

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| 1. SF Planning Limited, 12 Royal Crescent, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 3DA | Mark Godson MRTPI | Site Allocation | <p>Land at Orchard Road, Alderton, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>OBJECTION: Response to Draft Alderton Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>SF Planning Limited has been instructed by Mark Casey to make representations to the Alderton Draft Neighbourhood Plan (ADNP), Pre-Submission Consultation version (dated January 2016).</p> <p>Mr Casey owns land within the village to the north of Orchard Road ('the submission site') and therefore this representation letter includes an assessment of the planning designations and key benefits of this particular site, as well as commenting on the general principles and policies</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The submission site is located within the AONB and within an area of high landscape and high visual sensitivity as assessed by Toby Jones Associates in the revised Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study.</p> <p>A detailed draft technical assessment of possible sites around the village of Alderton was undertaken but not finalised as the submission plan does not allocate sites.</p> <p>In the assessment, all sites were considered against a range of planning criteria and ranked according to their overall score. The submitted site (NDP6), although one of the top 11 sites</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>within the ADNP.</p> <p>It is submitted that the submission site is a sustainable and logical location for future residential development to meet the local housing needs of Alderton, and can offer key benefits to the village that no other site within the ADNP is able to do.</p> <p>It would appear that the key benefits this site can deliver may not have been fully appreciated by the local community, or assessed within the ADNP. This representation is therefore made to better explain the opportunities provided by the submission site.</p> | <p>was not the highest scoring site.</p> <p>It is not accepted that this site can offer key benefits to the village that no other site could.</p> <p>There are other sites which could be considered more suitable for various reasons; these were set out in the draft site assessment and included for instance the site's location within the AONB, high landscape and visual impact of development, poor accessibility, and potential impact on neighbouring residential areas.</p> | |
| | | | <u>The Site and Planning</u> | Noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p><u>Designations</u></p> <p>The submission site comprises an area of land of approximately 0.39 ha bounded by residential development to the south and agricultural land/fields to the north.</p> <p>The submission site is not within a Conservation Area nor is it in close proximity to any listed buildings. The site immediately abuts the settlement boundary to the west and south, and is easily accessible from Orchard Road. The site is positioned in very close proximity to the village centre, the school, and is adjacent to existing housing development.</p> | <p>These matters were considered in the draft site assessment process.</p> <p>The draft site assessment noted that “the site has some accessibility issues requiring access via Orchard Road with the associated impact on existing residents.”</p> | |
| | | | The only known constraint at the submission site is its location | Not accepted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This matter should not prevent the allocation of the site for housing, but a robust justification is required. Part of this justification is the site's relative containment from the wider AONB/environment. This is because of the lack of public vantage points. Even where they do exist (for example, from 'Alderton Footpath 4'), the site is very difficult to see. I respectfully request that the Neighbourhood Plan team walks this footpath to confirm.</p> <p>The containment of the submission site is further confirmed by the Borough Council's own Landscape and</p> | <p>The NPPF advises in para 115.</p> <p><i>"Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas.."</i></p> <p>Para 116 goes on to say:</p> <p><i>"Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated</i></p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | Visual Sensitivity Study. This study is referenced at paragraph 4.1.17 of the ADNP, and it is submitted that the analysis effectively considers the site as part of the settlement through lack of assessment (see below). | <p><i>they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;</i> ● <i>the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and</i> ● <i>any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated."</i> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | <p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify planning consent for major housing development in the AONB around Alderton and development of such a site as this would not be in the public interest. Other sites outside the designated area of the AONB are available for development in Alderton should there be a need in the future.</p> <p>In any event Alderton village has more than met the proposed housing requirement set out in the emerging JCS through recent developments, and therefore there is no need for the NDP to allocate a large housing site.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | |  <p>The site</p> <p>Extracts from the Alderton 'Landscape' and 'Visual' Assessment Maps</p> <p>Not only does this exclusion from the Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study include the submission site within the existing boundary of the settlement, it provides further justification for the site to be included within any proposed extensions to the</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>There was an error in the original study.</p> <p>The Cotswold Conservation Board has confirmed that the land in question is within the boundary of the AONB.</p> <p>"There was a small white gap shown on our original boundary map to the north of the village but this appears to accommodate a small development at the end of Orchard Road that probably had planning permission at the time but had not been built at the time of map drawing. The ALD4 area is all within the AONB and is listed in the Toby Jones work as being of high sensitivity. We will of course consider any application on its</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | settlement boundary. | <p>merits but should an application come forward in the AONB and in any area already recognised to be of high sensitivity I would expect the Board would recommend that I submit an objection.” Andrew Lord, Planning and Landscape Officer, Cotswolds Conservation Board. Email dated 3 October 2016. Map provided.</p> <p>Tewkesbury Borough Council have spoken to Toby Jones who has confirmed there was a mistake in drawing the original map and that the boundary used in the visual and landscape sensitivity assessment should have been drawn tightly round the settlement boundary.</p> <p>This site is therefore confirmed to be in an area of high</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | Landscape and Visual sensitivity and subject to the additional protection afforded to AONBs by the NPPF. | |
| | | | <p><u>Planning Justification for Site Allocation</u></p> <p>Alderton is of course considered to be a Service Village within the emerging JCS and the draft Borough Plan. The emerging ADNP recognises at paragraph 4.21 that there is a need to provide a supply of new homes throughout the plan period that appropriately meets local needs but also fits into the scale, character and grain of the local area.</p> | Noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Paragraph 4.1.22 states that, “a proportionate number of smaller, open market homes would add balance to the existing and committed housing provision, enabling a greater range and variety of home owners, including young couples, single and retired people, to “buy into” the Parish.”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.23 goes on to state that, “Our housing policies must also take into account the need to improve housing provision for current residents wishing to downsize.</p> | | |
| | | | <p>The way in which the ADNP is seeking to deal with these stated needs is explained at paragraph 4.1.27, and has come about through a site assessment exercise carried out in March and</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The first site assessment and public consultation was undertaken at an early stage in the preparation of the NDP at a</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>November 2015. Seven sites were identified that held either potential for housing development or had current planning applications for housing development. The event provided the residents of the village with information regarding the future housing provision of the settlement, as well as offering the chance to comment on the proposed sites.</p> <p>Only two sites at the time of the exercise (and at the time of writing this letter) have no planning application, appeal, or appeal dismissals; sites number 6 and 7. Site number 6 refers to the site subject to this representation, and 7 being the 'preferred site' for development which will constitute</p> | <p>time of considerable development pressure. The public consultation focussed on sites which were currently the subject of live planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>This activity informed the early stages of the draft NDP, but a more thorough draft technical site assessment process and public consultation were undertaken as part of work to revise the NDP for submission.</p> <p>A decision has subsequently been made in the light of the 5 year land supply announced by TBC early in 2017 to remove references to the 'preferred site' from the ANDP.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | an extension to the new Charles Church development. | | |
| | | | <p>Within the table presented within Appendix C, numerous public comments are given to suggest site 7 as the preferred site for development within Alderton. These comments appear to provide the reasoned justification for putting site 7 forward as the 'preferred site' (should it be needed).</p> <p>Although land at Orchard Road (site 6) was mentioned within these discussions, it is apparent its location within the AONB was the only discussion point, and the site was deemed inappropriate on this ground (notwithstanding the lack of analysis in the document referenced at paragraph 4.1.17 of</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>A detailed draft technical site assessment process was carried out on the advice of Tewkesbury Borough Council with the methodology reviewed by independent planning consultants Kirkwells.</p> <p>The submission site scored well enough to be to be carefully considered but nonetheless has significant constraints.</p> <p>A decision was subsequently made in summer 2017 to withdraw reference to a 'preferred site' from the ANDP.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>the ADNP).</p> <p>The benefits that can be achieved from the development of site 6 for housing in meeting the aims at paragraphs 4.1.22 to 4.1.23 do not appear to have been fully appreciated, and appear to have resulted in the overlooking of the site as a preferred option within the ANDP.</p> | <p>Therefore the detailed draft technical site assessment was not finalised as it was no longer required as part of the evidence for the submission version of the Plan.</p> | |
| | | | <p>In addition, the dismissed appeals at sites 3 and 4 note the impact of housing development would cause disproportionate negative effects on the village in terms of cumulative impact of development on the social well-being of the community. It is</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>These matters are considered in the Plan.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>suggested that the 'preferred site', site 7, presents many of the same concerns relating to the reasons for dismissal given for the appeals at sites 3 and 4.</p> <p>In fact, site 7 is larger than both sites 3 and 4 and so any negative effects perceived in terms of cumulative impact and/or social well-being at these sites are somewhat exacerbated with a larger site. Site 7 is also some distance from the 'core' of the village meaning that the future residents will not necessarily feel part of the village. Such conflicts and negative impacts are overlooked within the ANDP.</p> | | |
| | | | Site 6, land at Orchard Road can provide both the benefits of increasing the housing provision | Not accepted. If the NDP included one or more | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>within Alderton as well as providing a development proportionate to the scale of the existing village that will integrate well within the community, thus negating the negative impacts perceived by the Secretary of State (through his appointed Inspectors) on other sites around Alderton. Land at Orchard Road is very close to the village centre, being adjacent to existing residential development and a very short walk to the village hall, public house and bus routes through the village and beyond (Ref: Figure.1).</p> <p>Additional housing in this location would be no more or less sustainably located than existing adjacent housing. The land is</p> | <p>site allocations then this submission site would be considered on its merits alongside other potential sites.</p> <p>However as the housing requirement for Alderton village has been met through existing commitments / recent developments, the NDP is not required to include a site allocation at the current time.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | bound by immediate housing to the south, as well as the remainder of the village and service provisions. Development at the submission site would preserve the existing settlement pattern and would not result in development sprawl within the open countryside to a detrimental effect. | | |
| | | | This submission site can offer key benefits to the village that would help accommodate the 'Vision Statement A': Providing homes appropriate to the needs and context of Alderton Parish (section 4.1 Housing, ADNP). Although there is no set proposal for the submission site, the site owner (a local developer well known for bespoke homes) has expressed | Noted. As above. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | interest in providing particular housing types to meet particular identified local needs - either bungalows for down-sizers (paragraph 4.1.23 of the ADNP), or starter homes for younger people to buy into the Parish (paragraph 4.1.22 of the ADNP). Two draft sketch schemes are attached at Appendix A1. As discussed within section 4.1 of the ADNP, this objective should be linked to the requirements of the village based on local need. | | |
| | | | It is difficult to see how a further 'bolt-on' development at Site 7 will achieve these aims. The existing 'Charles Church' development included predominantly large detached properties ranging in price from | Noted. As above – the submission NDP will not include a site allocation. Possible site allocations may be considered in more detail as | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | just under £400,000 upwards (market homes), which has effectively provided a development that is financially exclusive, pricing-out many existing and prospective residents from moving in, or relocating within the village. | part of a review of the NDP as and when the need arises. | |
| | | | The development of the Orchard Road site will offer the ability to cater for either first time buyers through starter homes or those wishing to downsize through provision of bungalows. It seems unlikely that a volume housebuilder would develop the preferred site (shown within map 7 of the ADNP) with the same opportunities and advantages as the landowner proposes at land at the submission site. Indeed, a | Noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | national housebuilder is unlikely to deliver the type of bespoke development that a smaller developer can provide. I have attached some examples at Appendix B of completed developments by Mark Casey. | | |
| | | |  | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | Figure 1: Site Location (red outline) & Key Village Services Plan (overleaf) 1 Please treat these plans as they are intended; to give an indication | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | of what level of development the site is capable of delivering. Designs and layouts would require more work in due course. | | |
| | | | <p>To conclude, key benefits of the site which do not appear to have been fully appreciated by the draft ADNP are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverable on site housing to meet local requirements; • Deliverable on site housing for the elderly and/or starter homes • Future residents located much closer to the centre of the village compared to the preferred site, which will help to achieve community cohesion, as well as support all services and facilities in the village, and; | <p>Noted.</p> <p>See detailed points above.</p> <p>Alderton has already had significant growth since the beginning on the Plan period, with two major housing schemes nearing completion.</p> <p>Further significant growth could impact on the need for the NDP to be in general conformity with local planning policy.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunity to allocate a site for a local small-scale developer who will provide an individual development unachievable through an allocation for a national house builder. | | |
| | | | <p>On this basis, we would urge the ADNP to undertake a review of the achievable benefits of bringing forward land at Orchard Road for housing, and respectfully request it is selected as an allocation within the plan. The submission site is within single family ownership and is available and deliverable within the plan period.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could acknowledge safe receipt of this</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The site has been reviewed as part of the draft technical site assessment process. However the submission NDP is not required to include a housing site as the housing target for the plan period has been met through existing commitments / recent completions.</p> <p>The site may be considered</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | representation letter, and should the opportunity be created, I look forward to working further with the community and the Parish Council to consider options for development of the submission site. | along with other potential sites as and when the NDP is reviewed. | |
| 2. Pegasus Group First Floor South Wing Equinox North Great Park Road Almondsbury Bristol BS32 4QL | Jonathan Rainey Director | Email | OBJECTION: Pegasus Group are writing on behalf of Mr Gilder who is the owner of land east of St Margaret's Drive. Our comments below relate to the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and as summarised in the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): | Noted. The Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Parish Council considers that the NDP meets the Basic Conditions. Ultimately this is a matter for the independent Examiner. The NDP has been amended prior to submission, taking into account detailed policy comments submitted by Tewkesbury | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>“having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;</i> - <i>the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;</i> - <i>the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority;</i> - <i>the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations; and</i> - <i>prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection</i> | Borough Council and the recently published modifications to the JCS. | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <i>with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan."</i> | | |
| | | | Our interpretation of these basic conditions is informed by recent NDP Examiners' Reports and High Court Decisions, which have affirmed the status of NDP's in the planning process, and identified the scope and intent of the basic conditions in terms of detailed planning policies. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | At the outset, it is noted that we are committed to continuing dialogue with the NDP Group and would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matters raised below, and to address any questions that may be outstanding in terms of our aspirations for the site. | Noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p><u>Role in Plan Hierarchy</u></p> <p>It is recognised that the NDP is coming forward ahead of the emerging Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan, and as such is based on un-adopted Local Plan. National guidance does not preclude this situation, but as seen in recent NDP Examinations, this has implications on the appropriateness of housing policies in emerging NDP policies, and requires that NDP policies recognise development maybe required that goes beyond that identified in allocations.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance sets out that NDPs can come forward ahead of Local Plans. Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20160211 sets out:</p> <p><i>“Can a neighbourhood plan come forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place?”</i></p> <p><i>Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>A draft neighbourhood plan or Order must be in general</i></p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | <p><i>conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic condition. Although a draft neighbourhood plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. For example, up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.”</i></p> | |
| | | | In this instance, we would draw | Noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>particular attention to the interim findings of the Local Plan Inspector to the JCS who has already outlined that based on the demographic projections alone the housing requirement within the JCS is likely to increase to up to 39,100 units; notwithstanding that additional work is required to test whether this should increase further to meet the economic aspirations of the Councils' and Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>As such, the potential requirement for the JCS area is likely to be at least 8,600 units higher than the currently proposed 30,500 units. Capacity studies have already been undertaken to identify the housing land supply available</p> | <p>Alderton village has already seen substantial housing growth during the plan period; 75 new homes have been constructed or received planning consent since 2014 – a potential increase of settlement size of 36% in Alderton village.</p> <p>The recently published main modifications to the JCS set out a revised figure for the objectively assessed housing need: 35,175 homes including at least 9,899 new homes in Tewkesbury Borough.</p> <p>However, as a Service Village, the required contribution of Alderton towards this overall figure is low. The vast majority of new development will be accommodated in the urban</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>within the constrained Cheltenham and Gloucester local authority areas, and as such any increase in housing requirement will be directed to the Tewkesbury Borough and settlements such as Alderton.</p> <p>On this basis, the NDP would be quickly out-of-date should it proceed on the basis of only allocating sufficient sites to meet the already out-of-date JCS housing requirement of 30,500 units. Given that the JCS will provide the strategic framework moving forward, and it will be upon this figure that additional housing developments will be judged.</p> | <p>centres Tewksbury, Gloucester and Cheltenham.</p> <p>Indeed, the Inspector’s Interim Statement for the JCS sets out in para 154 that <i>“The JCS indicated in the March hearing session that additional capacity could be considered in the Tewkesbury Local Plan and distributed across the Borough. However, scattering such a large amount of housing around the Tewkesbury villages would not be the most sustainable approach. More appropriate would be the allocation of strategic sites close to Tewkesbury town, which is identified as the second most important tiered location in the settlement hierarchy, after</i></p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | <p><i>Gloucester and Cheltenham”.</i></p> <p>The Modifications set out that Service Villages are required to accommodate 880 new homes across the 12 settlements. Assuming a broadly equal distribution this would mean approximately 73.3 houses for each village. However the indicative figure provided by Tewkesbury Borough Council for Alderton, taking into account the village’s services, accessibility, location etc is 51 houses.</p> <p>Whilst the distribution of dwellings per service village is not yet finalised, any increase will be proportionate to the size, function and the accessibility of</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | <p>the settlement.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that Alderton has met its housing requirement through existing commitments and there is no need at the current time therefore to allocate a further significant site.</p> | |
| | | | <p>The NDP's position in response to this that it would undertake a review would not preclude the situation that it would be out-of-date. Notably, given the progress of the JCS Examination, it is likely that the NDP would be out-of-date prior to its adoption. The implications of an out-of-date plan are well-documented, with the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 14 of the NPPF applying</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>With the recent publication of the main modifications to the JCS, and following changes to the submission NDP it is unlikely that the NDP will become out of date in the near future.</p> <p>However the Government has recently published guidance on the review of NDPs and the opportunity therefore exists to</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | in those instances. | review the NDP as and when appropriate. | |
| | | Paragraph 4.1.12 | <p><u>Distribution Strategy</u></p> <p>It is noted that the draft NDP attaches weight to Tewkesbury’s emerging Borough Plan, and its housing distribution exercise (at paragraph 4.1.12).</p> <p>We would recommend caution in relying on this exercise, given it has been subject to significant objections; and is not considered a robust exercise in directing growth to the most sustainable locations.</p> | <p>See above.</p> <p>The ANDP is tested against the Adopted Development Plan (TBLP to 2011) but takes note of the evidence base and emerging policies as the amended JCS draws closer to adoption in line with PPG.</p> <p>The NDP has been revised following detailed comments from Tewkesbury Borough Council and takes into consideration the recently published main modifications to the JCS.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | | |
| | | Policy LC2 | <p>This policy is overly restrictive, and fails to comply with the provisions of the NPPF. This sets out that a proportional approach should be applied to the protection of landscapes, and that planning policies should seek to protect and enhance 'valued landscapes' (paragraph 109).</p> <p>We would also draw the NDP Group's attention to an appeal which considered the attribution of value to landscape. In allowing an appeal for 150 units in a village in Stroud District, the Inspector considered whether a site which was within a landscape 'valued' by local persons constituted a landscape capable of protection</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council has taken action to remove restrictive policy wording and to future proof the plan by checking wording and policies for conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy LC2 has been revised in the submission NDP.</p> <p>The significant views identified in the Plan are supported by planning inspectors' decisions and are not solely based on community aspirations.</p> | <p>Policy LC2 has been revised.</p> <p>No further change.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|----------|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>under paragraph 109 of the NPPF. He found that, <i>“to be valued would require the site to show some demonstrable physical attribute rather than just popularity”</i> (#18, APP/13/2207324).</p> <p>As such, the Council’s identification of ‘significant views’ and their associated landscape protection, purely on the basis of quantum of local support, would fail to meet the requirements to show that the views, and their landscape setting, are valued for the purposes of the NPPF.</p> <p>Secondly, the use of the 2014 Toby Jones Associates Report as a bar to development in certain locations is contrary to its</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>intentions, and the purposes of such reports as established in industry guidance.</p> <p>The report itself states <i>“it is not the intention or purpose of this report to identify land suitable or otherwise for development”</i> (#1.3). Beyond this, the individual appraisals contained within Appendix B do not preclude development in any of the areas designated as ‘high’ sensitivity; but rather include references to necessary mitigation or enhancement requirements, or detailed design constraints, for example providing buffers to prevent coalescence.</p> <p>There is nothing within the baseline report to justify the</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | NDP's position that no development can occur within areas designated as 'high sensitivity'. Sensitivity is not the same test as impact; which is site specific. | | |
| | | Policy LC3 | Policy LC3 This policy as currently worded is not in conformity with the NPPF. An 'unacceptable impact' is not the threshold set within national policy, and the policy must be amended to accord with the NPPF paragraphs 128-141. | Accepted. | Policy LC3 has been withdrawn. |
| | | Policy LE3 | The policy text refers to Local Green Space, and Important Open Space, but only Local Green Space is shown on Map 9: are these the same thing or are there additional Important Open Space allocations | Accepted. The Policy has been amended to identify 3 proposed Local Green Spaces for protection. The identified Important Open Space is carried forward from the Local | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | missing? | Plan. A new map has been provided. | |
| | | General Approach | <p>The NDP as currently framed is not positive in its approach to sustainable development. Notwithstanding the comments above, the introductory chapters indicate a negative approach to development, and imply that the NDP is seeking to limit development over the plan period.</p> <p>This is contrary to the NPPF, and reflects the 'old' local plan drafting. The text should be amended to express a more positive approach to development.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out an approach which supports appropriate development taking into consideration the village's role as a Service Village in the settlement hierarchy and its location adjoining the Cotswolds AONB and within a Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>The village has already accommodated significant housing growth and it is unlikely that further major growth will be required over the Plan period.</p> <p>If the NDP planned for</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | significant growth over and above that required in the emerging JCS it could be considered to be undermining the strategic policy of guiding growth towards the most sustainable locations ie the major towns. | |
| | | Preferred site | <p>Land east of St Margaret's Drive, Alderton</p> <p>As recognised in the NDP, the site has been subject to a dismissed appeal (Ref: 14/2222147).</p> <p>However, it is important to note that the appeal decision gave no indication of an 'in-principle' objection to development of the site.</p> <p>The quantum of units proposed</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Parish Council has reconsidered this site during September 2016 – March 2017 in a comprehensive reassessment of all sites adjacent to the Alderton village settlement boundary.</p> <p>A further draft technical site assessment process has been carried out on all sites in a 360 degree ring around the village,</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>constituted the main issue for the Inspector, and whilst landscape impact was raised, this again pertained to the scale of the development and the loss of a large open pasture field.</p> <p>There is nothing within the decision to indicate that a small residential development on the site would be unsuitable for the purposes of the NPPF. On this basis, the NDP's site search (at Appendix C) is inappropriate, in that it automatically dismisses this site without consideration as to whether an element of the site would be suitable for allocation.</p> <p>The PPG requires an appraisal of options and an assessment of sites against clearly identified criteria</p> | <p>on the advice of Tewkesbury Borough Council in early 2017.</p> <p>In the draft site assessment the site east of St Margaret's Drive (17) was not one of the higher scoring sites and the site was considered to have significant constraints including potential impact on the AONB, adverse impact on the nearby heritage asset of the church and limited access.</p> <p>It would be inappropriate for the NDP to allocate a site for housing which has recently been dismissed on appeal.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>(PPG: 41-042-20140306). This does not seem to have occurred in this instance, and as such the draft plan would fail to accord with the Basic Conditions test set out in legislation.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments on the draft NDP in more detail, and we would like to be kept informed of the NDP's progress.</p> | | |
| <p>Foxley Tagg Planning Ltd. Normandy House, 305 -309 High Street, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 3FB</p> | <p>Sally Tagg, Managing Director</p> | <p>Local Green Space designation</p> | <p>OBJECTION Re: Alderton Neighbourhood Plan Local Green Space Designation</p> <p>I write on behalf of Mr & Mrs Wakeman who own the Gardner's Arms pub in Alderton. They would like to object to the designation of their private property as local</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>This space already has a level of protection through Tewkesbury Borough Council's designation of the area as an Important Open Space in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans.</p> | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Delete proposed Local Green Space at Gardeners Arms Public House.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>green space and as such Foxley Tagg has been instructed on their behalf to make this representation.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan talks of 'open space to the south and west of' the Gardener's Arms. This is inaccurate since the land is very much part of the curtilage of the public house functioning as the garden and can be associated with the operation of the public house. The description suggests that the land is adjacent to the public house when it is in fact very much a part of the curtilage.</p> <p>NPPF Criteria</p> <p>Local green space designation guidance is as follows:</p> | <p>This site is accordingly withdrawn from LGS designation in the ANDP but included as an Important Open Space.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p><i>The local Green Space Designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>☐ Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves</i> <i>☐ Where the green area is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness in wildlife.</i> <i>☐ Where a green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i> <p>The guidance therefore sets out some specific and clear criteria</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|----------|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>which the proposed green space must meet in order to be suitable for designation. We will examine these in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ The green space is in close proximity to the community ☐ It has not been demonstrated how the land is special to the local community. Indeed the land is private and should only be used by patrons of the pub. ☐ The land is simply a pub garden lined by hedges & trees – there is <i>no inherent beauty</i>. ☐ No historical significance – there are <i>no known historical reasons</i> for designating this land. ☐ The land is private and should only be used by patrons of the | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|----------|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>public house therefore there <i>cannot be said to be any recreational value.</i></p> <p>☐ The land is in the centre of the village, surrounded by roads and housing so <i>cannot be said to be tranquil.</i></p> <p>☐ The site constitutes a grass lawn with some unprotected and non-specific trees so there can be <i>no richness of wildlife</i> on the site.</p> <p>☐ The garden is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Therefore, while the land can be said to meet the first and third of these criteria, it clearly fails the second criterion.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---|----------|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Neighbourhood Plan reasoning</p> <p>The Alderton Neighbourhood Plan does give two reasons for the listing of the land as a proposed green space designation.</p> <p><i>1. Affords open views to neighbouring hills in the Cotswolds AONB</i></p> <p>As the photo below demonstrates, the trees on the site block any views through the site meaning that the countryside is not visible through the garden. Appendix E of the Neighbourhood Plan supports this view by stating that the view across the allotments to Oxenton and Dixton Hills is from the rear of the Gardener’s Arms. Therefore the view across the pub garden does not contribute to the vista.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Furthermore only half of consultees agreed that this was a significant view. Overall this reason does not stand up to scrutiny.</p> <p><i>2. Provides a green space within the residential boundary of the village</i></p> <p>The site does not provide a useable, public green space. The land is contained by boundary hedging and trees, and should only be used by patrons of the public house. Nor is this the only green space in the village – the extensive allotments opposite and the grounds of the church provide more significant and more important open spaces in the village.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>A final point is that the public house garden is opposite to the village allotment which serves all of the purposes outlined in the criteria above (beauty, recreational value, tranquillity and richness of wildlife) far better than the garden of the Gardener's Arms which is made up of a small section of lawn, hedges and a number of trees. As a consequence it is considered to be unnecessary to protect a small area of private garden when it sits so close to an area which delivers all of the criteria laid out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is considered that the reasoning behind this designation fails to meet the criteria set out in the</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>NPPF.</p> <p>The open view of the countryside has been demonstrated to be a spurious argument. Indeed the community have not been formally asked about the views across the public house. It appears that their responses to a different question have been used as evidence for this designation, which is inappropriate.</p> <p>Ultimately the land is of little value in respect of the arguments asserted other than other than as used by the owners as an important part of their business, which as a village pub is a community asset. As such this designation as local green space should be removed from the</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | Alderton Neighbourhood Plan. | | |
| Mr & Mrs R. Jones The Old Rectory Church Road Alderton, Glos GL20 8NR | | Local Green Spaces Para. 4.3.10 | OBJECTION My wife and I whilst particularly keen to keep Alderton `Green` or as Green as possible, no longer wish that our garden, The Old Rectory Garden be listed as part of the local Green Space Designation. Whilst we are custodians of this property it will, in our hands, remain Green. This is a listed building & there will be no attempts to build on, or plans put forward for any development at this location. Since we first considered putting this forward as a local green space, we have concerns about a further plan for development behind us on a site where development has twice been refused and refused on | Accepted. The garden forms part of the setting of the heritage asset and as such would be afforded some level of protection from inappropriate development. The site does not meet the criteria for Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF. This site is accordingly withdrawn from LGS designation in the ANDP. | Amend Plan. Delete proposed Local Green Space at The Old Rectory. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>appeal. We are concerned also that development could take place on land in front of us & which could in turn also pose concerns regarding access to our property from the drive from Church Rd to our property. We are now in our later years and have no intentions of moving away from the property at the moment. We do feel however that if future developments do affect us and we were inclined to leave because of that, having our location designated a local green space might cause constraints that could affect us if we wished to sell.</p> <p>We support fully the Local Neighbourhood Plan and attempts to keep the South East boundaries of Alderton free from</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>development for the foreseeable future. With the current developments taking place already traffic in Dibden Lane poses almost daily hazards and confrontations with buses and lorries in Dibden Lane are frequent and becoming inevitable. Several, in fact many villagers have voiced concerns that even with the current developments at present approved, in a few years we will find it very difficult if not impossible to get in our out of our village. Some are finding that already. We are so thankful that Alderton has a Village Plan that can hopefully take care of the future of the area and those of us who live here. With best regards and thanks.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| Gloucester Diocese Property Dept Church House College Green Gloucester GL1 2LY | Paula Taylor, Estates & Development Mgr | Local Green Spaces Para. 4.3.10 | <p><u>OBJECTION: 0158 Rectory Garden – Alderton – Proposed designation as a Local Green Space</u></p> <p>I refer to your letter of 15th November regarding the above. I am pleased to hear of the Parish Council's progress towards producing a Neighbourhood Plan. However, I am afraid that we cannot support your draft proposal seeking to designate the garden of the Rectory as a Local Green Space. I have taken advice from our retained expert on Planning and related matters. We are advised that it is completely inappropriate to seek to a LGS designation on a private residential garden. Whilst it might be a nice garden, it cannot possibly meet the criteria set out</p> | Accepted as above. | Amend Plan. Delete proposed Local Green Space at The Old Rectory. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 1: Objections | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>in paragraph TT of the National Planning Policy Framework. I am sorry but we must ask that you reconsider this proposal and request that it is not taken forward in any published draft of your neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Our stance is not because of any secret intended development plans (there are none) but simply because LGS designation of the Rectory garden is inappropriate and unjustified in Planning terms. Please do feel free to telephone me if you wish to discuss this matter further.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| 3. Tewkesbury Borough Council 3.3.16 email | Nick Croft | | <p>Thank you for consulting Tewkesbury Borough Council on your consultation draft Alderton Neighbourhood Plan (ANP). The response is provided at officer level and offers constructive advice to assist the neighbourhood plan group in refining their plan. Further advice was provided during ongoing meetings with parish representatives. This schedule should also be read in conjunction with advice previously provided by the LPA.</p> <p>A Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA) screening opinion was undertaken in 2015, which concluded that SEA is not required. The plan has not changed substantially since that SEA screening was undertaken such that it would require the screening opinion to be re-visited at this point in the plan's preparation.</p> | Noted with thanks. | Amendments have been made according to advice given by the LPA, including updated references to the SEA process and the Saved Policies in the Tewkesbury Local Plan. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>References to the strategic policies of the adopted development relate to the 'saved' policies of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011. Not all policies were saved. The list of those that were saved is set out in this letter from the Secretary of State which is available on the TBC website at: http://tewkesbury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=1902</p> <p>The government's planning practice guidance states that: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|----------|--------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.</p> <p>Our comments below are mindful of this advice. Additional guidance on writing policies can be found on the <i>Locality</i> website http://mycommunityrights.org.uk</p> <p>In terms of the adequacy and robustness of the evidence used to substantiate the policies and sites contained in the NDP you might find the two documents below useful:</p> <p>☐ Planning Aid - How to gather and use evidence</p> <p>http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How_to_gather_and_use_evidence.pdf</p> <p>☐ Locality – Site Assessment for</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|-----------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>http://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NP-Site-Assessment-Toolkit-Final-version.pdf</p> <p>As an overarching comment, the draft neighbourhood plan is very well written, supported with references to existing and emerging policy and is clearly structured.</p> | | |
| | | Plan dates | <p>The plan base-date has been changed to 2016.</p> <p>The base date for emerging development plans (the JCS and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan) is 2011. To align with the housing figures on which these overarching plans are based the NDP needs to use the same base date. The actual date that a particular version of plan is published can</p> | Accepted. | Amend all references to base date to 2011. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>be put separately – for example the front cover of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 states that it was adopted March 2006, but it has a base date of 1991. If a different base date is used for the NDP then this will require a new set of housing figures to be used.</p> <p>The front cover and Page 6 needs amending accordingly. Plus elsewhere in the plan that this is referred to.</p> | | |
| | | Para 2.6 | <p>The LPA notes the statement in the plan about the need for updating and review. It is helpful to include this information so that readers are aware that as changes occur plans require updating.</p> <p>It would be the qualifying body's role to update/review their plan although at present the legal regulations do not</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance has been updated recently to provide advice about reviewing NDPs.</p> | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Amend the section on monitoring and review to:</p> <p>“The Parish Council will monitor the use of the NDP policies in decisions</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | provide a process for undertaking a review as such. | | <p>on planning applications and report annually to the public Parish Meeting in April of each year.</p> <p>To respond to changing circumstances and to monitor housing provision across the Parish, ANDP policies may be subject to full review and amendment following the adoption of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan. The Parish Council will make a decision about whether to update the ANDP, taking into account the most up to date information and</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | | <p>planning policy advice and guidance at that time.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance¹ provides recently updated advice about reviewing NDPs:</p> <p>(Insert relevant PPG paragraphs)”</p> |
| | | Para 2.9 | Typo '2104' | Accepted. | Amended |
| | | Housing section | It is noted that some of the information provided by the LPA on an earlier draft has | Noted. | No change. |

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | been incorporated at various points in this section to demonstrate how the plan has been prepared within the objectively assessed housing need for the wider borough. | | |
| | | Para 4.1.4 | <p>With regards the future proofing of the document, TBC previously advised that “in some places it would be better to refer to the ‘adopted development plan’ to future-proof your policies”.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, where specific policies in the adopted dev plan are being referred to it would be helpful to state that adopted plan’s name. It’s only when you’re referring to the adopted Dev plan generically that it future-proofs it.</p> <p>Apologies for any confusion! The adopted plan comprises the saved</p> | Noted. | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Revise text in 4.1.4 and elsewhere as advised.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|-----------|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | policies of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011. | | |
| | | Para 4.1.5 | This last sentence 'A Housing Needs Assessment for Alderton Parish in 2010 identified 8 households as requiring affordable housing at that time.' could be put at the end of para 4.1.6 as a housing needs assessment is a pre-requisite for rural exception development not general market-led development. | Accepted. | Amend Plan. Move relevant text to supporting text referring to rural exception housing. |
| | | Para 4.1.19 | TBC's housing enabling officer has advised in relation to Para 4.1.19 – last sentence that 'The remaining 16 homes are 2- or 3-bed homes offered by a housing association under a shared ownership scheme.' is inaccurate, change to 'The remaining 16 homes are 1-, 2- and 3-bed homes offered by a housing association as Affordable Rents and Shared Ownership.' | Accepted. | Amend Plan. Insert revised text into supporting text for housing chapter: "The remaining 16 homes are 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom homes offered |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>You may want to also add in the Willow Bank Road development with 24 homes (market homes are 3, 4 and 5 beds I think, or larger!) of which 9 affordable homes as 2- and 3-bed houses as Affordable Rent and Discounted Sale.</p> | | <p>by a housing association as Affordable Rents and Shared Ownership. Nine 2- and 3- bedroom Affordable Rent and Discounted Sale homes are being built on a 24-dwelling site on Willow Bank Road, the remainder (62%) being 3-,4- and 5-bedroom homes."</p> |
| | | Pg.35 first para | <p>Paragraph numbering typo.</p> <p>Reference to 'local needs' – the ANDP is prepared within the context of the wider borough's housing needs. The objectively assessed need is for Tewkesbury borough as a whole. It is important that the plan is clearly prepared within such a framework</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Vision Statements etc still refer to local need as this is in response to evidence from local community based</p> | <p>Amend Typo.</p> <p>Amend Plan to refer to Objectively Assessed Housing Need (Section 2).</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | as per comments raised previously and suggested text in respect of 'Objectively Assessed Housing Needs'. | consultations. | |
| | | Para 4.1.11 <i>Service villages</i> | The number of settlements qualifying as service villages is subject to change through the JCS examination and further work undertaken to prepare the Tewkesbury Borough Plan therefore to future proof the NDP it would probably be better not to include reference to '13'. | Accepted. | Delete references to number of Service villages. |
| | | Para 4.1.21 <i>Housing needs</i> | The housing needs for the NDP need to be considered within the wider context of Tewkesbury Borough's housing needs as set out in the JCS Housing Background Paper. | Accepted. References to the Housing Background Paper are included in the supporting text. | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | Para 4.1.22 | <p>Para 4.1.22 – First sentence need to change 24 to 25 (16 at Beckford Road, 9 at Willow Bank Road).</p> <p>Also, after the first sentence they could add “Households with close connections to the Parish and immediate surrounding Parishes have been given priority for these 25 new affordable homes”. Gives some justification to the first sentence of how locally identified needs from 2010 may have been met.</p> | Accepted. | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Amend figure of 24 to “25” in text referring to Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Insert additional text:</p> <p>“Households with close connections to the Parish and immediate surrounding Parishes have been given priority for these 25 new affordable homes.”</p> |
| | | Para 4.1.28 Site assessments | It is noted that para 4.1.28 states that a site assessment was carried out reviewing “all deliverable sites around Alderton village”. Appendix C sets out more details of the work that was undertaken by the qualifying body. The comments of local | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Steering Committee has undertaken a comprehensive</p> | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>residents are provided in Appendix B. In terms of the adequacy and robustness of the evidence used to substantiate site selection you might find the Locality – Site Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans document useful (in particular the checklist at the back):</p> <p>http://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NP-Site-Assessment-Toolkit-Final-version.pdf</p> | <p>draft technical site assessment process of all sites in a 360 degree ring around the village, to help guide any decisions about possible site allocations.</p> <p>However following further discussions, the Steering Committee decided that there was no need to allocate a proposed housing site in the ANDP at the current time.</p> | |
| | | Policy H1 1-2 | For the sake of precision, it may be advisable to replace “1-2 properties” with | Noted. | Amend Plan |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | dwellings | “up to two dwellings” in the policy. | New policy wording has been used to avoid restriction on numbers. | Amend Policy H1 to read: “Within the settlement boundary of Alderton village, as shown on Map 4 Policies Map, small windfall and infill housing development of 1 – 2 dwellings will be supported...” |
| | | Policy H1 Infill | <p>The inclusion of a definition of the term “infill” either in the policy or in the Glossary would provide greater precision.</p> <p>One such definition is provided in Policy HOU3 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan. If the term is to refer to a settlement boundary, a plan showing the village with the settlement boundary and the criteria used in delineating that boundary would be required.</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Revise wording to refer to settlement boundary and include the proposed settlement boundary on the Policies Map.</p> | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Identify Settlement Boundary on Policies Map.</p> <p>Insert additional supporting text: “The settlement boundary for Alderton is identified on Map 4</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>If the settlement boundary set out in the TBLP is being relied upon for this policy then this needs to be clearly stated and justified – for example have there been any changes in the settlement’s form since it was adopted in March 2006 that would require the settlement boundary to be re-drawn? Whatever methodology is used for delineating the boundary then this needs to be applied consistently around the whole settlement.</p> <p>The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to these types of development are policies HOU2 - 14 where in conformity with the NPPF (please note that recent inspectors’ decisions on applications in the borough have placed little weight on some of the TBLP HOU</p> | | <p>Policies Map. The settlement boundary has been identified using the proposed settlement boundary in the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan and updated to include within it existing commitments / recent developments.”</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | policies due to that plan's end date being 2011). In the emerging TBP policies HOU2-8 cover these type of issues and the emerging JCS policy SD11 relates to housing infilling issues. | | |
| | | Policy H2 | <p>It would be clearer if the sources of the requirement to increase the allocation of Alderton as a Service Village – the JCS and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan – were referred to in the policy rather than rely on the reference in accompanying text.</p> <p>How does the qualifying body intend planning applications for housing to be considered in a location that is not the preferred site identified under Policy H2.</p> <p>Currently there does not appear to be provision for this other than the generic 'character' style policies later on in the</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The former Policy H2 has been deleted in the Submission Plan. This is because the proposed housing requirement of 51 new units has been met through existing commitments / recent developments. The</p> | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Delete former Policy H2.</p> <p>New Policy H1 will be used to guide new housing proposals within the settlement boundary.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | plan, and the existing saved policies from the TBLP insofar as they are still up to date. | preferred housing site with justification is noted in the supporting text. | |
| | | Policy H3 <i>AONB</i> | In addition to the policies of the AONB management plan. The AONB policy (LND1) in the TBLP was not saved. The emerging policy in the JCS is Policy SD8. | Noted. Amend Policy H3. | Amend Plan. Delete references to LND1. |
| | | Policy H4 <i>Rural exception sites</i> | The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to these types of development are policies HOU13 and 14 where in conformity with the NPPF. Development of rural exception sites is covered by the emerging JCS policy SD13 (7) | Accepted. | Amend Policy references as advised. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | Policy H5 <i>Affordable homes</i> | The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to these types of development are policies HOU13 and 14 where in conformity with the NPPF. Affordable housing is covered by the emerging JCS policy SD13. | Accepted. | Amend Policy references as advised. |
| | | Policy H6 <i>Density</i> | Reference to 'development adjacent to Alderton village' implies that this Policy does not also relate to infill development supported under Policy H1. Reference to 'development within and adjacent to Alderton village' may clarify that all residential development is subject to this policy. | Accepted. | Amend Plan. The Policy wording referring to density has been moved to the design Policy LC1. The wording of the criteria now refers to "Residential development within the Settlement Boundary ..." |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|-----------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | Policy H7 <i>Housing mix</i> | Housing mix is covered by emerging JCS policy SD12. | Noted. | The Policy wording has been amended to improve clarity. |
| | | Policy LC1 <i>Local distinctiveness</i> | Design is covered by emerging JCS policy SD5, TBP emerging policies DES2 and HER4 relate to design matters. Other policies cover listed buildings/conservation areas. | Accepted. | Amend Policy references as suggested. |
| | | Policy LC2 <i>'Development proposals are not supported in areas of high visual sensitivity as defined in Map 6.'</i> | <p>If it were satisfactorily demonstrated that a proposal did not adversely affect the landscape then would it be reasonable to refuse planning permission on those grounds?</p> <p>The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to landscape issues are: policies LND2, 4, 6, 7.</p> <p>The emerging JCS policies SD7 and 8 relate to landscape matters.</p> | Accepted. | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Amend text of LC2 to</p> <p>“Development proposals in the Parish which require planning consent will be required to show how design and siting have taken into consideration any adverse impacts on areas</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | The emerging TBP policies ENV1-6 relate to the environment/landscape. | | <p>of landscape and visual sensitivity (see Maps 6 and 7).</p> <p>Proposals should demonstrate how they will integrate into the Special Landscape Area and the AONB by ..”</p> <p>Amend Policy References as suggested.</p> |
| | | Policy LC3 <i>Heritage assets - ‘may not be supported if there is an unacceptab</i> | The use of the word ‘may’ accepts some unacceptable impact on setting to occur – the replacement of the word ‘may’ with ‘would’ stands firmly against unacceptable impact but allows for some ‘acceptable’ impact. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>On the further advice of TBC this Policy has been withdrawn.</p> | Policy withdrawn. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|-----------|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <i>le impact on the setting'.</i> | | | |
| | | Policy LC4 <i>Lighting - 'around the location'</i> | This is rather imprecise – does this mean the village, parts of the village or the parish as a whole? Or does it refer to the specific place in which the item is sited? | Accepted. | Amend Plan. Incorporate relevant wording into LC2. Amend wording to: “External lighting should be minimised to avoid light pollution. Street lighting is not supported in any area of the Parish. Street furniture and signage should be kept to the minimum required for safety and ease of movement.” |
| | | Para 4.3.1 | See reference to Para 4.1.4 | Noted. | Amend Plan. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | | Revise 4.1.4 to refer to saved and emerging policies. |
| | | Local Green Spaces text pgs.50-53 and policy LE3 | <p>It is noted that the ANDP proposes areas of Local Green Space (LGS). The plan goes on to cross reference the National Planning Policy Framework paras 76-78 and, in Table 1, considers each parcel of land in respect of its suitability against the NPPF criteria. The section of the NPPF reproduced in para 4.3.10 notes that development in these locations would be ruled out “other than in very special circumstances”. Does the ANDP have specific criteria in respect of what these circumstances might comprise? According to the NPPF, the policy approach should be consistent with policy for Green Belts see paragraph 89 of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is noted that whilst designation of LGS</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed Local Green Spaces have been amended in the Submission Plan following objections from local landowners.</p> <p>The 2 Local Green Spaces at the Old Rectory and Vicarage Gardens, and the Gardeners’ Arms are no longer proposed as Local</p> | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>does not depend on the permission of the landowner, and in some ways is therefore akin to any other planning use designation, the government’s Planning Practice Guidance (paragraphs ID37-019-20140306 and ID37-20-201403063) states that contact should be made with landowners at “an early stage” about any proposals to designate their land. Landowners will then have “opportunities to make representations in respect of the proposals” appearing in a draft plan.</p> <p>Accordingly it is noted that the qualifying body states the respective landowners are included in the list of bodies being consulted. There is no Local Green Space policy in the saved or emerging development plans. The NPPF criteria therefore need to be considered in respect</p> | <p>Green Spaces.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement includes copies of letters to local landowners of all proposed Local Green Spaces advising them of the intention in the NDP to include their land as Local Green Space and inviting any comments.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | of general conformity. | | |
| | | Policy LE1 <i>Protecting the environment - 'designated landscapes'</i> | <p>The plan needs to be clear how this policy links with LC2.</p> <p>The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to landscape issues are: policies LND2, 4, 6, 7.</p> <p>The emerging JCS policies SD7 and 8 relate to landscape matters.</p> <p>The emerging TBP policies ENV1-6 relate to the environment/landscape.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>This Policy has been revised and now refers to sustainable design.</p> <p>The 2 sections on Environment have been edited to improve clarity and consistency.</p> <p>Section 4.2 refers to local Built and Landscape Character and Section 4.3 refers</p> | <p>Amend Policy References as suggested.</p> <p>No further change.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | to Wildlife and (general) Environment. | |
| | | Policy LE2 <i>Biodiversity</i> <i>Geodiversity</i> | <p>The policy as currently worded catches ‘all’ new development.</p> <p>There may be instances where it is not appropriate for a development proposal (for example minor householder development) to provide all of the aspects required under this policy.</p> <p>The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to these issues are: policies NCN3, NCN5 and NCN6 for nature conservation, where these are in conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>The emerging JCS policy SD10 biodiversity.</p> <p>The emerging TBP policies ENV4-6 relate to the environment.</p> | Accepted. | <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Amend Policy wording to: “Development proposals in the Parish which require planning consent, other than for small infill or minor domestic extensions, will be required to ...”</p> <p>Amend Policy references as suggested.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | | |
| | | Policy LE3 <i>Local Green Space</i> | See comment above on LGS pgs.50-53 | Noted. | No further change. |
| | | Policy LR1 <i>Allotments</i> - <i>“alternative provision”</i> | To ensure that any allotment space lost is not replaced by an inferior facility it might be prudent to add the wording “..of at least the same quality..” after ‘provision’. The adopted dev plan policy on allotments is TBLP saved policy RCN10 | Noted. The existing allotments are also protected as Local Green Spaces in the Submission Plan. The amended Allotments Policy also refers to the proposed new area of allotments to be provided on adjoining land south of the | Amend plan. Insert new policy wording for allotments policy: “Allotments in Alderton are protected from alternative uses or redevelopment. The allotments include the existing area of allotments identified as a Local Green Space in NDP Policy LE3: Protecting Local Green |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | | Charles Church housing development. The Parish Council wishes to protect all allotments from development and does not consider that re-provision should be supported. The amended policy wording reflects this. | Spaces and Important Open Space, and the new area of allotments, adjoining the existing allotments to the west. Both allotments are identified on Map 4 Alderton NDP Policies Map.” Amend Policy References as suggested. |
| | | Policy LR2 <i>Community Facilities</i> | The last line of the first para needs a slight revision to read correctly. The adopted dev plan policy on community facilities is TBLP saved policy GNL15. Also see emerging JCS policy INF5. | Accepted. Advisability of cross referencing with emerging plans is | The Policy has been revised slightly in editing and no further changes are proposed. Amend Policy References |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) has commented that it considers the plan is useful for guiding development and conveys the important criteria for assessing future development within the parish.</p> <p>There is little information as regards community infrastructure requirements arising from new developments (education, libraries, health etc). These are detailed in the Tewkesbury Borough Plan and the JCS in more detail. It would be useful to cross refer these in the neighbourhood plan where relevant.</p> <p>Reference to means of supporting or funding infrastructure would also be useful. The Community Infrastructure Levy</p> | <p>noted.</p> <p>The ANDP focuses on local community assets and infrastructure.</p> <p>Amended wording in Section 1.26 Accessibility explains that secondary schools, libraries, medical and dental and other health facilities are not available in the Parish and are therefore beyond the scope of the</p> | <p>as suggested.</p> |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>may be particularly relevant to the parish, where a neighbourhood plan is in place, and it has been through a referendum.</p> <p>At present the draft NDP focuses on certain community requirements as set out in the Overarching vision statement – for example that “The Parish ...has services commensurate with its population’s needs”. This is helpful in terms of the vision but could usefully be expanded on.</p> <p>Draft Policy LR2 is an appropriate location for such elaboration, specifically broader infrastructure requirements (community infrastructure such as schools, libraries, health facilities whether they are within the Parish, or without). This could be achieved through cross-referencing to Tewkesbury’s Plan or to the JCS, and/or</p> | <p>ANDP.</p> <p>The policy as worded states that development proposals that bring improvement to recreational facilities will be generally supported.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | GCC's Developer Guide. | | |
| | | Policy E1 <i>Alderton settlements</i> " | Do you mean 'Alderton village' itself or 'settlements within Alderton Parish'? The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies that relate to these types of development are EMP2, EMP3, EMP4 and EMP5 where in conformity with the NPPF. The emerging JCS policy SD2 relates to employment issues. In the emerging TBP policies EMP2-5 cover these type of issues. | Noted. | Amend Plan. Amend Policy to refer to settlements within Alderton Parish. Amend Policy References as suggested |
| | | Policy E2 <i>Tourism</i> | If compliance with all criteria are pre-requisite (rather than to just one), it might be better to include the word 'and' at the end of the third criteria. Proposals that relate to tourism development are currently considered using the saved Tewkesbury Borough Local | Accepted. Amend Policy as suggested. | Amend Plan. Insert "and" at the end of criteria. Amend Policy References as suggested |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|----------|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | Plan policies TOR1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 where in conformity with the NPPF. The emerging JCS policy SD2 (supporting text) and SD3 relate to tourist issues. In the emerging TBP policies TOR1 and 2 cover these type of issues. | | |
| | | Policy RP1 <i>Healthy lifestyles</i> | The use of S106 restrictions will need to be considered in relation to the tests set out in regulation 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended. The tests are: 1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms 2. directly related to the development; and 3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development - See more at: http://www.pas.gov.uk/3-community-infrastructure-levy-cil/ | Noted. | Amend Plan. Amend Policy to improve clarity and consistency with CIL Regulations. Amend Policy wording to: “Proposals to improve the potential for walking and cycling to community facilities and nearby towns and |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>/journal_content/56/332612/4090701/ARTICLE#sthash.mkgea7NB.dpuf</p> <p>The saved Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan policies TPT1, TPT3, TPT5 and TPT6 relate to access and transport, and public transport corridors are covered by saved Policy TPT9 insofar as they are in conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>The emerging JCS policies INF1 and INF2 relate to access and the transport network. The emerging TBP policies TRAC1 and 2 relate to cycling and walking. TRAC3 relates to public transport.</p> | | <p>villages will be supported.</p> <p>New development should be designed to include access to existing walking, cycling and passenger transport networks to enable and encourage maximum potential use.”</p> <p>(Wording related to actions by the parish Council has been moved to the supporting text.)</p> <p>Amend Policy References as suggested</p> |
| | | Policy RP2 <i>Car parking</i> | There is no saved policy in the TBLP relating to this issue. | Noted. | Amend Plan. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | Emerging JCS policy SD5 (vii) refers to parking provision in new developments. See NPPF para 39 in relation to the criteria that should be used if setting local car parking standards. | | Amend Policy wording to: “Development proposals in the Parish which require planning consent should, where possible: 1. Provide onsite parking at a minimum rate of 1.5 spaces per dwelling; or 2. Make available in the vicinity of the development some suitable provision for off-road parking for households and visitors with vans as well as private cars.” |
| | | Para 4.6.6 <i>Car sharing</i> | GCC Highways have commented that – it does not consider that a car sharing scheme would be effective in Alderton. Car | Accepted. | Para 4.6.6 deleted |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>sharing is generally only effective in large built up areas where car parking and ownership is restricted, I believe that even in Gloucester the scheme was not successful. As the policy only states it is to investigate the possibility of this, it is not particularly opposed, but it is worth flagging up. Improvements to bus services are unlikely to be able to be secured given the size of potential development coming forward in the area, any sc106 towards bus improvements would unlikely to be considered as 'cost effective improvements' in line with the NPPF. The additional patronage generated by the new developments is also unlikely to be significant enough to sustain improved services.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 2: Tewkesbury Borough Council | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | Section 5 <i>Monitoring</i> | The intention to review the plan is noted, however there is no mechanism within the regulations currently to facilitate this therefore such an ambition is likely to be difficult to achieve. | Noted – see above. | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| 4. Natural England | Tom Amos, Land Use Adviser, | | <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 20 January 2016.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Natural England does not have the resources to respond in detail to all neighbourhood plans and we will prioritise the plans that are most likely to impact on internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites, and/or require Strategic Environmental Assessment or screening for Habitats Regulations</p> | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Assessment.</p> <p>We welcome the development of the neighbourhood plan and refer you to our previous comments from earlier consultations.</p> <p>We value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.</p> | | |
| 5. Historic England | David Stuart, Historic Places Adviser South West, | | <p>Thank you for your consultation on the draft Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>We were consulted by Tewkesbury Borough Council on the SEA Screening Determination for the Plan in July last year. In confirming that we had no</p> | <p>Thank you and comments noted.</p> <p>The site allocation has been deleted.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>objection to the view that an SEA would not be required we also took the opportunity to view the emerging Plan. We were additionally able to confirm that there were no comments on its contents which we wished to make other than to express our pleasure at the provision which the Plan made for the protection of local character and distinctive heritage of the area.</p> <p>Our only additional observation now in light of the updated version of the Plan relates to Draft Policy H2 which develops previous Draft Policy A1(b). We appreciate the qualified nature of this provision for additional housing and that any development will need to satisfy other policies in the Plan relating to local character and landscape (as well of course as relevant policies in the National</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan). In specifying that 25 homes is acceptable rather than citing an “up to” figure the policy as drafted will need to be sure that the site is capable of delivering this number while in accordance with those other policies which may also apply. We would therefore highlight the need for the Plan to be able to substantiate this figure with demonstrable evidence.</p> <p>Otherwise we would wish only to congratulate your community on the progress it has made to date and wish it well in the completion of its Plan.</p> | | |
| 6. Gloucestershire County Council | Rob Niblett Planning Officer | | Thank you for consulting Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) on the above matter. I have the following officer level comments to make. As you are aware GCC has previously made comments on this | Thank you for your comments. The Statement of Basic Conditions will | Amend Plan. For greater clarity, a list of services not available in the Parish such as |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>document.</p> <p>Community Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is useful for guiding development and conveys the important criteria for assessing future development within the parish. • There is little information as regards community infrastructure requirements arising from new developments (education, libraries, health etc). GCC understands that these are detailed in the Tewkesbury Borough Plan and the JCS in more detail. It would be useful to cross refer these in the neighbourhood plan where relevant. • Reference to means of supporting or funding infrastructure would be | list links to the Borough Council's emerging Local Plan. | those listed in brackets will be added to 1.24 Accessibility. Reference to relevant e-TBP/e-JCS policies will be added below each policy statement. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>useful. The Community Infrastructure Levy may be particularly relevant to the parish, where a neighbourhood plan is in place, and it has been through a referendum.</p> <p>At present the draft NDP focuses on certain community requirements as set out in the Overarching vision statement – for example that “The Parish ...has services commensurate with its population’s needs”. This is helpful in terms of the vision but could usefully be expanded on. Draft Policy LR2 is an appropriate location for such elaboration, specifically broader infrastructure requirements (community infrastructure such as schools, libraries, health facilities whether they are within the Parish, or without). This could be</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 3: Statutory consultees | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name of organisation | Name of contact | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | <p>achieved through cross-referencing to Tewkesbury's Plan or to the JCS, and/or GCC's Developer Guide.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss any of the points raised above please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| 7. Ali Armishaw, Gretton View, Alderton | | Thank you for all the obvious hard work, research and writing that has gone into this document. It is excellent. Thank you on behalf of the village (if I may so bold!) - we are very lucky to have such professional expertise in our midst. | Thank you and comments noted. | No change |
| 8. Jon and Liz Rea, Alderton | | No Objection to providing housing to provide a thriving and evolving village however it should be keep in scale and proportionate to the village size. This could be achieved with sympathetic planning and building by infilling in suitable sites within the existing areas of the village. By restricting building to a reasonable level this should not put a strain on the | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>existing services in the village such as water, sewerage , education, internet access, transport, roadways and parking</p> <p>It would seem sensible for Local Authorities to plan and establish larger housing sites closer to Industrial and Commercial centres so that people can travel easily and cheaply to work without putting further strain on transport services, to reduce pollution, minimise the need for new roads and reduce accidents.</p> <p>A more minor suggestion would be for a children’s play area/playground to be established in a more central position within the village.</p> | | |
| 9. Martyn Ellis, | | Firstly well done on an excellent document. I can see that a lot of hard work has gone into it and it's good to see | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| Alderton | | <p>the cross-referencing to the ever-changing list of linked planning policies at different levels. I think the document is comprehensive and well prepared to cover the main issues affecting our village. I really hope that when the plan is adopted it will give us the authority that it deserves. And that planning and highway discussions across Parish/Borough/County will become more joined-up.</p> <p>I have a couple of rhetorical questions:</p> <p>1. If this is a PLAN, should it have specific targets and measures? (I ask this having little knowledge of how a NDP should be constructed but if the plan is to be reviewed at regular intervals, how will we know if the plan has worked?)</p> <p>2. Should we now 'test' the plan by</p> | <p>There is an aim to review the NDP as and when appropriate eg when the new Tewkesbury Local Plan is adopted. The NDP Policies can then be assessed to see whether they have been effective, how they may be amended and whether they require updating.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>creating a short list of different current/future risk scenarios and then predicting how the plan would cope? Then make improvements if necessary.</p> <p>3. I am reminded about a couple of local issues that have created problems for our village and ask if the PLAN would have influenced the result ?:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a) The unfortunate narrowing of the road adjacent to Alderton Grange. The result of development is now that 2 vehicles can no longer pass each other on this stretch of road without mounting the verge and/or the pavement. (A new Policy RP?, Page 64 on preserving the established smooth and safe passage of traffic where development is carried out with appropriate reinstatement if necessary)</p> | <p>Testing of the ANDP has been undertaken throughout the preparation of the Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council has referred this point to Glos Highways. NDPs are limited in terms of policy making which can determine highways matters.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>b) The antics of (name supplied) who has now apparently started a new local enterprise adjacent to Gretton View. By cutting through an established hedgerow to create an unsafe road access and by planting some ridiculous boundary hedging, he is now a sheep farmer ?? (Draft Policy E1, Page 61 would suggest we have no objection unless he makes a noise). Should we have a section in the PLAN for Other Development ?</p> <p>Thanks again for all your hard work and please excuse my Meldrewing. No need to reply except to confirm that you have received the email.</p> <p>Good luck with the next stage.</p> | Policy E1 refers to the re-use of buildings. | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| 10. Peter & Jennifer Whittingham | | <p>First let me compliment the committee for a very thorough and professional plan, which certainly reflects our own views. We only hope we have sufficient clout to make it work and not become a worthless exercise.</p> <p>We strongly feel that any permitted development should be preceded by the establishment of the necessary infrastructure to support it sustainably. At present our current infrastructure can barely cope with our existing population and is shared with neighbouring villages and Winchcombe. Our schools are certainly in need of expansion and medical services unable to take on any more new patients. Transport is woefully inadequate for the carless residents. Large vehicles such as lorries etc. should be excluded from our lanes as they</p> | Thank you and comments noted. | No change |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>represent a real hazard and do serious damage to the verges and road surfaces. Can our sewerage system cope with the additional housing that has already been permitted, will our church, its cemetery or our village hall?</p> <p>Now our area is being asked to accommodate a large influx of Immigrants who will make greater demands on education, housing our own young people were expecting to acquire and of course our medical services. All this represents an alarming prospect for the near future. We sincerely hope that our Cotswold villages can be preserved like listed buildings and not absorbed into the concrete jungle for future generations to inherit.</p> | | |
| 11. Ian Day, | 4.3.12 | The proposed local green spaces, as agreed by community consultation 5 and | Thank you for your comments. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| Alderton | Pg 50 & 51 | <p>confirmed again at Consultation 6, are:</p> <p>The amendment I would like to recommend to the Development plan is as follows</p> <p>There are currently 5 areas of land listed in the above section , I would like to suggest a 6th area be added to the list in the Development Plan namely the Alderton Playing Fields on the Beckford Road adjacent to the Football pitch and children’s play area.</p> <p>The Playing Fields have currently displayed a notice board stating This Field is Protected Forever through the Queen Elizabeth 2nd Fields Challenge from Fields in Trust. I am not sure if this statement of protection excludes its need to be included in the Development Plan, however it a vital asset to the</p> | <p>The Parish Council owned Playing Field/football pitch is already included in the ANDP as a LGS proposal. No change made.</p> <p>The adjacent smaller playing field retained by the GCC as a school playing field and used only for occasional school sports</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>village as used greatly by the school children throughout the year.</p> <p>It certainly fits the criteria listed as what a protected Green area should contain:</p> <p>Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; ● where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and ● where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p style="margin-top: 10px;">Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts</p> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">I trust you will consider my recommendation and let me know your</p> | | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | opinion re this in due course. | | |
| 12. Janet Wright, Alderton | 4.6 4.6.4 4.6.5 | <p>Our quiet and very special place in, as yet a reasonably unspoilt corner of rural Gloucestershire needs protecting in order to provide only minimal growth in the most effective way to support its needs and therefore provide a sustainable future for the parish and its parishioners.</p> <p>I have lived here for 34 years having moved from a small village just 7 miles away. I think that I am fairly well qualified to fully appreciate everything that Alderton has to offer its true and loyal inhabitants.</p> <p>I have seen a paper copy of the ANPD and scanned it as best I can: it is far too big a book to take in and fully comprehend in a short time. Having said</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The concern regarding traffic is noted. Bus service using Dibden Lane has been discussed at Parish Council meetings in January and February 2016.</p> <p>Submission draft of the ANDP will be reduced in length and some aspects offered separately for ease of access to information.</p> <p>Advice on using the Plan was available during the consultation period via local coordinators and instructions given at a public meeting on 23 January 2016.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>that I think that I have grasped the general implications being set out for our village:</p> <p>Traffic, speed, narrow lanes, verges, pedestrians safety</p> <p>Bus route NOW travelling along Dibder</p> <p>The verges are totally flooded.</p> <hr/> <p>My overall feelings are that our quiet place in rural Gloucestershire needs protecting in order to provide only the most effective and minimal growth to maintain its needs and thus provide a sustainable future for Parish and its Parishioners.</p> | | |
| 13. John Appleton, Alderton | Page 27, 4.1 Housing | Objectives 1,2&3 provide an excellent summary of the views of the people of Alderton that have been expressed in the many recent surveys and consultations. The draft policies | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | contained in the rest of the document flow logically from the vision statement. | | |
| 14. Gareth & Mel Watkins, Frampton | | Have read some of this well prepared report and would like to make comments on the need for a new site location for a New Village Hall and Post Office with plenty of parking similar to Toddington. Also are there any plans to include affordable housing for those elder residents who may wish to stay in the village but down size, may be ground floor maisonettes? Thank you. | <p>Thank you and comments noted.</p> <p>Arrangements for the type and tenure of affordable housing fall to the Borough Housing Needs Officer to negotiate with a Registered Housing Provider. As such, this is not in the remit of the NDP.</p> <p>Policy H4 has been amended to include:</p> <p>“Proposals for new housing in Alderton should be for small and medium sized houses (with 1 to 3 bedrooms) to provide a greater mix of house sizes in the village and to support opportunities for downsizing or re-sizing.”</p> <p>A new location for the Village Hall and post office could only be achieved by the</p> | No further change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | | gift of land to the Parish by a local landowner or through CIL arising from a very substantial new housing development. | |
| 15. Keith Page, Alderton | | Having considered the plan and the circumstances that prevail in Alderton now, this plan offers the best solution to a difficult problem. I am sure that it will be revised in light of the results of the long awaited JCS and Tewkesbury Borough plan. | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |
| 16. Caroline Page | | I have read the Alderton NDP thoroughly and am impressed with the very high quality of the document. Everyone who has worked on it should be praised for the accurate representation and detailed evidence included in it. It would be a fitting result of all this hard work if our wishes are taking into account when decisions about the future of the village | Thank you and comments noted. | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | are made. | | |
| 17. Anonymou s (no name provided) | | Space required for car park - church funeral, weddings, shop, rambles. Village gets congested and dangerous for pedestrians. | Thank you and comments noted. | |
| 18. Anon. Address withheld | | <p>It's clear that you have all worked very hard – this report has top quality presentation.</p> <p>Glad to see field behind us is “high sensitivity for landscape quality/visual impact” – but so surely was the site where Charles Church has built, even more so because it's opposite the park (public).</p> <p>The biggest and most-used public space, the park, is a mess, broken equipment and eyesore and no facilities for the general public. What a shame –</p> | <p>Thank you and comments noted.</p> <p>This point is addressed by Policy LC1 once adopted.</p> | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>especially when in this report so much thought has gone to protecting Alderton’s open/public spaces. (Surprised Charles Church won’t at least help restore/replace existing equipment – it would help him sell the houses!)</p> <p>P44: Local Distinctiveness in Built Form: I can’t see that latest building reflects many of the characteristics listed here, which is of concern for any future building.</p> <p>The architecture of Alderton is special because of its interesting variety, we consider it important to keep the variety of styles. Seems to be forgotten so far? There is nothing harmonious about the Charles Church development that I can see – materials, windows, chimneys etc – very little variety and visually NOT</p> | <p>Please see Acknowledgements section where our local photographers have been named and thanked for their contribution.</p> | |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | <p>harmonious at all!</p> <p>Fantastic photo for front cover! Credits for any photos??! Please?</p> <p>Many thanks</p> | | |
| 19. Margaret Stocker | | <p>I felt the report fulfils a need for an accurate assessment of Alderton in the first quarter of the 21st century. I hope its purpose, to question and work to oppose future developments, will serve to speak for the residents both now and in the future.</p> <p>However, the outcome of a situation currently existing is the real reason why these and future developments threaten Alderton and other vulnerable villages. As long as landowners, either local or non resident, are allowed to sell land to</p> | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| | | developers for profit, this will continue and broken links of communications between them and local people “them and us” makes it easier on their conscience to cause such anxiety, stress and destruction. Far from being guardians of the countryside they are its destroyers and should be stopped. | | |
| 20. Anonymou s (signature undecipher able) | Pg 44 | The local Planning Authority which passed the design for Alderton Grange should have been informed that Alderton is a small rural village. The concept of this estate is more suited to an inner city development. Not even urban or suburban. From all points of the compass it looks like an abomination of all rural England is. | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |
| 21. V Hardwick, | | I think the plan has been well thought through and contains plans which are appropriate and proportionate for | Thank you and comments noted. | No change. |

Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan: Responses from Reg.14 Public Consultation

| Table 4: Residents | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Name | ANDP Section/ page | Comments made | Response | Changes to the NDP |
| Alderton | | Alderton village. | | |
| 22. Anonymou s (no signature) | | <p>No particular page just comment. The village is lacking green open space – for dog exercise, for residents just to sit.</p> <p>The village needs environment space – pond, new trees to benefit wildlife.</p> <p>New development does not provide the above. SPACE such as the above is a necessity for all generations.</p> | Thank you and comments noted. Policies LE1 and LE3 have been revised to address these concerns. | No change. |