

Sadler, Reiss

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 April 2019 18:09
To: Plans, Policy
Subject: Eckington Neighbourhood Plan - Com
Attachments: Eckington Plan - Comments from Halls Apr19.docx

Please see attached our documented concerns and observations against the latest Eckington Neighbourhood Plan – in particular we have major concerns with the Jarvis Street development as it has not been appropriately documented/agreed and in our view, should require more detailed planning before it is approved. We do not support this part of the plan therefore.

We reside at [REDACTED] incidentally.

Please confirm receipt of this email, and indicate when you will be able to formally respond to our points.

Best regards
Steve and Lorraine Halls
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Please see below our comments and observations on the Eckington Neighbourhood Plan 'Reg 16'. It is clear that a considerable amount of quality work has been completed to date to develop the Plan.

Whilst supporting the principles adopted to date – eg the 'plan has been community-led and it promotes the wishes and needs of the community and will result in a more sustainable and healthier community.' – **we do nevertheless have a number of significant concerns described below, solely around the Jarvis Street development which we do not support.**

Concerns – Jarvis Street Development

1. We do not support the principle of grouping the Jarvis Street (JS1/F) developments as shown on Map 3 & Map 7, and described in Policy H12 (on page 49) with the other proposed developments as the actual plan details have not been defined to a sufficient level and from our perspective have not been appropriately thought through – eg;
 - a. the exact positioning of the proposed 6 new dwellings has not been defined – this could potentially adversely affect our rear landscape view of Bredon Hill
 - b. bearing in mind the many notes in the plan around meeting the community need for housing, we do not understand or agree with the need for or provision of any 'Regular Market' homes for this development – presumably this is purely for financial gain to the landowner
 - c. the size/shape of the new recreation area has not been defined
 - d. the likely community use of this new area has not been stated - so;
 - i. will football or other sports pitches be installed – what is being considered
 - ii. will it support weekend sports activities – if yes then that would affect the ambience and peace/quiet to the rear of our property
 - iii. presumably the annual firework night and bonfire could be moved here -- if yes then that would affect the ambience and peace/quiet to the rear of our property
 - iv. presumably the frequent car boot sales could be moved here -- if yes then that would affect the ambience and peace/quiet to the rear of our property
 - e. the access through the new dwellings to the recreation area would surely add significant traffic movement to that end of Jarvis Street – we note that the scale used on Map 7 is completely misleading as shows a wide thoroughfare through Jarvis Street – it is in fact very narrow and restrictive
 - f. the access from the school grounds to the new recreation area has not been defined or agreed with the existing landowners – although it is shown on Map 7 as JSG
 - g. have the lighting requirements for the proposed use of the additional car park spaces at the school for the Village Hall been considered – surely in Winter the lack of lighting would be a health and safety risk – from our perspective, any additional lighting would affect our current 'dark sky' view, which we consider a considerable asset to our property
 - h. access to 3 The Thatched Barn garage (JSH on Map 7) has not been properly defined or agreed with the house owners

Other Concerns

1. Section 4 – Issue 5; this discusses existing 'traffic concerns' in the village – but does not take account of the likely increase in traffic volumes from the Jarvis Street development, nor has the plan estimated what these might be
2. Section 6.5; this states there is a community need for Open Spaces – how has this been determined and validated

3. Section 8.17; this states 'This policy is in conformity with SWDP 21 which requires that "the scale, height and massing of development must be appropriate to the setting of the site and the surrounding landscape character and townscape, including existing urban grain and density' – yet the Plan has taken no account of the landscape views from our property (and our neighbours property) of Bredon Hill which is a significant reason we purchased our property. We therefore request this be properly assessed before any detailed plans are agreed for the 6 new dwellings in Jarvis Street
4. Section 9.16; our points in 3 above apply additionally to this section
5. Annex 2 – Key Landscape 7; - this rightly highlights the importance of the landscapes to the properties in Hacketts Lane, but this section makes no mention of the same landscape view for our property at [REDACTED] and our neighbours at [REDACTED] – this is clearly an unfortunate omission – we formally request inclusion of our properties in future versions of this plan
6. Has any wild-life assessment been completed for the proposed area – if not then it should be as;
 - a. a small group of wild deer frequently use the area – we consider this to be an asset of our property
 - b. the open barns house a number of wild bats which are a common sight in Summer evenings – again we consider this to be an asset of our property