any other development that detracts from the rural nature of our Historic Village.</p> <p>This Rural asset is extremely valuable due to it's rarity especially in this current bid by developers to build on any green space regardless of being a conservation area or not. It is crucial that we protect this green oasis to be enjoyed by generations to come for once lost will never be regained. This gives us all a heavy responsibility.</p> | | <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">20</p> <p>I feel that the Draft Neighbourhood Plan needs a much stronger Vision Statement to protect Edgmond from unwelcome development.</p> <p>for instance.</p> <p>1. Keep Edgmond rural. This includes preserving the open spaces right into the heart of the village. The key open spaces in and adjacent to the Conservation Area and associated with key listed buildings should be preserved for their contribution to the setting and enjoyment of those listed buildings and the Edgmond Conservation Area.</p> <p>2. A buffer zone around the Conservation area protecting its connection with open countryside and the approaches to the village.</p> <p>3. A tighter definition of “infill” and some means of tracking the total number of infills, possibly with a cap on the total. We are already at approx. 20 in 5 years 2011 to 2016.</p> | | <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>“To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and historic identity and by strengthening the resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit.”</i></p> <p>Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Policy RES1 specifically refers to 1-3 houses. However amend policy RES1 ‘Residential Development <u>within</u> Edgmond Village’ to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only <i>will be</i> supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">21</p> <p>1) I believe that it needs a stronger vision statement to keep Edgmond rural and not be part of Newport. Most importantly no housing estates!</p> | | <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>“To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and historic identity and by strengthening the</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>2) Can you put more detail in what gives Edgmond it's special character. Can "in keeping" be described so if any developer ever comes to Edgmond they will know exactly what it means.</p> <p>3) More information on infil to keep track of the amount of houses that infil means as there have been two almost opposite my house.</p> <p>4) A buffer zone to keep the conservation area protected onto open countryside.</p> <p>5) REMOVE the affordable housing policy. If it appears on the plan it would mean that developers could use this to create a housing estate of 10 houses or more and will be open to all residents of Telford and Wrekin. This could create large housing estates and small affordable housing could mean unsightly crammed in houses rented to anybody or investors renting them to students. This is not what Edgmond would want! The policy is already covered by Telford and Wrekin's plan and does not need to be in the Neighbourhood plan.</p> | <p><i>resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit."</i></p> <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes. Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and NP policy RES2 seeks "suitable appropriate" schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy RES5 as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy—see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>6) Fewer policies as again developers may use this to say that any development would be in keeping with the plan if they include things stated. Try and keep the plan as tight as possible to stop them using anything they can to build or give them a way to say they have ticked the boxes for what Edgmond wish to have.</p> <p>7) More detail on HAU as if that is to get bigger it should go north on the B5062 to keep it completely separate from Edgmond Marsh or it will visually encroach on our village.</p> <p>Please would you consider the following points that I have raised when amending the Plan as it is of utmost importance to my family and I that the land at the rear of our house does not have a huge development of affordable homes on it which may be considered with the current plan. As I live at 31 Shrewsbury Road this was where the planning application for 85 houses were made and we bought our house in a rural village with beautiful views and we would like to keep it that way as there is no need for large developments for new AFFORDABLE homes</p> | | <p>by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>The Plan is seeking to deliver a positive approach to all aspects of sustainable development - these issues do not offer a 'green light' to developers.</p> <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to "appropriately designed and located new development" and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
| <p>22</p> <p>1. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. I am very excited about the prospect of the parish having a NP soon. I would like to thank the PC and Steering committee for all the work done to date.</p> <p>2. In general, I continue to support the vision and objectives of the emerging NP. However, in my view the document needs to be strengthened and to evidence and emphasise more, the outcomes it seeks to achieve. The document includes wording and statements</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>which will be exploited by developers to justify unwanted and inappropriate development within the parish.</p> <p>3. In my view the document unnecessarily duplicates wording/policies within the current draft TWC Local Plan. Unless such duplication strengthens the NP, it should be avoided. I have provided specific examples within my detailed comments below.</p> <p>4. Over the last few years we have seen developers seek to exploit, not just policy & wording within documents such as the Parish Plan and Edgmond Conservation Area Management Plan, but also omissions. The Parish Council and steering committee need to ensure that they very carefully think through the implications of including 'wording' but also in 'excluding' or accidentally not emphasising points which could strengthen this NP. The NP is a vehicle which the parish community can very clearly detail what is important and what is not so important. A vehicle which can which can provide clarity for planning inspectors and the Secretary of State when considering an appeal. A vehicle which can remove the opportunity for a developer's barrister to exploit omissions and ambiguity regarding what the parish 'wants' and needs.</p> <p>5. I recommend that when reviewing the public's comments and formulating the next version of the NP, the Parish Council takes time to think like a developer and like a developer's legal advisor. To consider if there are elements of the NP which can be exploited in order to support and justify inappropriate development within the village; and to remove such elements.</p> <p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>6. <u>Forward</u></p> | | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>6.1. Suggest bullet 1 includes 'rural'. It has been made very clear by parishioners that they wish Edgmond and the parish in general to retain a rural character. The Parish Council will have noted this both at PHE Public Meetings (often attended by 200+ people) and in the comments received in earlier NP consultation stages.</p> | <p>Pg 2</p> | <p>Agreed. Amend to read "Protect the historic <i>and rural</i> character...."</p> |
| <p>6.2. Include a bullet: 'To prevent Edgmond merging with Newport'.</p> | <p>Pg 2</p> | <p>Disagree. Considered to be too specific for foreword and covered implicitly by other bullet points and policy RES2.</p> |
| <p>6.3. Include a bullet: 'To prevent any further coalescing of Edgmond Village, Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University. These 3 places should remain distinctly separate'.</p> | <p>Pg 2</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>7. <u>Setting the Context</u></p> | | |
| <p>7.1. The context is the place where the NP can make a very strong statement about the rural character of the parish and of Edgmond Village. It is critical that this is done. In particular, the following MUST be emphasised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Extensively</i> Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land; • Rural landscape extending into the heart of villages and hamlets with settled areas retaining a distinctly rural appearance which are very different to the suburbanised estates of Newport and Telford. • Edgmond, Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University are 3 independent settled areas, separated by Grade 2/3 agricultural land which is currently farmed. • The conservation area and the unusually high number of Grade 1, 2*, 2 and locally listed heritage assets. | <p>Pg 6</p> | <p>Agreed – include some additional points in 7.1 in 'Setting the Context'</p> <p>Agreed. Insert additional text as new 3rd para <i>"The Parish is set in a predominantly rural landscape that extends into the heart of the village and other settlements leading to a distinctly rural appearance. Agriculture is the dominant land use with over 80% of land classified as grade 2 and 3 (moderate to good)."</i></p> <p>Agreed. Insert as additional text before last sentence in 1st para <i>"Edgmond, Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University are 3 independent settled areas, separated by Grade 2/3 agricultural land which is currently farmed"</i></p> <p>Not necessary – final para already refers.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important views (even if referred to in an annex) and the multiple publically accessible points within the parish which afford outstanding views which show off the rural character of the Parish and Edgmond and how they work with the surround borough and neighbouring areas such as The Wrekin. <p>8. <u>Vision</u></p> <p>8.1. The vision statement should be made much stronger. There should be a strong statement about what makes Edgmond special. It is not just another village surrounded by green fields and which a developer may deem suitable for new housing estates. It is very different to Newport and to Telford. The vision of the NP is to protect this rural community and the uniqueness of the Parish and Edgmond, and to prevent it becoming a suburb of Newport and Telford.</p> <p>9. <u>NP Objectives</u></p> <p>9.1. Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point 3. Delete 'Built-up' and replace by 'settled'. Recommended wording is 'to protect and enhance the open spaces between settled areas and prevent any merging of Edgmond with Newport, and of Edgmond Village, Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University. <p>10. <u>Local Character</u></p> <p>10.1. There should be a specific section on local character. Section 9 of the Madeley Neighbourhood Plan is an exemplar of this. This approach and style is clearly supported by TWC.</p> | | <p>Add new final para <i>"The open rural character of the landscape of the Parish is an asset much valued by the community for its scenic amenity, recreational use and environmental value and sets the principal context for the setting of Edgmond village."</i></p> <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>"To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and historic identity and by strengthening the resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit."</i></p> <p>Disagree. 'Built-up' is conventional wording and more readily understood. However re-word as follows <i>"..... by protecting and enhancing open spaces and to retain the rural character....."</i></p> <p>Disagree. Not needed in this context. Madeley completely different fully built-up urban area.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| <p>10.2. This section can be used to strengthen protection of the conservation area by clearly identifying the unique character of the different sub-areas within the ECA and detailing the historic environment and view which must be preserved and enhanced by any proposed development</p> <p>10.3. As in the Madeley NP there should be some policy/policies which protect the setting of the conservation area. See sections 9.13 through 9.16 of the Madeley NP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a policy on local distinctiveness to establish a 'buffer zone' around the Conservation Area and to add protection to non-designated heritage assets (locally listed buildings) and key features (open spaces/agricultural land) which contribute to the significance of the setting of the conservation area. <p>11. <u>Policy RES1</u></p> <p>11.1. This policy needs to be reworded. Currently it could be interpreted that all other types of development greater than 3 houses will be supported. The problem is down to the how the sentence is constructed.</p> <p>11.2. An alternative, and clearer, form of words would be "in order to protect the character and open aspect of Edgmond Village over the plan period only proposals which meet the ALL of the following criteria will be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land to be developed is a suitable infill site within the existing settled boundary of the village; • The proposal is for a maximum of 3 dwellings; | <p>Pg 15</p> | <p>See above. Consider preparing Village Design Statement</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 already refers to "locally important buildings, structures and open spaces"</p> <p>Some merit. Amend policy to read as follows "In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings only will only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> |
|--|--------------|--|

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal contributes positively to local character and distinctiveness. <p>11.3. NOTE: The phrase ‘help to meet local housing need’ should be deleted because (a) there has not been a detailed examination of housing need for many years and (b) a developer could argue that more 4 & 5 bedroom houses are the ‘local need’ which clearly they are not.</p> <p>12. <u>Policy RES2</u></p> <p>12.1. The wording relating to exceptions for suitable affordable housing schemes should be removed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an irrefutable fact that ‘Affordable Housing’ comprising social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing (such as that provided by housing associations) are only generated by very large housing schemes. The residents of the parish have given a very clear indication to the Parish Council that large developments are not warranted and would compromise the rural nature of the Parish and village. • In its current form, I believe that the NP is confusing what TWC and the Government define as ‘Affordable Housing’ with what is local aspiration for housing which is not so expensive and is generally smaller than 3 or 4 bed housing. For example 1 or 2 bed, single story houses. • The allocation of ‘Affordable Housing’ is made at TWC level on criteria over which Edgmond Parish has no say. It is very unlikely that ‘Affordable Housing’ would be allocated to local people. Thus defeating the purpose of this statement/policy. | <p>Pg 15</p> | <p>Agreed. However need to retain positivity in the Plan see reworded RES5.</p> <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single plots. The policy as worded does not ‘open the door’ to large housing schemes.</p> <p>See RES5.</p> <p>Local Need is usually established on/at a parish level with the assistance of TWC (LP policy HO11) and Housing Association and NP policy seeks “suitable appropriate” schemes which would include evidence of local need. NP must maintain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> |
|--|--------------|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy generates a significant risk of developers proposing large estates justified by this policy. Developers would argue at planning appeals that their proposal for a very large development would support the NP. • The emerging TWC Local Plan gives sufficient policy regarding Affordable Housing and this is unnecessary and dangerous duplication. <p>NOTE: It is strongly recommended that the NP is silent on 'Affordable Housing' except to explain that it acknowledges that affordable housing provision is covered in the TWC Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public consultation feedback also expresses a desire to maintain very clear physical and visual separation between Edgmond Village, HAU and Edgmond Marsh. Not just between Edgmond and Newport. This desire should be written in the NP too. <p>12.2. It is recommended that there be a specific policy relating to Housing/Residential development at HAU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development at HAU should only be supported if it is within 'existing building lines and is infill'. It should be noted that the curtilage of HAU extends well into open countryside. HAU should not be permitted to build new residential blocks on open farmland or sports pitches. • New residential development should only be north of the B5062 within the HAU campus in order to prevent further physical & visual encroachment into Edgmond Village. <p>12.3. Consultation responses also express strongly a desire to maintain the existing separation between Edgmond Village, Edgmond</p> | <p>Disagree. Policy already refers to "suitable, appropriate affordable housing schemes". Amend policy to refer to "..... new <i>open market</i> housing development..."</p> <p>Disagree. Policy is attempting to articulate in a positive fashion the importance of the surrounding countryside in the context of NPPF and development pressure.</p> <p>Agreed. For clarity amend policy to refer to Edgmond Marsh and HAU after Edgmond Village at end of first sentence.</p> <p>Disagree. NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to "appropriately designed and located new development".</p> <p>See above.</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| <p>Marsh and HAU. It is not just about maintaining separation with Newport. The NP should also have a statement to this effect.</p> <p>13. Policy RES5</p> <p>13.1. This policy should be removed. It duplicates unnecessarily the TWC local plan.</p> <p>13.2. Please note my earlier comment about the definition of 'Affordable Homes' and the fact that 'Affordable Homes' are only generated by very large scale housing developments and even if they are built the Parish will not have control over who they are allocated to and there is no guarantee (and one could argue very little chance) of them being allocated to local Edgmond people.</p> <p>13.3. Recommend that 'affordable' be replaced by 'lower cost' noting that the TWV draft Local Plan already covers 'affordable housing' in some detail.</p> | <p>Pg 19</p> | <p>Some duplication is evident. Policy needs to express desire for smaller less expensive open market houses rather than 'affordable housing'.</p> <p>See earlier comment re local needs.</p> <p>Amend policy as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy—see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. |
|--|--------------|--|

| | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| <p>14. <u>Policy G1</u></p> <p>14.1. I don't believe that local green spaces are limited to those in 'public ownership'. Therefore, other key green spaces should be designated as such.</p> <p>14.2. The Parish Council has sufficient evidence gathered from comments on planning applications, and from their consultation exercises, as to the strength of feeling for protecting other green spaces in and around Edmond Village. For example the meadow adjacent to Egremont Meadow. The paddock adjacent to the Manor House. The land to the west of the village separating the village from HAU.</p> <p>14.3. In particular, the decision notices and expert evidence (by Historic England) state the important role played by the open fields to the west of the village and adjacent to the conservation area in contributing to the setting of the conservation area and to the rural character of the village. This evidence should be reference in this policies' supporting commentary.</p> <p>14.4. The list of designated 'green spaces' should be expanded to include the areas at para 14.2 above.</p> <p>14.5. Any developer would use the current version of the map at Figure 4 to argue that the NP is not interested in protecting other 'green spaces' in and around the village.</p> | <p>Pg 19</p> | <p>Local Green Space designation can include land in private ownership but only where the landowner has been involved in the process and agreed to the designation. An Examiner would not support LGS where there is not landowner agreement.</p> <p>The sites selected for LGS designation in policy G1 are those considered to meet the requirements and have been agreed. It is not appropriate to designate large tracts of countryside as LGS in an attempt to prevent development.</p> <p>Disagree. These areas do not meet the criteria for LGS designation.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Disagree. That is not the point of LGS and to seek to put in place some sort of blanket designation of LGS would be seen as too restrictive by an Examiner.</p> <p>Disagree. This policy needs to relate to all development.</p> |
|--|--------------|--|

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| <p>15. Policy G3</p> <p>15.1. This policy should be removed or wording included to emphasise that this policy relates to non-residential development proposals only.</p> <p>15.2. 1-3 dwelling infill sites are very unlikely to improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and therefore this policy only serves to unnecessarily duplicate TWC policy.</p> <p>15.3. It would be exploited by developers proposing large scale development to justify their proposal. We have seen these arguments used in planning applications TWC/2015/0454 and TWC/2016/0603. 'Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported' is a very dangerous policy to state within the NP!</p> | <p>Pg 22</p> <p>Pg 24</p> | <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats <p>Disagree. The policy refers to all development and requires that it should be "appropriately designed and located". To limit all development in the way suggested would not work for all forms of development and will be seen as too restrictive.</p> |
|---|---------------------------|---|

| | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| <p><u>Policy E3</u></p> <p>15.4. Please note my earlier concern regarding HAU building out into open country side. Rather than ‘existing boundary’ or ‘curtilage’ please change to ‘within existing building lines and not out into open countryside or sports pitches’</p> <p>15.5. I would also like to see a specific policy relating to development at HAU which ensures that maximum efforts are taken to restrict further light pollution by HAU. When driving over Cheyney Hill from Newport the University appears like a ‘major airport’ in terms of light pollution. To date light pollution by HAU has been completely uncontrolled.</p> <p>16. <u>Policy C2</u></p> <p>16.1. This duplicates TWC policy and should be removed. Developer’s contributions are only generated by large scale developments which the villages has clearly indicated that it does not want. Developers contribution are not generated by 1-3 dwelling infills.</p> <p>See also map in original response regarding green spaces</p> | <p>Pg 27</p> | <p>Disagree. HAU needs to ensure the safety and security of staff, students and visitors.</p> <p>Noted. However this policy is designed to cover all forms of developer contributions including any future CIL. Both CIL and s106 are under review by government and policy may change – all new dwellings have an impact on community infrastructure.</p> |
| <p>23</p> <p>Having lived in Edgmond for nearly eight years, I feel I have a good insight into the importance of preserving Edgmond and its community - something I am sure you are also aware of. Living in London in my early life has allowed me to understand the importance of preserving green areas and villages and to prevent urban sprawl, which unfortunately is occurring currently in Newport. I feel therefore that it is important to express this point in the Neighbourhood plan, in order to state more explicitly how we should prevent the introduction of large residential estates due to their destruction of natural beauty as well as community. These estates destroy the scenic countryside of Edgmond and threaten the conservation area.</p> | | <p>Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting. Additional evidence base work also underway.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Even allowing construction around the conservation areas could damage them, as views are destroyed and the area is opened up to building, such as in the green belts around many cities. I believe the Neighbourhood plan needs to emphasise further the importance of preventing construction on the countryside around Edgmond and limiting the increasing urbanisation due to villages becoming part of Newport, such as in Church Aston.</p> <p>Not only should developments be prevented and monitored, but it should be made explicit that unfortunately the production of affordable housing occurs due to the introduction of housing estates, which decreases value of an area due to detracting from the attractiveness of villages and the higher density of living. Therefore it is very difficult to achieve affordable housing without the production of housing estates, which costs the rest of the village. This should therefore be made clear and we should prevent completely the introduction of large housing estates deemed appropriate purely for the purpose of affordable housing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the construction and development at Harper Adams' is also affecting the views around Edgmond. Even though the university is slightly detached from the village, the building is still visible and ruins the natural</p> | | <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single plots. The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes.</p> <p>Amend policy as follows:</p> <p>More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and <i>affordability likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social-rented needs of people with a local connection; <p>and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity.</p> <p>NP must retain positivity about development at HAU, policy already refers to "appropriately designed and located new development"</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>views. Although the university is very important and successful, construction and development should be monitored so as not to detract from Edgmond's beauty.</p> <p>Edgmond's community and beauty should be preserved and protected, and therefore I believe the neighbourhood plan should emphasise the aforementioned points more clearly in order to ensure the preservation of such a lovely place, and mitigate exploitation of developers. The neighbourhood plan is already and hopefully will continue to preserve our village.</p> | | <p>and has established a development boundary in fig 5. Policy RES2 seeks to avoid settlements merging together.</p> |
| <p>24</p> <p>I feel this is a vital document and should help protect Edgmond from excessive and inappropriate development.</p> <p>Edgmond is a separate and distinct village and community and not an extension of Newport or Telford. It has a unique rural character with historic buildings such as the Church, The Manor House or Provosts house. These building all owe much of their character to the rural settings and surroundings that Edgmond currently provides.</p> <p>Limited infill housing would be acceptable and a cap on this ought to be stated. Development of larger housing estates would be out of character and change the village permanently. I feel even stating information regarding cycle paths would allow developers to claim that Edgmond is ready for expansion and should be removed from the plan. Likewise the inclusion of a policy on affordable homes should be taken out as it duplicates what is in the local plan and would allow any telford resident to be offered the housing rather than Edgmond residents alone - so not an issue for the neighbourhood plan.</p> | | <p>Agreed. Policies RES1, RES2, RES3 and RES4 recognise the character of Edgmond and its rural setting.</p> <p>Noted. See policy G3 as amended.</p> <p>Noted. See policy RES5 as amended.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>I feel there should be more detail on development by Harper Adams University restricting their building to within a specified boundary to prevent encroachment onto the village. We should also have a buffer zone around the conservation area to maintain the rural space and character. The space between Edgmond and Newport is already being eroded by the development on Cheney Hill and no further loss of this space should be allowed.</p> | | <p>Noted. Boundary established for HAU see figure 5. Policy E3 seeks appropriately designed and located HAU development within the development boundary.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">25</p> <p>RES1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have a problem with only 1-3 houses on infill sites. This could actually mean that we end up with fewer large houses on a given site, rather than a larger number of smaller houses on the same site. Consultation results noted a desire for smaller houses to enable young families to move here and older people to downsize, but this policy seems not to support this. How do we define 'local housing needs'? How can any 'need' be assessed? <p>RES2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does 'build form' mean? How do we define 'open countryside'? For example, is a large field with housing on two of its four sides 'open countryside'? Do we have to have the exceptions for affordable housing in open countryside? Is this a green light for development of the caravan site down Marsh Road? <p>RES3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 1 - 'high quality design...in the area'. I think we should say immediate area. <p>RES4</p> | | <p>Noted. The Plan is to be read as a whole and there is a need to retain a positive approach to sustainable development. See RES5 as amended</p> <p>Criteria established in policy HO11 of TWC Local Plan.</p> <p>These are terms that are generally understood and will need a consistent approach with applications.</p> <p>Yes. This is in line with national policy to maintain a living, working countryside whilst recognising the importance of the surrounding countryside to the Parish.</p> <p>Disagree. Immediate area may not contain or be representative of local characteristics.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think it should read ‘...development proposals...’ should complement ‘...the locally distinctive character...’ NOT <u>promote</u>. Point 6 - should surely be - ‘retain and/or increase the stone walls..etc..?’ <p>RES5 How is a need for houses ‘proven’? This policy sits at odds with RES1 which restricts infill to only up to 3 houses - which will act as an incentive for larger houses. This policy seems to mix up ‘affordable’ (housing association owned/ownership controlled) with ‘smaller’ houses (smaller and therefore <i>de facto</i> more affordable).</p> <p>G1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a problem with the box at the bottom of page 19 - it’s not complete. Page 20 - second para - doesn’t read right. | <p>Disagree. “Promote” implies something of the local character; “Complement” implies something that is similar to. Agreed. Amend as proposed.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend policy as follows: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for ‘exception sites’ (sites that are an ‘exception’ to planning policy – see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>Agreed. Drafting error. Sentence should read: “Proposals for built development other than appropriate community uses on these Local Green Spaces <i>will not be supported</i>.” Agreed. Amend as follows “.....protecting these areas space to contribute to.....” Noted. Check with Steering Grp</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Playing field doesn't have lighting - the car park does. It reads as if the playing field is floodlit or something. • The children's play area is not 'in the heart' of the village. • We have included two areas held by trustees...presumably that has been checked out as being acceptable? <p>G2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do hedgerows have to be 'species-rich' to be noteworthy? There are many hedgerows in the village, and beyond, that are not species-rich but are still of value to the environment. <p>G3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a problem with this policy. How can a small development of say, 3 houses, include the enhancements to the infrastructure set out in this policy? I agree that where possible we should support and encourage greater connectivity via cycleways and footpaths etc, but to say that ALL new proposals will be '... expected to include...' such enhancements is in conflict with RES1 and may even encourage the proposal of larger schemes as a result. <p>E1</p> | | <p>Agreed. Amend as follows: " Open green space in heart of at <i>entrance to village</i>"</p> <p>Noted. Check with Steering Grp.</p> <p>Noted. However policy is seeking to emphasise the species rich nature of hedgerows compared to other environments. Amend to 'established'</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats |
|---|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>If we had a scenario where Lea Bros wanted to develop their site... how would such a proposal be accommodated within E1?</p> <p>Within the policies there is no mention of brownfield sites. I feel we should be clear about how we would react if, for example, the Lamb site was put up for housing.</p> | | <p>Noted. There are 2 separate issues here – 1 concerned with the retention of employment use and economic activity that contributes to the viability and resilience of the village and 1 concerned with the reuse of brownfield land. Could consider adding to policy as follows: <i>Proposals for the use of land or buildings on existing employment sites for uses other than employment purposes will not be permitted unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>it can be demonstrated that the on-going use of the premises or land for employment purposes is no longer viable; or</i> • <i>the alternative proposal would provide demonstrable employment benefits to the local community and contribute to its long-term sustainability</i> <p>Noted. This scenario covered by policy C1: Community Facilities</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">26</p> <p>Strategic Framework P 10</p> <p>The term 'provision of services' is used, Do we have a clear definition of this as it can be interpreted in numerous ways? If so we should state clearly what is intended.</p> <p>Newport is a historic market town and is expanding at a very rapid rate which will undoubtedly cater for the vast majority of housing needs in Edgmond with its very close proximity.</p> <p>P11</p> <p>Whilst there may have been requests for 'affordable housing' in the pop in sessions it is clear that its precise definition opens the door for a developer to propose building an Estate in the village which has a small proportion of affordable houses included. These would not be</p> | | <p>Not required. Accepted use of a generic term, in this context 'services' includes the range of services, facilities and infrastructure provided by both the public and private sector.</p> <p>No, this is not always the case especially in rural areas affordable housing only can be developed on small exceptions sites or on single plots. The policy as worded does not 'open the door' to large housing schemes.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>allocated to village residents but be under the control of the Telford and Wrekin Housing Association.</p> <p>We should avoid any mention of affordable housing in our Neighbourhood plan other than as defined in the Local Plan under sub section 5.3.2.3 for rural exceptions.</p> <p>Let us avoid opening the door to a developer to build an Estate in our village.</p> <p>P14 In the vision statement the addition of the word 'open' prior to 'rural character' would be an enhancement.</p> <p>Housing 1 This sentence would be reinforced by addition of limited prior to infill and historic prior to identity.</p> <p>Housing 3 Perhaps this should read 'to maintain the separate identity of the built up areas of Edgmond village , Edgmond Marsh , Harper Adams University and Newport by maintaining their distinct physical separation</p> <p>Policies P15</p> <p>RES 1 This would be better reworded in order to avoid ambiguity. Eg Development proposals must contribute to the open rural and historic character of the village. Only proposals of 1-3</p> | | <p>No, it reflects current issues in rural areas.</p> <p>The Vision needs to present a positive view in a brief sentence – however consider revising as follows: <i>“To shape the future of Edgmond by retaining and enhancing its open rural character and historic identity and by strengthening the resilience of the community and improving quality of life for residents to create a safe welcoming neighbourly place to live work and visit.”</i></p> <p>Agreed. Amend as suggested.</p> <p>Disagree. Objective is clear enough and policy RES2 amended to refer to separate places.</p> <p>Amend policy to read as follows “In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Edgmond village over the Plan period, proposals for new housing development of 1-3 dwellings <i>only will</i></p> |
|--|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>dwelling on suitable infill sites will be supported. Should 'to meet local housing needs be' cross referenced to the Local Plan. Do we have a definition of this?</p> <p>RES 2</p> <p>Remove the statement relating to affordable housing and replace it with something specifically related to 'specific exceptions' and HO11 in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The term curtilage could be interpreted as the area of influence of HA university including the land which it rents. This term needs to be replaced</p> <p>could the words 'sympathetically designed' be used in place of the word appropriate as the conclusion of this Policy statement? It demonstrates high quality design <u>and high quality appropriate</u> materials that is in.....</p> <p>Will the limited infill development necessitate cycle connections to existing routes? Very unlikely.</p> <p>RES 4</p> <p>add after..... 'with their settings <u>and important associated spaces</u>. In addition..</p> <p>G3</p> <p>As recent planning applications have used the sentence..... New footpathsfrom residential areasas a way to enhance their proposals it should be removed. Is there really a need for new footpaths and rights of way?</p> | <p>only will be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and <i>distinctiveness</i> where they help to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Disagree. Policy seeks “suitable appropriate” schemes. NP must retain commitment to sustainable development across all 3 elements.</p> <p>Agreed. Delete “curtilage” and replace with “development boundary”</p> <p>Disagree. Design of housing covered by RES3 and “appropriately” provides flexibility for HAU whilst ensuring attention is paid to design.</p> <p>Policy RES3 seeks positive outcome from new residential development.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend as suggested.</p> <p>Noted. Amend policy as follows: Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for</i></p> |
|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>E1 & E3</p> <p>These replicate what is already covered in the Local Plan without adding anything. They should be deleted.</p> <p>There is a danger that as Harper Adams expands it will move closer to Edgmond Marsh with the likely further impact on residents of that community. A boundary for future development needs to be defined to provide space for this community.</p> | | <p><i>pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats <p>Disagree. Responding to community desire to support opportunities for small scale employment development.</p> <p>Boundary established for HAU see figure 5. Edgmond Marsh is not a settlement in the TWC Local Plan and is seen as countryside.</p> |
| <p>27</p> <p>In respect of the above plan, I would hope the parish council takes on board all of the points made by the PHE team amend the plan</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |
| <p>28</p> <p>Before the end of the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Draft Consultation Period, I would just like to mention the term "AFFORDABLE HOUSING". It's very appealing terminology, and one can't help but agree with the concept. But exactly what it means has not been defined in our Neighbourhood Plan. I understand that there are several approaches to Affordable Housing, one being the fact that if a proposal for a development of 11 or more residences,</p> | | <p>See amended RES5: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>or where gross floor space is greater than 1,000 square metres, is put forward, it will contribute to meeting the A.H. needs OF THE BOROUGH. To me, that could mean that A.H. wouldn't necessarily be built elsewhere in the borough. An arguable point. This could mean that new build A.H. would not be for the exclusive use of people wishing to remain in Edgmond even if built in the village. With all the massive development taking place just 1 ½ miles away in Newport, couldn't this help meet the needs of people wanting to live near Edgmond and get their feet on the bottom rung of the ownership ladder? Unfortunately, this ambiguous statement "needs of the borough" could mean that people wanting to remain in Edgmond and say, wanted to move from rented accommodation to ownership, wouldn't be able to rely on A.H. in the village being allotted to them even with Parish Council support.</p> <p>If the term Affordable Housing is included in the N.P. would it be an idea to define exactly what the implications would be? i.e. which option of the several available, would Edgmond residents prefer to be stated in the N.P., or preferably not be included at all, as it could lead to larger developments, not just infill housing on appropriate sites.</p> <p>Another point is "CYCLE TRACKS". The reference to "Cycle Tracks" in the N.P. could also be used as a lever by developers wishing to build larger, unsuitable estates in the parish. By incorporating cycle tracks in their plans this could be used as a plus to help persuade planners. Edgmond's narrow roads, many without even pavements, just aren't suitable to create tracks to join up with any from an estate. That is, unless many front gardens were annihilated, along with sandstone walls, banks and hedges, detracting from the charm of our rural village.</p> | <p>affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy—see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; ● and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>See amended G3</p> <p>Proposals for the enhancement and improvement of the existing Public Rights of Way will be supported. Proposals for improved linkages and accessibility within Edgmond and to the areas beyond will be supported. All new proposals will be expected to include the following enhancements to maximise accessibility to residents and to support local biodiversity: <i>demonstrate safer and easier routes for pedestrians and cyclists to local services, facilities and existing networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhanced public access and appropriate signage to the rights of way network from residential areas |
|---|---|

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New footpaths and cycle routes linking to existing and new networks and village facilities; and • Linkages to wildlife corridors and provision of landscaping and planting along routes to support local biodiversity objectives such as provision of new areas of woodland and orchards, new hedgerows, grassland and wetland habitats |
| <p>2017 – 2031</p> <p>As the closing time for comments on the Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan is near, I have re-read the document and would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>Page 10. Last sentence . It has become very apparent what a huge increase in Newport housing provision has and is taking place. Should our NDP state that " any local housing need in Edgmond could be provided for in Newport"</p> <p>Page 14. Under Neighbourhood Plan Objectives/Housing/3. One of the key issues is "preventing the merging, thus keeping the separate identities of Edgmond, Edgmond Marsh,HAU and Newport maintaining the rural character with the present open spaces".</p> | 29 | <p>No. Wrong context the Local Plan has already established Edgmond as suitable for limited infill.</p> <p>Disagree. Objective is clear enough and policy RES2 amended to refer to separate places.</p> |
| <p>1. Policy RES5 .</p> <p>Whilst I recognise and support the desire to support affordable housing for those with strong connections to the parish, I do not follow why that might be an exception to the plan? I would have envisaged that affordable housing should be delivered within the parameters of the plan, for example , maintaining the character of the village, etc. By making affordable housing planning applications an exception to the parish plan, then it seems as though the safeguards to planning are significantly reduced. Rather, I would have thought that affordable housing provision should be a priority within the rest of the planning constraints</p> | 30 | <p>See amended RES5: More small houses are sought in Edgmond to provide housing for the younger and older generations. The <i>size</i>, type, tenure and affordability <i>likely price</i> of housing will therefore be important considerations when making planning decisions. Proposals for affordable housing on exceptions sites that comply with Local Plan policy HO11 will be supported.</p> <p>The village and wider Parish may also offer opportunities for 'exception sites' (sites that are an 'exception' to planning policy— see NPPF definition) for affordable housing development (as defined</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>2. Policy E3 and Appendix 1.</p> <p>The overall discussion around Harper Adams within this document is significantly concerning. Harper Adams development activity has accelerated over recent years and in my view, is starting to become of a scale which is inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining the rural character of Edgmond. This is most clearly demonstrated, daily, with the scale of traffic flow through unsuitable country lanes in Edgmond, but in many other ways. Appendix 1 seems to set no limits to Harper Adams ambitions and indeed it seems to imply that the wider economic benefits that it brings gives it licence to be an exception to planning constraints that would apply to others. The constraints upon Harper Adams development to be within the Development Boundary needs to be absolute. Within Appendix 1, development is described as being “focused” in the Development Boundary, which I read to mean “mainly” within the boundary. The Policy E3 says that Harper Adams development will only occur in “exceptional circumstances” It is not explained what these circumstances might be and I do not see why Harper Adams should not abide by the planning constraints that apply to all others, rather than be given special status outside of the Development Boundary that his document confers through the undefined “exceptional circumstances”</p> <p>More generally, I do find the language of the document a little equivocal , and in the context of repeated attack by developers on our community over the last few years, I would have expected the parish to be more definitive in some of the language used. Many of us are concerned about</p> | <p>by NPPF) only where this will satisfy a proven local need. Such proposals will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they contribute to meeting the affordable and social rented needs of people with a local connection; • and the development is subject to an agreement which will ensure that it remains as affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity. <p>Agreed. For clarification delete “focused” and replace with “take place”</p> <p>Disagree. Policy E3 does not say that – it states “Unless exceptional circumstances indicate otherwise all development will take place within the existing boundary....” . NP must retain positive approach to HAU development.</p> |
|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>developers using lawyers to exploit language in such documents to justify planning applications which clearly fall outside the spirit of what is meant. I do not have the professional background to comment in detail upon this, but I would recommend that the parish take expert advice on this point to ensure we don't have hostages to fortune in the document.</p> <p>Thank you for all the time and effort spent in preparing this document and I do agree with much of the document as presented.</p> | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">31</p> <p>Firstly I would like to say how fortunate and thankful the villagers of Edgmond should be, in how the Parish Council has published the very important, comprehensive and timely Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am sure there has been a lot of members' time and hard work, all in the best interest for the village and villagers.</p> <p>Over past decades Edgmond village has grown slowly, and appropriately, without losing it's most important rural and historic character, which makes Edgmond special I am sure, to all the village community.</p> <p>For the protection and continuation of our rural and historic village, I list a few comments, which I think are worthy of a strong statement in the Draft Development Plan.</p> <p>Comments: Edgmond Village should retain its own identity and separation as it is, and always has been, and not allow any building developments which are the start, or can result in the merging into neighbouring areas such as Edgmond Marsh and Harper Adams University.</p> <p>Definite buffer zones around the Conservation Areas would help to ensure their protection and connection with the open countryside and approaches to the village.</p> | | <p>Delivered by Housing Objective 3 and Policy RES2 as amended.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The building of any housing estates within the village is not desirable, as they would be totally out of character for the village, as it continues to maintain its rural identity.</p> <p>Just a few heartfelt comments from a thankful villager.</p> | | |
| <p>32</p> <p>Good morning, I am emailing to object to the above plan with the following comments: Edgmond needs clearer definition of its boundaries so that it doesn't become part of Newport. The rural boundaries need to be maintained. There needs to be clear definition of limited infill so maintain the character and heritage of Edgmond. The history and inherent style of the village needs to be clearly preserved. There needs to be more specific terms of the development of HAU as they are expanding and will no doubt continue to do so.</p> | | <p>Disagree. Policy RES2 as amended seeks to avoid settlements merging.</p> <p>Policy RES1: 'Residential Development <u>Within</u> Edgmond Village' sets the no of dwellings at 1-3 houses on suitable infill sites.</p> <p>Noted. Policy E3 seeks appropriately designed and located HAU development within the development boundary.</p> |
| <p>33</p> <p>There is no need for cycle paths, footpaths or lots of lighting, they are for urban areas.</p> <p>Infill must be described as limited to a maximum of four houses.</p> <p>Edgmond must keep its rural identity. We already have four housing estates. The quota is filled.</p> <p>There are a lot of historical features that must be protected.</p> | | <p>See amended policy G3</p> <p>Policy RES1 refers to infill of 1-3 dwellings.</p> <p>The NP policies seek to achieve this – see Objectives 1 – 6 and policies RES1 RES2 and G3 in particular. Agreed. See policy RES4</p> |
| 34 | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>1. I believe the plan should include more information on the history and character of Edgmond and why it is important that the village is protected. I have seen too many villages destroyed by developers and many more being targeted by developers wanting to build 'housing estates' to make huge profits.</p> <p>2. I would like to see a clearly defined buffer zone to protect Edgmond and our conservation areas from these developers. I think it is incredibly sad that the identity of Church Aston is being lost as a result of several new housing estates on the edge of the village. These estates have in effect removed any boundaries between Newport and Church Aston. The same will happen to Edgmond unless we have a clearly defined buffer zone. The development at the bottom of Cheney Hill is a prime example of how developers are cleverly moving the town's boundaries further out and they will quickly absorb Edgmond unless we have a clear boundary.</p> <p>3. I would like the plan to include a very clear definition of what is meant by the term 'infill' by defining the size of a plot/type of plot that the term refers to as well as the number of houses and the standard and style of house. 'Infill' for a developer could easily mean 80 houses as opposed to one or two houses. It is also very important that the houses are of a style (design and materials) and standard that is in keeping with the village and it's history. I believe the two new houses down the road from me at the bottom of Robin Lane are a good example of a carefully considered infill.</p> <p>4. I would also like the plan to include more detailed information on development plans for Harper Adams University. The University has grown considerably and so too has the campus. What plans does the University have for more student accommodation and how will this affect the boundaries of Edgmond and Edgmond Marsh?</p> <p>5. I believe the number of policies should be reduced as developers will only use them to their advantage, claiming their plans meet village needs</p> | | <p>Not necessary – considered there is sufficient information in the Plan and associated evidence base.</p> <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Policy RES1: 'Residential Development <u>Within</u> Edgmond Village' sets the no of dwellings at 1-3 houses on suitable infill sites.</p> <p>Maybe but unlikely to be regarded as such by a Planning Officer or Planning Inspector.</p> <p>New development at HAU will take place within the development boundary of HAU. See policy E3</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>etc. We do not need another park e.g the recent application to build houses next to Egremont House with a park for villagers. We have a park and playing field already and lots of cycle routes and foots paths; with our rural location we do not need dedicated cycle lanes.</p> <p>6. I would also like the reference to moving 'local facilities' removed from the plan as I believe this refers to the Village Hall. We have a very lovely village hall that is loved by all and has indeed recently been saved by the village for the village. It is a charming traditional hall this is in keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>7. Finally I would like the Affordable Homes policy removed from the Neighbourhood Plan as the Affordable Homes scheme is for 10 houses or more and could therefore encourage larger scale building applications. I also believe this policy is an unnecessary duplication of the local plan</p> | | <p>See G3 as amended.</p> <p>Disagree. This does not refer to the Village Hall but any local community facility.</p> <p>See RES5 as amended</p> |
| <p>35</p> <p>I think the majority of the neighbourhood plan looks good but some of it seems open to interpretation, particularly the protection statements. With reference to the protection of the conservation areas as there seems little point in protecting the conservation areas themselves if the land adjacent to them is deemed available for housing developments which would change and possibly ruin the general feel of the village as a rural settlement so I feel this should be addressed strongly.</p> | | <p>Disagree. Buffer zones around conservation areas considered too restrictive and not supported by NPPF. Policy RES4 refers to the setting of the conservation area.</p> |
| <p>36</p> <p>Gladman has responded, their full response is available</p> | | |
| <p>37</p> <p>Protect Heritage England (PHE) has responded, along with the three authors, two of which have also sent in their personal responses. PHE sent out its response, which is referred to in a number of the comments received.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 38, 39, 40 Statutory consultee responses are also available. | | |
| 41 TWC response is also available | | |

APPENDIX 5

Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation Telford & Wrekin Council

| Section/ Policy Area | Page/ Policy Ref | T&WC Recommended Suggestion | T&WC Comments | Neighbourhood Plan response |
|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Introduction | | Amend text for consistency purposes. | In several parts of the NP text "Telford & Wrekin" is written as "Telford and Wrekin" | Amend where necessary |
| P8 3rd paragraph | | Amend wording to read ... "Telford & Wrekin Council's Cabinet" | The designation of the neighbourhood area did not go through the Cabinet process as stated in the paragraph. It was signed off under delegated officer authority. | Amend sentence as suggested: "...Telford and Wrekin Council's Cabinet resolved in September 2016....." |
| Process of preparing the Plan | P9 | Amend accordingly to allow consistency to the Local Plan. | The NP states that the "Draft Plan may need to be amended so that it complies with the probable modifications to the Local Plan". The Council, in response to the Inspector's questions after the Examination hearing, has produced a schedule of modifications to Local Plan. The parish Council may need to refer to the document. | The draft Neighbourhood Plan will be checked against the Inspector's modifications when available. |
| National and Local Planning Policy Framework | P10 | Amend text to read "...Wrekin Local Plan is now time expired..." | The third paragraph states that the Wrekin Local Plan is now out of date. | Amend text to read: "The previous Wrekin Local Plan (1995-2006) is now time expired....." |

| Section/ Policy Area | Page/ Policy Ref | T&WC Recommended Suggestion | T&WC Comments | Neighbourhood Plan response |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Policies | Policy RES1 | More justification is required | The definition of infill sites was discussed at the recent Local Plan EiP and the Inspector will provide comments on it in his report. It may be helpful to the NP examiner for the parish to articulate a justification for the NP's definition of infill sites. | The community considers that the range of likely infill sites in Edgmond village are only suitable for housing developments of not more than 3 dwellings. Proposals for more than 3 dwellings on likely infill sites are considered out of scale and character. |
| Policy RES2 | | Revise policy | <p>The policy reads like a blanket policy restricting development in the countryside with exceptions only made to affordable housing schemes. Telford & Wrekin Local Plan SP3 supports development in the rural areas where it addresses the needs of the rural communities.</p> <p>Policy uses the word "preserve" the built form. The word preserve is normally associated with historic assets. Does the Plan satisfactorily provide an explanation of the type of built form to be protected?</p> | Disagree the policy refers to housing development only and has been amended to refer to 'open market' housing. Amend policy title to clarify that refers only to housing development: "POLICY RES2: NEW <i>HOUSING</i> DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF EDGMOND VILLAGE" |
| Policy RES4 | | Revise policy | <p>Whilst the policy provides guidance on preserving and enhancing the Conservation Area (CA), it is silent on how harm to the CA will be assessed.</p> <p>The policy would be improved if it set out how any harm to the designated heritage asset (the CA) must be justified in line with</p> | Disagree. The proposed amendment is not required. The policy seeks to take a positive approach to any development in the Conservation Area. It is clear that development which does not meet the NP policy criteria will be harmful to the historic character of Edgmond and will not be supported. |

| Section/ Policy Area | Page/ Policy Ref | T&WC Recommended Suggestion | T&WC Comments | Neighbourhood Plan response |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | guidance in the NPPF (para132, 133, 134...). | |
| Policy RES3 | | Revise policy | <p>The policy provides criteria against which proposals are to be tested if they pass policies RES1 and RES2. It is suggested that instead of using “permitted”, the policy should state that “where development is in line with the principles in policies RES1 and RES2...”</p> <p>Last bullet point refers to minimum standards. Appendix F of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan sets parking standards. These are not minimum parking standards.</p> | <p>Agreed. Amend policy as suggested: “Where residential development is permitted in line with <i>the principles in</i> policies RES1 and RES2.....”</p> <p>Agreed. Amend policy as follows: “Proposals that exceed the minimum parking standards in Appendix F of the Local Pan will be supported.”</p> |
| Policy G1 | | Revise policy to insert missing part of the sentence | <p>Last sentence in the policy seems to be partly missing.</p> <p>The policy gives exemptions to appropriate community uses. Paragraph 76 of the NPPF rules out development on Local Green Space other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 78 goes further in stating that policy for Local Green Space should be consistent with policy in green belts.</p> <p>Table 1 provides information on proposed sites. Is that enough justification to allocate the sites as local green spaces?</p> | <p>Agreed. Drafting error. Sentence should read: “Proposals for built development other than appropriate community uses on these Local Green <i>Spaces will not be supported.</i>”</p> <p>The wording is deliberate following experience elsewhere to allow for example additional recreation facilities, equipment storage or clubhouse/changing facilities.</p> <p>Yes. Evidence matches that provided for approved Neighbourhood Plans elsewhere.</p> |

| Section/ Policy Area P20 | Page/ Policy Ref | T&WC Recommended Suggestion Amend text | T&WC Comments Second paragraph mentions “areas space”. Do you want to mean “open spaces”? | Neighbourhood Plan response Agreed. Amend as follows “.....protecting these areas space to contribute to.....” |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Policy E1 | | Revise policy | Revise the phrase “Development proposals to... ” to read “Development proposals that... ” The NP could be improved if it were to encourage provision of small “ well designed ” buildings consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Theoretically, any new building will have an impact on character of the village. | Agreed. Amend as suggested: “Development proposals to <i>that</i> provide suitable,..... Agreed. Amend 2 nd bullet as suggested: “Provision of small <i>well-designed</i> new buildings or conversion of ...” |
| Policy C1 | | Amend policy or appendix 3 to clearly signpost users to the community facilities referred to in the policy. | The policy offers protection to existing community facilities listed in the Parish Profile (Appendix 3). Appendix 3 contains information about the parish including community services under “Access to Services and Public Transport. Does the Policy C1 mean these community services? Should the title of the policy be reworded? | Agreed. Amend Appendix 3 to clarify that referring to community facilities listed rather than other services such as public transport. “Access to <i>Facilities, Services and Public Transport</i> Most community <i>facilities and</i> services are centered within the village of Edgmond. These include the following <i>community facilities:</i> ” |

APPENDIX 6

Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation The Environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England

Environment Agency

Mrs. Katrina Baker (MBE)
Edgmond Parish Council
Oaklands
Waters Upton
Telford
TF6 6NP

Our ref: SV/2012/106308/AP-
02/IS1-L01
Your ref:

Date: 24 February 2017

Dear Madam

EDGMOND PARISH DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

I refer to your email of the 16 January 2017 in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plan (NP) consultation. We have reviewed the submitted document and would offer the following comments at this time.

We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment at this time. You are advised to utilise the attached Environment Agency guidance and pro-forma which should assist you moving forward with your Plan.

However, it should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of 'fluvial' flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with the drainage team at Telford and Wrekin Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

I trust the above is of assistance at this time. Please can you also copy in any future correspondence to my team email address at SHWGPlanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

Yours faithfully

Mr. Graeme Irwin
Senior Planning Advisor
Direct dial: 02030 251624
Direct e-mail: graeme.irwin@environment-agency.gov.uk

Environment Agency
Hafren House, Welshpool Road, Shelton, Shropshire, Shrewsbury, SY3 8BB.
Customer services line: 03708 506 506
www.gov.uk/environment-agency
End

Natural England

Date: 27 February 2017
Our ref: 205941
Your ref: N/A



edgmondpc@btinternet.com

BY EMAIL ONLY

Hornebeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mrs Katrina Baker

Edgmond Neighbourhood Plan – HRA and SEA Screening

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 16 January 2017

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made..

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. We note the conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening reports and would agree with the conclusions.

Additionally, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact Grady McLean on 020 802 61266. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Grady McLean
Lead Adviser – Sustainable Development
North Mercia Area
Grady.mclean@naturalengland.org.uk

Historic England



Historic England

WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

Ms Katrina Baker
Oaklands
Waters Upton
Telford
TF6 8NP

Direct Dial: 0121 625 6887

Our ref: PL00062862

23 February 2017

Dear Ms Baker

EDGMOND PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION.

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Edmond Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England are supportive of the Vision and objectives set out in the Plan and the content of the document, particularly its' emphasis on local distinctiveness including undesignated heritage assets and the maintenance of historic rural character.

Overall the plan reads as a well-considered and concise document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the Parish.

Regarding the draft SEA Screening Document and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA); for the purposes of consultations on SEA, Historic England confines its advice to the question, "Is the Plan or proposal likely to have a significant effect on the environment?" in respect of our area of concern, cultural heritage. Our comments are based on the information supplied by yourselves in your consultation to us.

On the basis of the information supplied, including that set out in the draft plan, and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of 'SEA' Directive], Historic England conclude that as the analysis undertaken has identified no likely environmental effects then a Strategic Environmental Assessment is unlikely to be required. We do, however, note that the screening document itself does not appear to have reached any conclusion on the matter.

Regarding HRA Historic England does not disagree with your conclusions but would defer to the opinions of the other statutory consultees.

Beyond those observations we have no further substantive comments to make. I hope you find this advice helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Boland
Historic Places Advisor



THE AXES 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TG

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act, 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Appendix 7

Responses to Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation Gladman Developments

| Comment on policy: | Parish Council Response | Suggested Amendments |
|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| RES1 | <p>The Plan is seeking to achieve all aspects of sustainable development not just the economic element delivered by new housebuilding. The community and the Plan recognise the importance of some new housing in the village of Edgmond but there is a very strong desire expressed through all the community consultation undertaken to balance this with a recognition of the importance of the environment both natural and built within the Parish. The Plan is therefore seeking to deliver all three aspects of sustainable development as set out in para 7 of NPPF.</p> <p>Evidence has been provided in the form of community responses to earlier consultation phases and the collated information for the 4 planning applications listed in the evidence base to justify the need to limit infill development to 3 dwellings or less.</p> <p>The Plan seeks to contribute to all three aspects of sustainable development and by recognising the importance of the local environment and supporting limited infill development the Plan does meet basic conditions (a) and (d).</p> | None. |
| RES2 | <p>Policy RES2 conforms to the framework established by policy HO10 of the T&W Local Plan which states that “elsewhere in the rural area residential development will be strictly controlled”. Policy RES2 builds on this by applying local detail and specificity as expected of Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p> <p>Policy RES2 retains flexibility for the development of affordable housing exception schemes. Where an appropriate scheme is proposed this would only occur where a willing landowner is prepared to accept a lower return on land values.</p> | None. |

| Comment on policy: | Parish Council Response | Suggested Amendments |
|--------------------|---|--|
| | The rebadging of inappropriate large scale housing developments in the open countryside as “sustainable growth opportunities” does not constitute sustainable development as envisaged in para 7 of NPPF. It is considered that the Plan meets the basic conditions. | |
| RES4 | The Plan seeks to achieve an appropriate level of consideration of the contribution the Conservation Area and other heritage assets make to the historic and rural character of Edgmond Village. The Plan is seeking greater recognition of this from all parties and is pursuing, within the framework set by NPPF, more evidence and understanding from development proposals in order to achieve this. | None. |
| RES5 | In common with many rural areas there is an imbalance of housing types in Edgmond with a dominance of larger detached housing and a quarter of households aged over 65. It is a reasonable aim of the Plan to seek the delivery of some smaller houses as an element of any limited infill development proposed. | None. |
| G2 | This policy seeks to build on the policy base established in policies NE1 and NE2 of the T&W Local Plan by further emphasising the importance of the natural environment and biodiversity features to the character of Edgmond. Para 113 of NPPF refers to criteria that Local Planning Authorities should establish. T&WC have done this in policies NE1 and NE2. | Clarify policy as follows; “All development will be expected to protect and enhance features of high nature conservation or landscape value <i>where identified</i> , including mature trees,.....” |
| C2 | The Plan supports new limited housing development on infill sites so expects some developer contributions to be generated but accepts that this may vary hence the inclusion of “Where appropriate” in the policy. | None. |