

## MARDEN PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

### Results of the Community Consultation 17-30 September 2020

#### On new Sites to allocate and the Vision, Objectives and Policies – amended and new

The Community Consultation was sent to 625 properties, residential and commercial, on 16-17 September. Responses were accepted up to 4 October, to allow for late postal delivery of responses. One response received on 7 October was not included. The electoral register has 1123 people on it.

**Percentages in the results below are rounded up or down for simplicity. Not every respondent answered every question. Percentages are of the total number of respondents.**

Only responses that gave an identifiable address if living in the parish were accepted. This was to confirm that only residents or those who work or do business in the parish were included in the results. The responses were entered according to the number of people on the electoral register identified for each response. Therefore if 3 people on the register were identified on the form for a particular address, 3 was entered against each response, unless a difference of opinion was identified on a form.

#### Results

##### General data

- 102 households responded, 16% of properties surveyed
- 191 people living in the parish were represented on the responses, 17% of those on the electoral register
- One response for 1 person was received from someone who works and does business but does not live in the parish
- 104 (54%) of those who responded live with the Marden village settlement boundary
- 21 (11%) of those who responded live within the settlement boundaries of Burmarsh, Litmarsh and The Vault
- 66 (34.5%) of those who responded live outside one of the 4 settlement boundaries in the parish
- 1 (0.5%) of those who responded works and does business but does not live in the parish

*The consultant's report recommended the following sites would be suitable for allocation and this consultation is to gain Community support for the parish council to allocate the 3 sites that were assessed as most suitable, for 8 houses in total:*

*Site 2 – Land at rear of Rose Villa, Marden – north part of site only for 3 houses*

*Site 3 – Land adjacent to Old School House, Marden – for 4 houses*

*Site 9 – Land adjacent Broxash, Litmarsh – for 1 house*



*It must be noted that at the time the Consultation was sent out, 14 sites had been submitted. However, due to an error by the independent assessor, the site designated site 2 was assessed by the independent assessor but was not submitted until after the Consultation started. The original site submitted by the landowner is site 15 in the Revised Site Assessment Report which can be found on the website at <https://www.mardenherefordshire-pc.gov.uk/parish-council/marden-neighbourhood-development-plan/>*

**Question 1**

Which site(s) do you think should be allocated? *Please tick the site(s)* – Totals are more than 100% as respondents could tick more than 1 site.

- **Site 2 – Land to rear of Rose Villa, Marden** – north part of site for 3 houses – **125 (65%)** responded that this site should be allocated
- **Site 3 – Land adjacent to Old School House, Marden** – for 4 houses – **137 (71%)** responded that this site should be allocated
- **Site 9 – Land adjacent Broxash, Litmarsh** – for 1 house – **132 (69%)**, including 1 non-resident, responded that this site should be allocated

**Question 2**

Do you agree with the Vision? *Please tick your response*

- **176 (92%)** including 1 non-resident, agreed with the Vision
- **16 (8%)** did not agree

**Question 3**

Do you agree with the updated Objectives? *Please tick your response*

- **169 (88%)** including 1 non-resident agreed with the Objectives
- **19 (9%)** did not agree

**Question 4**

Do you agree with the Policies? *Please tick your response*

- **161 (84%)** including 1 non-resident agreed with the Policies
- **24 (13%)** did not agree

**Comments made**

- **27 (26%)** responses, representing 48 people, made comments
- Responses and changes made in response to the comments are shown in the table below

Comments to Informal Community Consultation	Draft Response to comments	Draft Changes made in response to comments
<p>I currently have a sewage pump station above my house which due to run off storm water being wrongly connected to it from the last development in paradise meadows overflows due to the storm water- which then runs sewage over my property and into the river- so I have no confidence in any of the outline measure actually being carried out?</p> <p>Also you are above the number of new houses needed so why build any more as this will add to the sewage problem.</p>	<p>Being addressed by the Environment Agency through discussion with Welsh Water. Outside remit of NDP.</p> <p>The review of the NDP and the allocation of further sites will ensure that the Marden NDP carries full weight in the determination of planning applications in the parish.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Not site 3 as this extends the village boundary further than just this site.</p>	<p>Settlement boundary will only be extended to include allocation site.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Site 2 – see policy M4c. the proposal will have a detrimental impact. It will also spoil the country through which the well-used path to Sutton Walls runs, significant building has already been allowed in this area.</p>	<p>M1 (g) more relevant. Would be adjacent to footpath short stretch of MR24 to Sutton Walls. No legislation to prevent development adjacent to footpaths.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>We do not agree with the vision specifically around the over emphasis on Marden Village with the surrounding hamlets almost featured as an afterthought. 71% (10 out of 14) of the proposed sites submitted as part of this consultation come from the hamlets reflecting the desire by many people to avoid living in the built-up area of the village centre of Marden. Whilst we accept the need for considered development in the surrounding countryside and hamlets it seems the Parish Council adopt a position to justify non-approval of any new development. The justification of restricting development more broadly across the parish seems to be restrained by the fact that a development of 90 houses has been supported in Marden Village and this has now become the dominating factor in the Parish Councils approach.</p> <p>Objective 2 – The emphasis is on ‘controlled’ in the header sentence reference to the hamlets. In your recommendations only 1 house has your support. The 90 houses in Marden (and a potential further 5) have not even been started and yet only 1 site outside of the village has your support. Where is the inspired thinking around balance to which I refer above. This appears to be a case of constriction not control.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy identifies Marden as being the settlement which will be the main focus of proportionate housing development. Burmarsh, Litmarsh and The Vault are also identified as being other settlements within the parish where proportionate housing may be appropriate. Reduced services and amenities and narrow road network outside of Marden village were cited by parishioners previously as reasons for not having development within the settlements.</p> <p>The development in Marden Parish has to be in accordance with the Herefordshire Core Strategy</p> <p>See above.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<p>Policy M2 – You strongly advocate the development of brownfield sites in the policy yet in the proposal for site 10 is down scored and does not make your list of recommend sites. This seems to be based on it being outside the Litmarsh NDP however other sites which are not currently in the Marden NDP gain a recommendation (site 3).</p>	<p>Site 10 is a greenfield site. Very few brownfield sites exist in the parish.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>2 – overcrowding. 3 – new houses do not retain rural and historic character. 4 – loss of agricultural land use.</p>	<p>Believed to relate to questions 2, 3 and 4. Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Response attached to the Development Consultation. To my mind the land adjacent to schoolhouse seems the best fit for the village at this time and seems to cover the requirements, more or less. Neither of the other 2 offer much to the Vision for the village as outlined, only to reduce natural habitats and precious green land. The greater issue in my opinion, however separate it might be, is that of the access roads into the village from Moreton-on-Lugg, Wellington and Sutton-St-Nicholas. We’re still very vulnerable to being completely cut off during flooding and I’m sure there are many who would welcome a consultation on how we remedy that before embarking on anything major in relation to housing, no?</p>	<p>Noted.  Not within remit of NDP, Highways Authority surface water issue.  Parish council currently using drainage grant to investigate drainage issues.</p>	<p>No change.  No change.</p>
<p>I object to no houses to be built outside the set boundaries.</p>	<p>Development in open countryside is contrary to national and Herefordshire Council planning policies unless satisfies certain criteria.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Behind Rose Villa not affordable homes. All new developments seem to only be 4/5 bedroom homes – no small starter homes, objective 2. We don’t need a new community centre as the old one is under used now.</p>	<p>Application was approved by Herefordshire Council, some 3 bedroom houses approved.  No availability for new sessions/groups in current centre, new centre needed for current and future population growth.</p>	<p>No change.  No change.</p>
<p>Land at Old School House too far along the village green area, no sustainable drainage system.  Disagree with new houses next to old historical houses. Road speed too fast.</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage addressed by development management process when a planning application is submitted.  New houses have to be built next to old houses. 30mph zone at this point.</p>	<p>No change.  No change. No change.</p>
<p>Vision – proportionally each time a development takes place, thereafter the next development will be proportionally bigger. There is no end to this in the Vision, Marden will grow &amp; grow &amp; grow. Policies – in general I</p>	<p>Depends on government and Herefordshire Council policy in the future.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

do agree with the policies but they are not binding in anyway, most points are subjective using wording such as 'where appropriate/appropriately/historic pattern of development/satisfactory (To whom?)/where practically suitable? A policy is a document which must be implemented. This document is open to interpretation to suit whoever wants to do whatever they like.	Legally enforceable statements used when possible.	No change.
Vision – We would like to have a commitment from the PC that a village hall application wouldn't be dropped in favour of housing.	New community centre planning application currently awaiting approval.	No change.
M12 – before any building commences within the Marden area, the local government should work on reducing the flooding affecting local roads (during the heavy rain 3 out of 4 roads were impassable). This will keep occurring unless flood planning and <u>work</u> is carried out.	Not within remit of NDP, Highways Authority surface water issue. Parish council currently using drainage grant to investigate drainage issues and regularly raises issue with Highways Authority.	No change.
Just concerned about the future or our fragile historic bridges if heavy traffic is increased. Also river pollution possibility by industry.	Bridges were strengthened to take heavy goods vehicles.	No change.
Add to Vision '... the historic and important cultural landscape setting of St Mary's Church and Sutton Walls Hillfort will be preserved for future generations'.	Listed building and Scheduled ancient monument protected by national designation, Herefordshire and national policy. Review Group agreed that next review will include community consultation on protected views within the parish, including to Sutton Walls and the church.	No change.
Site 9 – no mains drainage. Road too small and subsides. Well done, good work!	Sustainable drainage is required but not mains drainage.	No change.
There is no infrastructure to support development in Litmarsh, particularly water supply. Please note, whilst we support the general views of the consultation, as residents of the north part of the parish we are not allowed a connection to mains water due to weak pressure.	Welsh Water is a statutory consultee on any planning application.	No change.
Quite frankly I couldn't understand most of it! I have no idea what curtilage is and I think it's stretching a point to call these (policy M10) green spaces. Much too complicated for me, sorry!	Noted.	No change.
Vision – change 'commercial development <i>will impact our rural appearance, feel and identity with a consequent need to protect</i> '. Objective 2 – change 'surrounding hamlets <i>including Litmarsh, Burmarsh and The Vault is proportionate to their size</i> '. Objective 4 – change 'suitable <i>range of types, sizes, affordability and are flexible</i> '.	Not part of 'vision'.  Add 'proportionate'.  Noted.	No change.  Change current to 'controlled appropriately and is proportionate to their size'.  No change.

<p>Objective 5 – change ‘community facilities and infrastructure in the parish’.</p> <p>Objective 7 – change ‘skies of the parish are <i>maintained</i>’.</p> <p>Objectives 1, 3, 6 – acceptable.</p> <p>M1 – change ‘likely impact on the roads, within a 5 mile area, and the railway’.</p> <p>M2 (a) – change ‘within, or adjacent to, the settlement’; necessary as there does not appear to be any intention to change the previously agreed settlement boundaries.</p> <p>M3 – I fail to see the reason(s) for deleting the initial statements, excluding para (d) on page 18 of the extant NDP; (g) change second sentence ‘Every dwelling in new developments shall have a minimum of two car spaces within its curtilage, or if not, in community allocated parking areas. Garages should be available either within each curtilage or in community garage blocks’.</p> <p>M5 – (a) change ‘All developers proposing new housing complexes shall demonstrate to the parish council how they contribute’.</p> <p>M7 – (d) below, change interest having offered the site(s) for sale on the open market for at least six months’; (f) delete ‘it’ at beginning of sentence.</p> <p>M9 – change ‘provided within the site to all properties to facilitate’.</p> <p>M10 – 4. Given the recent PC decision to remove the flagpoles this statement will be considered inappropriate.; change to ‘All areas around the front of the school building’.</p> <p>M11 – (a) change ‘Ensuring exceptional development outside the designated settlement boundaries shall retain the development’.</p> <p>M13 – last sentence ‘general public and is acceptable to, and approved by, the formal Public Rights of way Office in Herefordshire Council’.</p>	<p>Add part.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Add part.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries will be amended to reflect allocations.</p> <p>Deleted on advice from Development Management team at Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>Garages not legally required.</p> <p>Although discussion with the parish council is advised by Herefordshire Council, no legal requirement to do so.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed in part.</p> <p>Agreed in part.</p>	<p>Change current to ‘focal point for the village and wider parish’.</p> <p>Change current to ‘of the parish are maintained’.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Change current to ‘likely impact on the strategic highway network of the parish and the railway’.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Change current M7 below (d) to ‘market interest having offered the site(s) for sale on the open market for at least six months’.</p> <p>Change (i) to ‘Or would’.</p> <p>Change current M9 to ‘and to all properties’.</p> <p>Change M10 4 to ‘All areas around the front of the school building’.</p> <p>Change M11 (a) to ‘Ensuring exceptional development outside the designated settlement boundaries retains the’.</p> <p>Change M13 to ‘general public and is approved by the Rights of Way Officer for Herefordshire Council’.</p>
--	--	--

Polices M4, M6, M8, M12, M14 – acceptable.	Noted.	No change.
Objective 6 (c) at present very little consideration is given to the impact of the heavy goods traffic through the village, with constant damage and pollution being caused by 40ton articulated lorries and very large tractors and trailers carrying heavy loads. The roads are already in very poor condition without additional traffic.	Regularly raised with Highways Authority by parish council. Legally unable to restrict heavy goods vehicle traffic.	No change.
What this doesn't tell us is if we say yes to these three property proposals, is this it, or is it just the thin edge of the wedge allowing more proposals into the future. Can you provide some information about the likely future pattern of development?	Unable to at present, depends on government and Herefordshire Council policy in the future.	No change.
Policy 5(c) – we need to encourage young families who need larger houses, not more OAPs, the parish should not be a ‘geriatric dormitory’. Policy 10 (4) – this would seem to be out of date!	Desire for mixed housing tenure expressed in NDP.  Agreed, as above.	No change.  As above.
M2 – we would like to suggest that the area south of the Amberley Arms Public House ‘The Wymm’.	Not within remit of NDP. Herefordshire Council produced settlement hierarchy based on sustainability criteria and such areas are in open countryside.	No change.
I would agree in principle but there is no mention of improvements to sewage systems (River Lugg grossly polluted), improved roadways to enter for increased traffic levels.  I feel that any increase in housing should move outwards from the core of the village, small developments dumped in the middle of green belt countryside must not be allowed.	Sustainable drainage is required but not mains drainage. Welsh Water is a statutory consultee on any planning application as are Highways.  Agreed.	No change.  No change.
I am concerned that house building already in the pipe line could result in another 200 or so cars on our narrow, bendy and sometimes flooded roads and that this can be considered if any new large developments are submitted for approval.	Regularly raised with Highways Authority by parish council. Legally unable to restrict more development or more vehicles.	No change.
M2 – any future increase in housing will impact on the existing issue of flooding via the culvert down the lane from no. 14 Burmarsh Cottages to the bungalow Leyara. A new larger culvert would be required, so as to stop flooding gardens and drives up to people’s properties	No allocation proposed in Burmarsh.	No change.
The parish council has a duty to spend money wisely. My first impression on receipt of the consultation document by post to be appalled that this document was being sent out by 1 <sup>st</sup> class post.	Difference between first and second class post small, parish council considered speed of delivery to be important.	No change.



<p>We feel it is vital to protect the view from Sutton Walls as this is such an important historical site.</p>	<p>Listed building and Scheduled ancient monument protected by national designation, Herefordshire and national policy. Review Group agreed that next review will include community consultation on protected views within the parish, including to Sutton Walls and the church. Review Group agreed that next review will include community consultation on protected views within the parish, including to Sutton Walls.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	-------------------

12.10.20