


## Newborough Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> – Friday 27<sup>th</sup> May 2016

### Regulation 16 representations

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
<b>NEWB1</b>	Mike O'Connell	Whole plan	<p>Hi, please accept this email as confirmation of my support for the Newborough Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In particular I am FOR the plan's housing strategy and AGAINST any future dwellings being built in the conservation area.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB2</b>	Noreen O'Connell	Whole plan	<p>Hi, please accept this email as confirmation of my support for the Newborough Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In particular I am FOR the plan's housing strategy and AGAINST any future dwellings being built in the conservation area.</p>	yes
<b>NEWB3</b>	Andrew Clay	Whole plan	<p>As a resident of Newborough village, I wish to express my support for the Newborough Development Plan (NDP). I have been involved at all stages of discussions as the steering group have put together the polices that will guide the village's future development. I believe that the plan expresses the majority views of the villagers to preserve Newborough's heritage and linear character in a rural setting.</p>	-

<p><b>NEWB4</b></p>	<p>National Grid    Robert Deanwood  Consultant Town Planner</p>		<p><b>Newborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation  SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</b></p> <p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p><b>About National Grid</b></p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England West Midlands and North London.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified the following high voltage overhead powerline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZE Route – 400kV from Cellarhead substation in Staffordshire Moorlands to Drakelow substation in South Derbyshire.</li> </ul> <p>From the consultation information provided, the above overhead powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p><u>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</u>  Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact <a href="mailto:plantprotection@nationalgrid.com">plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</a></p>	
---------------------	---	--	--	--

NEWB5	ESBC	Various policies	<p><b>Newborough Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 comments from ESBC</b></p> <p>May 2016</p> <p><b>SP1:</b> we question what ‘other mitigation’ might involve in bullet point two. This should either be defined further or deleted.</p> <p><b>SP2:</b> second paragraph – we believe requiring SUDS on every development would be onerous and is not appropriate/reasonable for all development. The types of development should be defined.</p> <p><b>SP3:</b> second sentence is more of a statement – what is the outcome/what level of development does this relate to? Final sentence - consulting Historic England on every heritage asset might be overkill, ESBC usually consult when grade II* and I are affected.</p> <p><b>SP4:</b> we believe a definition of what the parish’s cultural landscape is would be helpful, so the first part of the policy can be implemented. Third paragraph, does this part of the policy refer to conversion schemes or agricultural development too? Would this preclude modern buildings? 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, this is not currently requested at validation by ESBC unless in a known area. It would be beneficial to see Staffordshire County Council comments on this part of the policy.</p> <p><b>HE1:</b> 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph – this part of the policy would be difficult to enforce as home working could be as simple as working at the kitchen table – it would not be a reason to refuse an application.</p> <p><b>HE2:</b> ESBC are broadly in favour of this policy, as it states ‘approximately 17 dwellings’. This is not a ceiling and it responds to the Local Plan windfall number for Tier 3 settlements. We are also supportive of the limit of 4 dwellings per development, as this has been used in other ‘made’ NPs. Small typo on first sentence – should be ‘policy’, not policies.</p> <p><b>HE3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Substantial’ needs qualifying. Substantial might be okay in some cases and wouldn’t harm character, heritage assets etc</li> <li>• Replacement dwellings – we do allow some enlargement for original dwellings in our Local Plan Policy DP4</li> <li>• D shouldn’t be read under the first sub heading</li> <li>• The ‘four’ appears to only apply to linear development. Do we assume that infill will therefore be for single dwellings?</li> <li>• The last paragraph shouldn’t really use the word ‘resisted’ but ‘restricted’ would be more appropriate – this should also be linked to the viability point D mentioned above.</li> </ul> <p>CF1: It would be useful to quantify what is no longer ‘economically viable’ e.g. a period of marketing the community facility before different uses are explored.</p>	
-------	------	------------------	---	--

NEWB5	ESBC continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 'four' appears to only apply to linear development. Do we assume that infill will therefore be for single dwellings?</li> <li>• The last paragraph shouldn't really use the word 'resisted' but 'restricted' would be more appropriate – this should also be linked to the viability point D mentioned above.</li> </ul> <p><b>CF1:</b> It would be useful to quantify what is no longer 'economically viable' e.g. a period of marketing the community facility before different uses are explored.</p> <p><b>CF2:</b> ESBC agree that the sites listed are appropriate for protection as Local Green Spaces. It might be better to say "are protected" instead of "will be protected" in the first sentence. Also this policy states "the plan" in a couple of places, this is a given so these phrases could be deleted or amended.</p> <p><b>CF4:</b> as above it is probably not necessary to state "The NNDP" and possibly it should be "refused" instead of "resisted"?</p> <p><b>TA2:</b> As in previous comments above the level of development needs quantifying – as a single dwelling or subdivision on the north or south of the village may not warrant 'safe access for both pedestrians and cyclists to and from the centre of the village'.</p> <p><b>TA3:</b> Staffordshire County Council stipulate a minimum internal space of 3m wide x 6m long x 2.5m high, smaller than that proposed in this policy. We feel it is quite large but would be interested to see whether the County Council comment on this.</p> <p><b>Proposals map (village inset):</b> the Public Realm Improvements colour (yellow) is very similar to that of the development restriction colour (pale yellow) therefore difficult to distinguish.</p>	
-------	----------------	--	---	--

<b>NEWB6</b>	Bethan Waite	All	<p>As Chairman of the Parish Council and member of the Steering Group, I have been involved with this plan from the outset, having been the person responsible for the initial front runner funding bid.</p> <p>My original motivation was for our community to have a sustainability debate. At the time our school and pub were both struggling to survive, the bus service was being cut and church services very poorly attended. I very much wanted the community to consider whether additional housing might go some way towards helping to secure these assets in the future. I was and am also a keen supporter of affordable housing in the village. There is currently no possibility of our young people being able to afford the house prices in the village in which they grew up.</p> <p>While the output, following a long period of consultation, is not what I had originally hoped for, I do believe that this plan has been developed in a very robust and democratic way and is genuinely representative of the way the community feels. On this basis I strongly support the plan and urge the Examiner to support it as well.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB7</b>	Phil Spencer	All	I fully support the document	
<b>NEWB8</b>	Shirley Daly	All	Re the above, I would like to say that I attended all of the meetings and having read the final suggestions I would just like to say that I cannot find any negative comments to make.	No
<b>NEWB9</b>	James Chadwick, on behalf of Staffordshire County Council	Whole Plan	The Parish Council has consulted Staffordshire Council at various stages in the Neighbourhood Plan preparation and incorporated comments we have made accordingly. Therefore, we have no further comments to make other than to thank the Parish Council for undertaking a productive consultation process in the build up to the examination.	yes
<b>NEWB10</b>	Coal Authority	Whole Plan	<p><b><u>Newborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission</u></b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p> <p>Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority using the contact details above.</p>	-

NEWB11	Environment Agency	Various	<p><b>NEWBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b></p> <p><b>POLICY DOCUMENT – SUBMISSION VERSION MARCH 2012 - 2031</b></p> <p>Thank you for referring the above submission document which was received on 26 April 2016.</p> <p>Having reviewed the documents we wish to make the following comments:</p> <p><b>Flood risk:</b></p> <p><u>SP1 – Sustainable Development</u>  The statement regarding flood risk could be strengthened and ‘future proofed’ by including a reference to climate change e.g. ‘Does not increase the risk of flooding from either increased runoff or from building within flood risk areas <b>and takes account of the predicted impact of climate change</b>’</p> <p><u>SP2 – River Management and Flood Risk: Support</u>  You may wish to consider including a reference to the impact of new development on both existing <u>and</u> future flood risk and that where appropriate, development includes measures that mitigate and adapt to climate change.</p> <p>We note and welcome the support in principle for natural flood management schemes in the upstream catchment.</p>	
--------	--------------------	---------	---	--

NEWB11	Environment Agency continued		<p><b>Biodiversity:</b>  Opportunities should be sought in the Swarbourne catchment to combine objectives 2 (flood risk) and 8 (countryside and biodiversity) through the relevant policies SP2 and CF3 respectively. In particular this could be implemented through natural flood measures deployed through the catchment.</p> <p>Within the National Character Assessment for Needwood and South Derbyshire, in which Newborough sits, the following Statement of Environmental Opportunity is particularly relevant to working towards attenuating flood risk and improving the water quality of the catchment.</p> <p>SEO 4: Manage and enhance the network of rivers, flood plains and wetlands, increasing the landscape's ability to naturally and sustainably manage flood and drought risk and provide other ecosystem services such as water supply and food provision, while recognising the needs of individual species and habitats.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b>  We have the following comments to make which relate solely to the protection of 'Controlled Waters' receptors.</p> <p>In planning any development in this area reference should be made to our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' (GP3) document. This sets out our position on a wide range of activities and developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storage of pollutants and hazardous substances</li> <li>• Solid waste management</li> <li>• Discharge of liquid effluents into the ground (including site drainage)</li> <li>• Management of groundwater resources</li> <li>• Land contamination</li> <li>• Ground source heat pumps</li> <li>• Cemetery developments</li> </ul>	
NEWB12	Mr Carl Henry Bullingham	Whole Plan	I fully support all aspects of this plan as it exists	Yes

<p><b>NEWB13</b></p>	<p>Hannah Hogan on behalf of the Staffordshire County Council Flood Risk Management Team.</p>	<p>SP2, Section 5.10, HE3</p>	<p>Our Ref: FRM/2016/027 - Newborough Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank-you for consulting us on the Newborough Neighbourhood Plan. Please find our comments below given in good faith.</p> <p>Areas of Newborough adjacent the River Swarbourne are shown at flood risk as informed by the Environment Agency’s indicative floodplain map defining the extents of Flood Zones 3 and 2. Also, the updated flood map for surface water (uFMfSW) show potential overland flow routes for water. This mapping contains a number of assumptions and is not as accurate as it could be. However, it’s still best available data in the absence of any detailed flood modelling for the area.</p> <p>With regard to Policy SP2: River Management &amp; Flood Risk and Section 5.10 of the Plan – the aspiration to limit sites to below 5 l/s per hectare may be unrealistic, as it depends upon local geology and characteristics and greenfield rates can vary between 3 and 8 litres per second per hectare. The average figure taken for a mean annual greenfield site run-off rate is 5 litres per second per hectare, but can vary considerably – depending whether a site is on sand, clay and / or the permeability of the soil type. Driving sites to below greenfield rates, is usually used in areas of significant flood risk and may have limited benefit within the Newborough area, given the large upstream catchment.</p> <p>On large development proposals, long-term storage could be utilised and this is storage of rainfall for slow infiltration to protect floodplains and effectively, surface water is managed collectively and discharged at low rates to extend the runoff hydrograph from the site. Often, sites using long-term storage will have a variable greenfield rate, depending upon the return period storm. (i.e. For example only: The two year storm and discharge rate: 5 litres per second per hectare; compared with a 100 year storm: 33 litres per second per hectare – indicative example only) and where a volume of water is segregated from the main peak flow attenuation, and discharged at low rates. In practice this arrangement is quite complex and difficult to accommodate on small sites subject to site layout, topography and number of catchments and outfalls.</p>	
----------------------	---	-------------------------------	---	--



<b>NEWB13</b>	Hannah Hogan on behalf of the Staffordshire County Council Flood Risk Management Team Continued.....	SP2, Section 5.10, HE3	<p>Therefore, we would recommend that new development sites discharge at greenfield rates and utilise SuDs, in accordance with the NPPF and planning guidance. Stipulated greenfield rates would still result in developments attenuating surface water on their sites and discharging at controlled rates. However, we would suggest that given the large upstream catchment and undulating areas, controlling surface water run-off from proposed new development will not necessarily alleviate known flooding problems, but flow control to greenfield rates and the incorporation of SuDs will help create safe and sustainable development in the area.</p> <p>We welcome the support of SuDs and Natural Flood Management (NFM) measures within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>In terms of Policy SP2: we would recommend the following wording as arguably greenfield, undeveloped sites will have area specific greenfield run-off rate: “New development should demonstrate no exacerbation (an improvement) in the overall levels of surface water runoff through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).”</p> <p>We especially welcome the intention for the River Swarbourne to become a village focus to improve accessibility and improved public access and the drive in Policy CF3 for the Swarbourne to become part of a green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Areas shown under policy HE3 should be sound and remain in line with the spatial strategy set out within the East Staffordshire Local Plan 2015. It should be noted that not all of the area shown under Policy HE3 is shown at surface water flood risk so the Plan may wish to focus more upon the preserving the setting and character of the conservation area and archaeological importance, rather than the focus on the envisaged generation of surface water run-off of development within this area.</p>	
<b>NEWB14</b>	June Elizabeth Bullingham	Whole Plan	I fully support the Neighbourhood development plan for Newborough	No
<b>NEWB15</b>	E J Hall	HE3	<p>I can no sense in your idea to exclude development of land to the east side of the Yoxall Road.</p> <p>If the east side is excluded from development the village will long and narrow, a ribbon type of development which in my view should be avoided at all costs.</p>	Yes

<b>NEWB16</b>	Guy Harte	Development, Planning and Policy section	<p>I am in agreement with the plan as a whole, and welcome it.</p> <p>I feel that it is very important to adhere to the planning style and development in the plan, to keep the fabric and structure of the village within its current style. It is important that the plan is enforced to prevent unsightly development within the village.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB17</b>	Mrs B I Skipper	HE3	<p>Policy HE3 should be expanded to include Brownfield sites.</p> <p>Policy HE3 should not restrict any building of houses on the east of Yoxall Road, there are sites at poplars farm that are close to the centre of the village where street lighting and pavements are already in place.</p> <p>Policy HE3 supports the extension of the village by linear development. I think this is wrong and linear development should be resisted until all plots close to the centre of the village are built on first.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB18</b>	Bethan Waite (Chairman, Newborough Parish Council)	Whole Plan	<p>As the individual (PC Chairman) who initially instigated the bid for a front runner status grant for the NDP, I have been involved throughout the process. Although the outcome of the process is not what I had hoped – I had really hoped that we could have persuaded residents to support some more housing development in the parish to support the future of the school, church, pub, bus service etc – it is clear to me that the overwhelming view of parishioners is to welcome only a minimal number new houses, several of which we have already secured. Many residents were clear that they did not wish any further development.</p> <p>I believe that the Parish Council, Steering Group and consultants Bpud have done everything in their power – and indeed gone well beyond that which could be seen as reasonable – to engage with the community and encourage them to share their views.</p> <p>The initial draft plan was met with considerable hostility and the SG subsequently went to great lengths to further engage with the community and take these views on board in the further draft plan.</p> <p>I am extremely confident that the current plan represents the wishes of the community and urge the Examiner to support the Plan.</p>	Yes

<b>NEWB19</b>	Sarah Skipper	HE3	<p>HE3 Policy. This should be expanded so as to include any brownfield sites, including those with previous developed land within the village. HE3 Policy – not acceptable on ribbon development with little or no infrastructure, it would cause the loss of rural character through developing and loss of rural views.</p> <p>HE3 Policy – should not be excluding development to the east of Yoxall road, where there has been land for development and parking for the village offered in the original draft policy, that is within the village , meeting the criteria originally drafted. Policy HE3 – the linear development needs to be withheld until all the necessary sites within close proximity of the village are built or developed upon.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB20</b>	David S Jeffries	Whole Plan	<p>I write in strong support of the Draft Newborough Development Plan as forwarded to ESBC. As a long term village resident I have also had the benefit of my experience as Chair of our NDP Steering Group, although this letter is written in a personal capacity.</p> <p>We have consulted extensively and regularly with residents and with a wide range of outside agencies. The most challenging area was always likely to be that of Housing and to maximise participation all of the public meetings relating to this issue were followed up by a repeat at a different time of the week. To further gauge opinion the meetings were followed by a well supported parish wide Housing Survey. The results as expressed by 382 preference responses were very clear:-  No new build was supported in the Conservation Area, other than replacement buildings on the same footprint, possible roadside infill and conversions.  The heritage and setting of the village was to be protected, in particular the surrounding slopes which form one of the most attractive landscape features in East Staffordshire.  Residents favoured a Criteria based housing policy, a more " normal" development boundary approach found little support, not surprising perhaps as this would have concentrated building in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There has always been a clear acceptance for delivering the village's share of the Tier -3 expectations, in fact I am confident that the village will significantly exceed this thanks to permitted development. Already within the Plan period a number of such Planning proposals have come forward and others are anticipated. The policy as a whole, in my view, enjoys widespread acceptance as does the whole Draft.This was revealed in the most recent survey.  The Steering Group has no Plan B for delivering the residents' wishes.</p>	

<b>NEWB20</b>	David S Jeffries Continued.....	Whole Plan	<p>The other major issue that the village faces is that of periodic flooding, a concern to many. We live in a valley but there are obvious, inexpensive measures that could be put in place which could help in mitigation, but we need support from Staffordshire C.C, ESBC, The Environment Agency and crucially from one or two local landowners. This remains a work in progress for the village.</p> <p>The support and encouragement of the ESBC local plan support team has, I believe, been invaluable. I hope that they will attest to the commitment of our community to the process. I would appreciate knowing the outcome of any judgement made at the earliest opportunity.</p>	
<b>NEWB21</b>	Andrew Ellis on behalf of Mr Ron Skipper (W.J Skipper (Haulage)Ltd)	HE3	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of my client, Mr. Ron Skipper (W.J.Skipper (Haulage) Ltd, Moat Lane, Newborough, Burton on Trent, DE13 8SS), in connection with the consultation process currently being carried out by the Council in connection with the Newborough Neighbourhood Plan. My client is particularly concerned about the approach which is being taken in Policy HE3 which relate to the location of new residential development.</p> <p>Policy HE3 sets out a series of criteria for the location of new housing. Having assessed the criteria my client would wish to make the following comments and objections to the policy. For ease of reference these follow the bullet points in policy HE3:-</p> <p>1A. An infill plot should not have to front an existing highway. The policy should not seek to exclude plots within the village that may be set back from the highway but are suitable for housing e.g. sites within a cluster of dwellings.</p> <p>1C. This bullet point refers to replacement dwellings and would not achieve any increase to the housing supply within the village. I would suggest that detailed development management policies would be sufficient to deal with the impact of any replacement dwelling on the character and appearance of a particular area.</p>	

<p><b>NEWB21</b></p>	<p>Andrew Ellis on behalf of Mr Ron Skipper (W.J Skipper (Haulage)Ltd) Continued.....</p>	<p>HE3</p>	<p>Policy HE3 seeks to support the linear north-south extension of the village along either Holly Bush Road or Yoxall Road. My clients' concern with this policy is that it would lead to unacceptable ribbon development. Ribbon development is a line of buildings extending along a road, or private lane generally without accompanying development of the land to the rear and often served by individual accesses. A common feature of a village is groups of houses built using the road frontage edge of what were previously fields with side streets and blocks of buildings along streets forming over time. Whilst there will be opportunities to complete or "round off" these blocks (for example, by developing on sites that complement existing buildings on the opposite side of the road) ribbon development can become a problem when these well established groups are extended in a fashion unrelated to the traditional village pattern. This can result in the rural character being lost with development dominating otherwise rural views. Typically development of this type occurs on the approach into a village and fundamentally alters the physical image and setting of a settlement. Continuous linear development leads to suburbanisation and a loss of rural character for example, through the introduction of pavements and street lighting. Buildings come to dominate the view, where narrow roads were once bounded by trees, hedgerows and dykes. It could also make access to farmland difficult or cause road safety problems. Incremental development along a roadside with no natural finish point should be avoided. Policy HE3 should not seek to exclude the development of land to the east of Yoxall Road when the majority of this area has such a close physical relationship with the village centre and the limited community facilities. Whilst it is of course appropriate to protect the character of the conservation area this should not be at the expense of effectively sterilizing any future development within this area. The past history of the conservation area would act as a stimulus for high quality new design and development, leading to successful community building. My client has already promoted and offered a site to the east of Yoxall Road adjacent to Poplars Farm for residential development. This site can accommodate a minimum of four houses with the added benefit of delivering public open space and parking for the village. The site is available and should not be excluded from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could notify me of the decision on the plan proposal.</p>	
----------------------	---	------------	---	--

<b>NEWB22</b>	Phillip Metcalf (The National Forest)	CF3, TA2	<p>Thank you for consulting The National Forest Company on this submission draft version of the Newborough Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We have previously commented on this document and we are content that the amendments previously sought have been incorporated into this version.</p> <p>The National Forest Company particularly welcomes policy CF3 – Landscape and The National Forest. Development in the Parish which accords with this Policy will help to deliver the National Forest Strategy both through the creation of new woodlands and habitats and the enhancement of existing habitats. The opportunity for new habitat creation to contribute to a green infrastructure network is particularly valuable given the amount of new and mature planting within the Parish. Improving habitat connectivity will be of great benefit to these.</p> <p>Policy TA2 which supports enhancements to footpaths and leisure routes is also welcomed. This policy will enhance access to existing woodland sites within the parish and encourage increased use of this resource.</p> <p>The National Forest Company would be grateful to continue be notified of this Plan’s progression towards adoption.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB23</b>	Harry Skipper	HE3	<p>HE3 – seeks linear development of what is a rural village, development of this nature would cause rural views already enjoyed to be obscure if not blocked them completely.</p> <p>There was a site put forward on the original draft that met the criteria of public open space, much needed off road parking space and some small development without needing further infrastructure of pavements, lighting and other utility works.</p> <p>Linear development should be avoided and other sires, east of Yoxall road should be developed to meet the needs of the village. No linear development space will meet the open space and parking with the village.</p>	Yes
<b>NEWB24</b>	RJ & JM Rushton	HE3	<p>We feel that it is neither fair nor desirable to exclude development to the east side of Yoxall Road.</p> <p>If the protested plan goes ahead the village will be unbalanced, in fact it will be resemble a ribbon type development that should be avoided.</p>	Yes

<b>NEWB25</b>	Mr A K H Nelson	HE3	As I have written before to the NDP (Newborough) Committee I object to the inclusion for further linear (ribbon) development. The Dark Lane / Yoxall Road confluence is narrow and a pinch point for traffic. No doubt footpaths and street lighting would have to be installed. Purchase of land from the existing properties to extend footpaths would be contentious. It was agreed over a period of years by village inhabitants that development should be in the centre of the village to enhance and enforce a "heart" to the community. The Yoxall Road/Dark Lane section towards the village is prone to serious surface water flow off. I have in the past agreed with and allowed SCC Highways to pipe across my land to the Swarbourne to alleviate this. However, flooding still occurs. I suggest infrastructure costs would be expensive. There is no bus route along Yoxall Road. Several applications with Staffordshire have been turned down because of this situation – your views please.	
<b>NEWB26</b>	Rosemary Jeffries	General representation	I write in support of the NDP as forwarded to ESBC. Much time and effort has been put in by everybody concerned to explore aspirations for the future and the wish to preserve what we have and what we value. I particularly support the aspect of the Housing Policy that favours interspersed new properties rather than a housing estate. Neighbours seem to be supportive of what has been achieved and the openness of the process.	Yes
<b>NEWB27</b>	Jackie Beeston		Ideally situated with easy access on and off the road. More development encourages more benefits for the local businesses in such a rural area. It also gives other locals opportunity for their family members of the younger generation the chance to purchase a property in a beautiful area where property rarely comes on the market	Yes
<b>NEWB28</b>	Margaret Beeston		Expanding the village encourages families to move out here, hopefully giving years of generations joining Newborough school, keeping a village community and supporting the local businesses that are set in a very quiet area.	
<b>NEWB29</b>	Tracey Harte	HE3 and HE4	I support the proposals outlined in the above sections for the plan which allow limited housing growth (appropriate for a small village like Newborough), while ensuring measures are in place to protect the rural landscape and make sure any new development reflects and preserves the character of the area. I also support the wider objectives of the plan to improve traffic calming, reduce the risk of flooding, preserve community facilities and improve poor broadband provision and mobile phone signal in the local area.	Yes

<b>NEWB30</b>	Corinne and John Blackmore		<p>We strongly support the draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>As you would expect the major concern of residents was the number of new houses to be built and their location. Most wanted Newborough to keep its village centre and surrounding conservation area free from new developments.</p> <p>There have been many discussions within the village culminating in a village wide vote on the possible locations for any new developments. This vote showed that there was overwhelming support for any new developments to be linear extensions to the north and south of the village.</p> <p>In addition to the proposals on housing the plan also contains many proposals that seek to enhance the village, its amenities and way of life.</p>	
<b>NEWB31</b>	Lee Mainwaring		<p>Prevent loss of views for current occupants and prevent overlooking .</p> <p>DE3 – Duffield south side should not be discounted outright.</p> <p>DE3 – South side of Duffield lane to be considered as an option</p>	
<b>NEWB32</b>	Karen Mainwaring		<p>Agree plan is improved, fundamentally need to prevent current occupiers in the village losing views and being overlooked.</p> <p>I would still want the South of Duffield Lane to be part of the consideration not discounted out right. As it could be a good solution.</p>	Yes



NEWB33	David John Williams	<p><b>Section 6: Housing and Employment Policies (HE), HE3 Location of New Development</b></p>	<p><b>Section 6: Housing and Employment Policies (HE), HE3 Location of New Development</b>, specifically the paragraph <i>'new build residential schemes, excluding conversions and replacement buildings as defined by criteria 1B and 1C above, which are proposed in the area to the east of Yoxall Road and the south of Duffield Lane (as marked on (continued) will be resisted. This is to preserve the setting and character of the conservation area, the high probability of below ground archaeology and the landscape features of the mediaeval village and to prevent an increased risk of localised flooding as a result of additionally generated run-off water.'</i></p> <p>I completely support the above point. Unlike in some urban and particularly city locations in the UK, there is no compelling need to build on or near the flood plain of the river Swarbourn in Newborough. Reassurances by developers of their intentions to install additional drainage to mitigate flood risk – especially when the developments are for the construction of large-scale executive homes that the community neither wants nor needs – miss the point entirely. Further development around the river simply isn't required within the period of this Plan and should be rejected.</p> <p>We have suffered significant flood damage 3 times in the last 20 years and it's a very unpleasant experience. To rebuild our confidence that East Staffordshire Borough Council is serious about upholding its duty of care over residents, we need to see real evidence of its commitment to working with Newborough Parish Council to protect the interests of the general community even if this prevents a few landowners from building unwanted houses in the wrong areas.</p> <p>I support the Neighbourhood Plan entirely.</p>	Yes
--------	---------------------	--	--	-----