

Madley Issues and Options 1st – 30th November 2016

Consultation Responses

The consultation on Issues and Options was promoted using the Parish Council (NDP) website, parish magazine, local newspaper, posters, leaflets etc. A consultation event was held in the village hall on the afternoon of Saturday 12th November 2016 and around 35 local residents attended. Overall 22 response forms were completed and returned. Not all respondents answered all questions.

The responses and comments will be carefully considered and used to inform the next stages of preparing the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Option 1: Do you have any comments on the draft vision and objectives for the NDP?

Comments

Affordable, smaller houses are much needed. Maybe even static mobile home sites.

More publicity is required concerning plans for such projects as raising a steering group of councillors and “local residents”. These are usually “local residents” known to councillors.

Not yet!

Objective 3. In line with population increase / decrease and employment opportunities.

The vision is very positive in written form.

Objective 1 needs to encourage residents to participate by keeping them informed, by various methods, so their opinions are valued, and encouraged.

Vision is excellent.

Approve.

Seems fine.

The Duchy of Cornwall supports the draft Vision and Objectives. It is important to ensure that residents are closely involved in determining the future of their Parish.

Vague aspirations and closely constrained by NPPF & Hereford Core Strategy. Where housing is concerned, the developers will either get what they want in Madley or go elsewhere. They have huge “land banks” in Herefordshire - too many green field sites which they will prioritise over their brown field holdings until such time as real restrictions are placed on the former.

1. Vision – more positive ie development will enhance (not if possible)

2. Would like to see sustainable development more defined eg as set out in the The UK Sustainable Development Strategy 'Securing the Future' which gives the following five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly.
3. It is hard not to be cynical about this whole exercise so I hope that expectations will not be raised that are immediately crushed. I went through Canon Pyon for the 1st time in a while today and was amazed to see the 2 large scale housing developments underway. Plus, noting the potential site on the edge of Clehonger currently advertised for sale. Plus, the current application for a totally out-of-place industrial development on Stony St – exploitation at its worst. None make one optimistic that there is much that can be done to prevent unsuitable development. But, if a strong Neighbourhood Plan can have some influence, than I whole-heartedly support the Parish Council in your work to develop one. And would like it to be framed as comprehensively as possible.

Satisfactory as proposed.

Any building should be sustainable – grey water systems, ground source heating etc. Bus routes will need improvement to meet objective 3.

Option 2: Should the NDP include a settlement boundary for Madley?

Yes 11

No 7

Comments

Without a boundary there is a tendency for development to follow existing roads, leading to ribbon development.

New development would be acceptable all the way round Brampton Road.

Far too large a population for such a congested area, such as the bottleneck by the church and parking at the school during the day.

Traffic flow around the church in Brampton Road is bad enough now.

It should include a boundary away from flooding areas / low points – see map.

No – more flexibility.

The settlement boundary should be tight as there is good land that can be developed within the existing settlement area.

This would allow greater control over development.

Comments: No, because Madley built form comprises several other distinct areas such as Shenmore and it is unlikely that any arbitrary boundary would have force over and above normal planning policy. Who is going to be brave/foolish enough to draw the boundary?

It should be as tightly drawn around the existing buildings as possible.

Probably

- 1) Should be the presumption of new developments being within or adjacent to the existing settlement.
- 2) I would like to see a map of how this would be drawn

To protect valuable farmland and nature. However, the settlement boundary should only be drawn after a call for sites process has been undertaken and the boundary should only include proposed sites which have been examined and approved as meeting the criteria of the NDP.

? Without looking at possible “boundaries” this is an unanswerable option!

Option 3: Should the Parish Council undertake a call for sites process to identify site allocations in the NDP for new housing development?

Yes 12
No 6

Comments

I have heard from Eaton Bishop NDP team that this cost can be recovered. If so then do it.

Too costly.

Any development should be north of the village to avoid congestion round shop / church.

Would be a cost to the Parish Council but benefit the Parish in the long term. Too much tight development within Madley would further detach from outlying areas instead of encouraging small areas to mix and match (sorry had to explain)

This would seem a measure that would control random development and assist people to forward plan their lives.

Seems logical to sort this out now.

In meeting the five objectives of the NDP it would be prudent to carefully consider housing site alternatives through a 'Call for Sites'. There might be a case of suggesting that a flat fee be paid by those submitting site details under the 'Call for Sites' for each site submission to cover the site assessment costs.

Presumably this is the prime object to provide additional housing. The overall cost of this exercise (£10,000 +) cannot be justified when the Parish will still be constrained by NPPF, Hereford Core Strategy and the whims of Hereford Planning Authority. Also, it is clear that making choices between various parishioners is a recipe for discontent and argument. We already see Parish Councillors openly attempting industrial development permission on a greenfield site with complete disregard for the local residents or even other parishes downwind. Will the latter enjoy Madley pollution and will an NDP include the power to stop such irresponsible behaviour?

Probably a good idea

The development is a given and doing this would only cost money and cause delays; A waste of finance and resources.

1. It wasn't clear to me on the map of potential areas for housing development why marked areas were considered of no potential/low/moderate constraints
2. Undertaking this process would allow for information re: current, but not yet commenced developments to be illustrated
3. Overall would then permit more knowledgeable consideration of any new sites identified ie to be considered within the full context.

As a process will more completely enable local people to be participative in the process of identification

This would "flush out" any local (and not so local) landowners who might be contemplating offering their land for sale for housing and give the village the opportunity to scrutinise such sites before they are included within the settlement boundary.

According to the Parish map shown, Herefordshire Council is not happy with any of the pink sites which are allocated with “significant restraints”. If sites process did not highlight any tracts of land that could be used for housing, what would the LA then do? Decide that the land with constraints was viable?

Option 4: Should development be focussed on several smaller sites around the village or on one or two larger sites?

Comments

I would favour smaller sites as large developments tend to be uniform in appearance and not fit into the village character.

Several smaller sites. Easier to manage smaller sites.

One large one north of the village would be preferable in order for associated traffic to use Bridge Sollers

One large site.

One or two larger sites / or several smaller sites which facilitate the local youth / younger generation of Madley, IT micro industry and working at home / working locally.

Several smaller sites – infill between houses.

Several smaller sites.

On several smaller.

Several smaller sites.

Several smaller sites.

Smaller sites around the village.

Settlement development should be on several smaller sites with developments of up to 5 houses preferably.

Yes. Problems with traffic and access would be minimised.

Smaller sites would seem to suit better.

Comments: Smaller sites, but planning approval already exists for large sites in Madley and surrounding parishes. So surely this plan provides too little too late!

Any new development needs to fit within the existing buildings as naturally as possible

No real preference but smaller sites would be easier to integrate into the village community. All the developments should be in keeping with the (very) local buildings.

Several smaller sites

Yes. Makes it more feasible to ensure incremental development – ensuring actual local needs can be determined and met, allows for the relevant infrastructure to be developed alongside, and for the increased numbers to be integrated into the existing community

If several smaller sites can be identified then this would be preferred.

32 houses could be split over 2 smaller sites, plus a small development (4/5 houses) at Shenmore.

Option 5: Are there any areas of the Parish where you think development would not be appropriate?

Comments

Around the church, vicarage and the town house which could be lost amongst houses.

Bridge Sollars Road. The traffic through the village at peak times is just awful!

South of the village must be a no-go – the traffic up to the shop and church is already at near saturation point – particularly at school dropping off times.

South of church ie off Brampton Road.

The Glebe Field, Bridge Sollars Road (Traffic problems, parking for the church and perhaps be used for parking in the village)

East of Brampton Road – Woodyatts Road Flooding HR2 9NN. Large scale development would increase the risk of two houses being flooded again (Low Point).

The western side of the village is not appropriate due to the inevitable increase in traffic through the village centre which is already gridlocked twice a day.

Should be near to existing built up areas.

Specific protected areas.

Maintain the existing recreation area.

I don't live in the village, best if those that do, sort this one.

Comments: Development would not be appropriate on the Recreation Field and areas traversed by rural footpaths (PROWS).

The Glebe Field could be seen as an ideal housing development site with easy access to village facilities on foot via the churchyard and safe vehicle movements onto the B 4352.

Agricultural land needs to be maintained

Areas without good vehicular access i.e. single-track lanes in surrounding hamlets should not be considered because of the increased volume of traffic which would impact on the safety of children playing in open-fronted gardens, pedestrians as there are no pavements or room for footpaths. Also, there should be good access to local shops, community transport and services.

Anywhere on the Bridge Sollars road as this road is already too busy.

1. Should be a presumption against further ribbon development
2. As covered elsewhere I would support existing recreational areas, communal green spaces and community resources being exempt from the potential for development

The field containing the Moat. See 3.2.6 re residents' wish to retain this amenity for wildlife. The Moat was rescued from a lifeless rubbish dump and brought back to a wildlife habitat by many local volunteers and Friends of Madley Moat continue to look after it to this day, restored in 2007. There are great crested newts in it.

No further development below Archenfield towards Shenmore. This area is now the busiest within the village.

Option 6: Should the NDP include a policy setting out criteria for new housing within the settlement boundary?

Yes 19

No 1

Comments

With the criteria such as those suggested.

Whilst promoting sustainable energy efficient design, maintaining the rural character and encouraging new development to be phased across the plan period whilst delivering affordable housing stock and opportunities such as Hi-Tech IT industries cottage industry and housing stock for local employment such as agricultural, commercial employees and their families.

Eco / energy efficient housing.

Eco-friendly, fitting (in keeping) with the landscape.

Housing should match existing properties in scale – not three storey houses overlooking bungalows.

Development should be phased over the whole period of the development plan. Ideally 5 houses every other year would reduce the impact of development until 2030.

Infill, brownfield, rural character, phased, energy efficient, all seem to be good ideas.

Yes. But unfortunately constrained by existing NPPF and Core Strategy policy. Brown field sites should always be the priority – despite being an anathema to developers. Also, developers will decide what is to be built and where – despite residents wishes.

A policy that requires new housing to be infill development within a settlement boundary, on brownfield sites, and of a scale and design that responds to the distinctive character of the surrounding area, is very acceptable

All the comments above agreed.

In addition to any identification of new sites. I would like this option to be a prescriptive as possible, including the factors outlined in the introduction above.

Could not options 6, 7 and 8 be amalgamated into an overarching policy describing the presumptions on which developments will be supported?

Comments

Response to option 6, 7 and 8. Presumptions on which support for developments would be given:

- Brownfield sites
- Ensure provision of adequate sewerage capacity
- No risk of flooding from streams etc and adequate provision for water run-off

- Maintenance of local character
- Encourage use of energy saving ie materials used, design, heating methods
- Include gardening/growing spaces
- Include communal green space
- Include off-road parking spaces
- Promote/enable pedestrian and bicycle access to local amenities ie pavement/potential to avoid using the traffic routes, plus lighting
- Provision of affordable housing/social housing
- Supports new families to remain within their community of origin
- 'Lifetime' housing – enable older residents to remain/move to fully accessible, independence promoting, support-enabling (NOT 1-bedroomed properties), ?extra care housing
- Mixed developments promoting community integration, not segregation.

Policy to favour compatible styles and sizes of dwelling, but also to encourage eco-friendly features such as solar panels, “passive house” etc.
Sustainable is essential in a rural environment and we should all be looking that way.

Option 7: What sort of housing do you want to see being built in the village in the next 15 years?

Comments

I would prefer to see a variety of styles and sizes but in keeping with the village character.

1-2 bedroom flats and / or retirement bungalows

No so-called “social housing” because in the last few years this type of development has seen the increase in drug related problems.

No more social housing latest development brought drug dealers to village.

Sustainable development types with a green and clean energy focus built with quality, energy efficient materials that complement the surrounding location.

Strong IT infrastructure connections to all dwellings whilst designed in a way that adds value and a sense of quality to Madley. Connecting infrastructure should be built in tandem with such house types that cater for young and old.

Mix of housing – terraced / semi detached. All types.

Sustainable, affordable.

Three bedroom houses for families two bedroom bungalows for retired / disabled people.

Small family houses within financial reach of young families.

Housing for the older residents and younger to allow all to remain in the village. Eg small residential complex for older residents.

Hereford is a developing city and attracting more professional people. Madley already has a high proportion of social housing and also bungalow housing for the elderly so there should be a preference to quality family housing.

Sustainable environmentally sympathetic housing with a mixture of affordable and less affordable housing.

“Affordable” for local people and youngsters, to ensure a future vibrant village, with some housing for the more affluent, probably older elements.

Comments: Bungalows for elderly residents and really affordable housing for young families. But please define clearly what is meant by affordable.

Affordable to the tenant/owner as well as the taxpayer is the only sensible criterion!

Passive housing would be good for individuals, the community and the environment

A full mix of houses that maintains the existing ratio of private, rented and affordable homes

There needs to be a mix, but 2-3 bed affordable houses are a must

As a relatively low wage area, there is a need for affordable housing for buying and renting. Single storey dwellings (bungalows) would meet the needs for the ageing population.

Small family developments – 2/3 bed RTB properties ½ beds.

Option 8: Should the NDP include a policy setting out requirements for particular housing types, sizes and tenures?

Yes 14

No 4

Comments

Two bedroom accommodation is much needed.

Land should be looked at from a community benefit perspective. A community development lease angle will allow affordable housing to be built by local people that will offset the cost of buying a plot to build their house on. They pay for the house construction and pay an annual ground rent subject to terms and conditions.

We do not need any more Executive four bedroom homes mainly occupied by elderly couples. Should be a mixture including rented affordable homes.

Guidelines to ensure housing needs are met.

See 6 and 7.

Comments: See Option 7, but, once again, it is unlikely that the Parish will have any serious opportunity to influence such decisions. Developers will build what they want or go elsewhere.

Yes I think our community should say what we want rather than have ideas hoisted upon us by developers

The problem is that builders in general want to put up “executive homes” to make more money. But what is needed is more modest homes which builders are less interested in.

However to assume that young people wish to remain in the area and they grow up and buy a property is not necessarily accurate – most want to move away and then return in their 30s to settle.

Option 9: Should the NDP include a policy for development in the wider countryside?

Yes 15

No 3

Comments

A landscaping policy could be prepared which identifies those features which contribute towards the special landscape character of the area and encourage development to protect and enhance them. Such a policy could require new development to protect unspoilt features and incorporate appropriate local species and landscape design to enhance local biodiversity eg protecting existing and planting hedgerows using native tree species, conserving and restoring tree cover along watercourses and roadsides, restoring natural riverbank features and incorporating ponds, bat boxes etc. Herefordshire is recognised for its dark skies and the policy could require external lighting to be minimised and designed sensitively.

Allow housing in agricultural buildings and the odd housing infill between houses in small hamlets and smaller settlements eg Shenmore.

Housing should be allowed for farm workers etc.

If in keeping and a genuine need.

No. There will be some natural development of agricultural workers housing but the hamlets and smaller settlements do not have the infrastructure for significant development.

The restrictions placed by the core strategy and the localised nature of development should cope with this.

This seems to be covered by the core strategy so can't see much point. Maybe you could specify the type of housing, energy efficient, rural character. If there is a need it won't necessarily be in a hamlet or settlement.

Comments: Yes, but ensure that development is restricted to housing and not to include chicken broiler farms and power stations!

So long as any policy proposes to maintain and sustain the beautiful countryside. In particular I would like to see a specific directive that prohibits change of use from agricultural land to industrial

Perhaps instead of focusing on just the village some of the housing developments could be situated just outside, obviously not big developments but sites with 4-6 houses.

Probably. Particularly where housing is linked to supporting local people to live and work within the parish. Encouragement given to develop building that minimise their impact on the environment.

Restrictions on developments on green field / prime farming land should be maintained especially arable land (pasture land only may be less restricted perhaps)

Shenmore and Canon Bridge would both be suitable for that purpose.

Option 10: Should the NDP include a policy requiring new development to protect and enhance the local landscape character and wildlife?

Yes 18

No 1

Comments

It should attempt to keep the village as part of the wider parish and not become an urban island in the countryside.

The NDP could identify locally important views and require development to be sited and designed to ensure such views are protected.

Protect local ponds and existing hedgerows. Protect the Glebe Field as a green area – old oak with Church view.

EW are in danger of destroying our landscape and wildlife.

This is essential in any development in a rural environment.

Plenty of trees and hedges and sensitive external lighting please.

Comments: Yes, obviously the environment and dark skies are important but have already been severely compromised e.g. filling in of glacial ponds at the Bage Farm, toxic air pollution and water pollution in streams. We are in the Wye Valley which should be much better protected than it is at present.

Phosphate and Nitrate pollution of watercourses has reached critical levels.

I completely agree with the above. Our countryside is beautiful but we still need to actively support the bio diversity. I would also like to see restrictions on the use of harmful chemicals on the fields

Absolutely, particularly as the parish is distinctly rural.

I would strongly support the inclusion of this option. All new development should be required to conserve and enhance local biodiversity. There should be a presumption on providing green spaces with native plantings, provision of features that offer nesting opportunities for bird and bat species and which provide corridors through to important existing habitats eg ponds and watercourses. Mature trees should be preserved and not undermined by development.

When Archenfield was redeveloped recently residents successfully fought off street lighting. This was a victory for ecology and cost saving as well. The Moat should be protected as well as the kettle ponds. Many local ponds were medieval fish ponds. Please don't let the Bage farm get away with filling in the 2 lakes with rubble.

Option 11: Should the NDP include one or more policies to encourage sustainable and locally distinctive design in new development?

Yes 18

No

Comments

Since past developments reflect national styles and their period with no local character.

Height and scale are very important

Should not be ultra modern developments, which would conflict with the character of the village.

No real need – Madley is already a huge mix of tiles / slates / brick stone.

Policy should encourage designs to match existing buildings not create wooden sheds that match nothing locally.

Blending in.

But I wouldn't rule out glass personally. Modern buildings can fit in, as long as scale and height are acceptable. Depends on the architect. We can presumably always object if we don't like it.

Comments: Yes, but do you have priority over the Planning Authority and the wishes of potential developers?

Yes it's very important to retain traditional building materials and features as far as possible although effective eco materials should also be considered.

However we do not want to see a Tesco's or a block of flats in Madley!

As long as a common sense approach to this is applied

We should encourage innovation in eco-design, eg the use of pre-fab kit houses with energy saving features. Provided the style is compatible.

See option 1 and 6 with more local external matches of buildings.

Option 12: Should the NDP include a policy which guides investment in employment uses at the airfield site?

Yes 18

No 3

Comments

Yes as suggested.

Stoke Street is not designed for the heavy traffic at the moment.

However, a masterplan needs to be established by the local residents which reaches the goals and objectives of the Madley NDP. A masterplan can also be used to attract new business and retain the younger generations in local employment and benefit future generations. Should cater for a fair and reasonable approach to development in terms of local, low individual and family agri-income, whilst developing new opportunities in IT, cottage industry other than the airfield.

It should have some say on what type / size of development happens on the Madley Airfield.

Provided that the road infrastructure is upgraded to link to the proposed western bypass for Hereford.

Light industry but not anything with noise and excessive light pollution. Maximum tree screening. Heavy lorries going to Allensmore nurseries on Brampton Road are already a hazard.

The road network is overburdened, and the landscaping and screening is far from sympathetic.

Yes. This area will develop over time and there should be clear guidelines to control impact.

Particular care should be taken with the visual and pollutive nature of these developments and their impact on local traffic.

Increasing transport is a potential problem as roads here are narrow and poorly maintained. Also need to ensure pollution is kept to a minimum.

Landscaping and screening yes but need to ensure screening is maintained.

Comments: Yes, but current proposed developments could have already compromised this aspiration.

Yes very much so. We do not want to see gas fired power stations with twelve 43 foot chimneys for example! Any development needs to consider the impact of traffic, noise and air pollution and aim towards any construction which is sympathetic with the local landscape

The road network surrounding the airfield is already inadequate to cater for the existing businesses – particularly around Brampton and Shenmore to the south and west of Madley. There should be weight and/or size restrictions on many of the surrounding roads.

Business accommodation on the airfield area would be good along with allowing a few select housing developments of 4-6 houses, the airfield itself needs to be better screened

Do the businesses accessed via the road to Webton Court (between the high school and the surgery in Kingstone) come within the Madley Airfield site – Dene Garage and Curves)? Although I'm sure they consider themselves Kingstone am I reading the map correctly that they actually lie in this parish? Is the

plan allowed to make strong representation against industrial developments outside the already designated sites? If so, it should do so. Requirements should be to prevent noise and light pollution, and any adverse effects on air quality, and to minimise disruptions by increased traffic issues particularly for those people living in properties along Stony St.

But just because it used to be an airfield this doesn't mean anything goes. Polluting or noisy industrial uses should be banned as inappropriate to the rural nature of the area. Stony Street is narrow at both ends which should prevent heavy industrial uses.

Option 13: Should the NDP include a policy which supports appropriate tourism related development?

Yes 15

No 3

Comments

The idea of promoting tourism is completely unrealistic. Who would want to tour anywhere apart from the church?

Only on small sites.

Madley needs to attract tourism. Country sports can support this by allowing and promoting for example a discount for tourists/ locals for using the fishing run by Wye USR foundation at Canon Bridge, for salmon and course fishing. The recreation ground could be used for festivals – music , food, craft. This would attract tourism.

The 4 points should be used to support development.

But ow key. Encouragement of walkers by good, well signed rural footpaths.

Need to be careful where these are located, as traffic on local roads is already horrendous.

Comments: Currently facilities for tourism in the village are totally inadequate – the Red Lion public house has poor quality food, the B&B at Shenmore no longer exists; there is a lack of car parking in the village, and a lack of interest except by an energetic few in keeping the village clean and tidy and the Footpath Network (PROW) open. We are all being encouraged to “get out and walk” but the Parish & County Councils no longer support the Footpath network. Residents have been asking for a car park for years. If visitors cannot park they move on and spend their money elsewhere.

Yes we would agree especially with point 4

Developments should be of very small scale, be highly sustainable in nature, support local employment, thereby minimising travel requirements, and enhancing to the environment, and encouraging access via cycle, walking or public transport.

But only re-use of existing buildings or previously used sites. Not greenfield locations.

Option 14: Should the NDP include a policy which guides the re-use of existing disused farm buildings for employment uses?

Yes 19
No 1

Comments

Any changes of use need to be managed and controlled.

It would make better housing for young families eg 2 bedroom accommodation

Not if it increases traffic.

Absolutely.

Disused farm buildings could be used houses or economic activity if its use is sensitive.

Sympathetic without encouraging further impact on roads.

As long as does not cause traffic problems and car parking must be off road in proper car parks and if necessary screening will be needed. Etc.

Comments: SENSITIVE is the operative word here. We do not need more poultry units, auxiliary power stations or boot sales!

Yes so long as the use is "sensitive" and in keeping with the local character

At least one policy that covers 10, 11 and 12. Requiring use of low impact materials, energy conservation, appropriate landscaping, no increase in light, water and air pollution

The re-use of disused farm buildings should be restricted to non polluting small scale concerns eg artisan workshops, architectural practices etc.

Could they not also be considered for housing purposes?

Option 15: Should the NDP include a policy which guides new agricultural development of large farm buildings when planning consent is required?

Yes 19

No

Comments

New buildings tend to be large and can have a dramatic impact on the landscape.

Too late for the buildings already granted!

Sensitive development which has a size limit.

But closely watched and assessment of need.

To ensure blending in with the area.

Definitely. Tin sheds are already invading Herefordshire like the plague! And will ruin the tourist industry and my view.

Comments: Yes, but the policy should be able to ensure that irresponsible building of large barns (such as at Cornerstone Farm) is restricted. Again, will it be possible to really guide planning policy given the obvious priorities enjoyed by the agricultural industry?

Absolutely agree

At present there is a free for all regarding such large scale buildings along Canon Bridge Road. Controls seem lax. The NDP should place some restrictive criteria on such buildings since the Council (Herefordshire) seems not to.

Option 16: Should the NDP include a policy which guides new polytunnels when planning consent is required?

Yes 19

No

Comments

As above.

No tunnels.

Sensitive development near to housing / village should require planning consent.

Preferably on a smaller scale.

Could destroy the area if not within guidelines.

Again definitely.

Comments: Yes, obviously!

Absolutely agree

One of the worst things about poly tunnels is that they use string chemical sprays to "sterilise" the soil. This is a disaster ecologically. Quite apart from the ugly plasticisation of views.

Option 17: Should the NDP include policies to guide development to areas of lowest flood risk and design new buildings to be flood resilient and resistant?

Yes 16
No 1

Comments

Is this required.

An infrastructure development plan needs to be put in place by the County Council that will minimise flood risk and storm water drainage.

High ground away from low points to avoid flooding from the water table – adds ditches as well – join to local streams.

Local councillors have stated that there are no flooding problems around Madley.

Not relevant to this area if development is restricted to the existing settlement boundary.

Avoid these areas if possible.

Comments: This should be obvious but no evidence of this happening to date! Frequent flooding at many locations in Madley is regularly ignored in planning applications. The excuse seems to be that “it only happens when it rains!” The local water table is too high to permit ready absorption of rainfall.

Absolutely agree

There should be an obligation on developers to remedy any regularly flooding areas and adjacent to their site, and prove that this development will not exacerbate the situation.

However as recent weather events teach us, no buildings are truly resistant to floods so buildings should not be in a high risk area.

Option 18: Should the NDP include a policy to protect existing community facilities and encourage investment in new facilities?

Yes 19
No 2

Comments

Facilities need to be maintained to encourage use so the cost of this needs to be managed so as not to deter use or be a burden on the Parish precept.
We have enough facilities for the village.

Protect the above facilities and the 2 points should be considered.

Without facilities there is no community.

Yes – this is the basis of sustainable development as the community grows.

Comments: Yes, obviously, but where is the investment coming from? Given that we were able to raise a considerable sum of money during the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in 2012 (without the willing response of the Parish Council), we could suggest that is about time that the same Parish Council gives a strong lead to fund raising for the village. There are many sources of funds and much expertise amongst residents, but previous experience suggests that volunteers are not welcomed by the Parish Council!

Absolutely agree

Any development should mandate the provision of proper community facilities. i.e. a few children's play equipment on a small corner of land is NOT adequate. Another shop, public parking, better public transport for surrounding hamlets, etc.

It is pleasing to see the recent developments within the recreation field. I agree completely with the presumption in favour of maintaining this space. Would like to see the wildlife value of this area improved – wildlife meadow, wildlife corridor. Linked with comments re: green space, provision of safe route to school. ?Possibly a requirement of developers to contribute financially towards such improvements. Can the Stables Cafe be included

Madley Moat and Green lanes and public footpaths

Madley Moat, a scheduled ancient monument, which was restored for wildlife in 2007 and is valued by villages should be protected. Pond dips are held there from time to time and the primary school takes its children there on visits. More attention needs to be paid to local footpaths which are deteriorating since the previous foot path officer was dismissed.

Option 19: Should the NDP include a policy which identifies 1 or more areas of Local Green Space for protection from development? If so, please identify them and explain why they are important.

Yes 17

No 1

Comments

Again to avoid the village becoming an urban island.

The Glebe Field

All the land to the south of the village should be exempt from any building.

The Moat. This has a scientific and nature interest.

The Glebe Field – enhances the church

The Bower, Shenmore – beauty spot.

Protect the Glebe Field / The Bower, Shenmore. Protect local “new” wood – Woodyatts Lane (only wood near to Madley)

The large open fields west of the village are an important habitat for wildlife and should be kept that way.

The playing field, tennis club and children’s play area need to be protected.

Every community requires local green space as above.

Yes the Glebe Field should be protected as this provides an essential image of the village as it is approached.

New to the area so unable to be specific but if such areas are important to the community, improve the villagescape, aesthetic then they should be protected.

Comments: All green field sites in the Parish should be carefully protected, and more priority should be given to maintaining the Footpath network.

Yes, we especially like The Bower

The Bower in Shenmore is used regularly by the local residents as both a meeting place and for social events. It is also the only space where children can play as there are no footpaths or other social areas in the area. The local residents maintain this area themselves and raised the funding to have a seat custom made and installed. Just this year, resident’s funds have paid for private company to cut the hedges.

The school’s green space?

Green space corridors to the special wildlife sites – The Moat and other kettle ponds.

Madley Moat. See comment son Option 5 above. All green lanes and public footpaths – important for wildlife and health (walking).

Glebe Field Madley. As a Madley resident this had significant value for village fetes, weddings etc and should be preserved.

Option 20: Should the NDP include a policy to encourage developer contributions towards improved traffic management measures and walking and cycling? If so, please provide suggestions.

Yes 17
No 2

Comments

Not sure how!

Developers pay enough money in various fees eg planning, legal advice

Why not install traffic lights at the Madley cross roads and ban parking on the main through road.

An infrastructure development plan should be in tandem with a village masterplan and then filtered down to developer input.

If this is possible and walking / cycling paths can be added to provide access to the village centre.

When development is allowed the roads need to be widened at the expense of the developer to make usage safe as possible for everyone – this currently does not happen.

Any planning should include assessment of heavy vehicles. I feel the planners did not fully realise the amount of heavy vehicles now travelling the road passed Great Brampton House.

If possible. This would be very difficult due to the nature of Madley. Eg large employers having shift workers could have bus (small or large). Pick up service reducing cars, journeys etc.

There are considerable issues of traffic management on Stay(?) Street due to car boot sales on Sundays, Brightwells management of their sales etc. These issues could be alleviated if they were prepared to contribute to traffic management.

Speed limits on Roman Road (Stoney Street) would be a good idea. Maybe width restrictions on some narrow roads and traffic calming. Also renovating white lines which are virtually non-existent.

Comments: But without major investment, cycling in the area is dangerous at all times of the day and night and especially in winter. Traffic management is non-existent (especially near the school and shop). There is no evidence that this will improve without the cooperation of the Police and investment from Hereford Council.

- 1) All this begs the question – what happened to the Community Led Plan of 2010-2012? Much money (£3000+) was spent and great deal of time invested by many of us with nil effect! We are now spending over four times the amount of tax-payers money on virtually the same territory with no guaranteed results.
- 2) Why does this exercise require an expert (outside) Planning Consultant when the Planning Dept. of Herefordshire Council has been used by other Parishes at minimal cost to the taxpayer?

Yes, any developer should be expected to contribute to traffic management.

The road network surrounding the airfield is already inadequate to cater for the existing businesses – particularly around Brampton and Shenmore to the south and west of Madley.

Walking and cycling around Madley is dangerous as the roads are just too busy with a large amount of HGV's on it, c

Scope for the parish council taking a lead in developing foot/cycle path access possibly via the recreation field, to the school and village hall, minimising the temptation to access both by car and possibly reducing some of the congestion

Adequate off road parking for new development is essential.

Maybe developers can fund a shuttlebus to Belmont for picking up primary children and returning commuters twice a day. This would alleviate congestion and serve as a "stride and ride" for commuters who can walk down the railway lines at Belmont.

Other comments

When is anything going to be done about the parking issues around Madley Primary School?

A scheme which incorporates a car park for Madley would benefit all for safety reasons. This needs to be seriously taken into consideration.

Not easy to fill in as not many residents of Madley have been made aware so have no knowledge, and the opinion appears to be if they do take part their views will not be valued. Much more encouragement to include all the areas of Madley as it is a scattered settlement, needs to be introduced. A more neighbourly approach that portrays the vision, which is a positive approach, looking to the future.

NB Mistakes in paras 1.3 and 1.4 where it states Madley is east of Hereford and Shenmore is east of Madley. Surely this should say west in both places?

Para 1.4 should mention arable land as well.

NB The fields between Archenfield and the Nursery and Forty Farm is rising ground. The 3 homes opposite Archenfield on Harp Meadow are all bungalows. Any development on this field would have to be single storey as well otherwise it would overlook and cut out light from existing houses.