14th October 2014

Dear Mr Griffith,

I provide the following additional comments, as requested:-

Site 25 – I did view the site from the road to the north of the site and private land to the west of the site back in September, when we looked at the other sites for consideration. I noted that the land was ‘domed’ in shape and fell away to the south and west. This tract of land forms an important setting for the canal and the railway and a rural edge to the village, with views back toward the Conservation Area. I have concerns that the development of this land for housing would have a detrimental impact on landscape character. I believe I referred to this site as Site ‘B’ in the conclusions of my initial analysis.

Site 26 – In order to develop this site, the dwellings would need to face Marsh Road, as the existing dwellings do on the west side of the road. Just taking the number of dwellings on the opposite side of the road, the site would be potentially capable of accommodating approximately 10 dwellings. However, this would result in a large number of dwellings backing onto the garden of the neighbouring property. It would also result in ‘backland’ development gardens (similar to site 3 in terms of overall assessment). Consideration would also need to be given to potential unacceptable overlooking to the neighbour to the southeast, since minimum separation distances to the shared boundary would need to be maintained. The access road is narrow and WCC Highways would need to be consulted in order to ensure safe access/egress could be maintained. Any dwellings on this site would be within the ‘built envelope’ of the village and would cause minimal visual harm when compared with other sites on the periphery of the village. Therefore, the site may have potential, but concerns remain relating to the physical constraints of the site and potential harm to residential amenity. If the site was accessed from Aston Cantlow Road, I do not see how there would be sufficient remaining space to develop the site.

Site 27 – Again, when we drove up to site 12 back in September, I did gain a view of the agricultural land beyond (listed here as site 27). From memory, the land appeared reasonably level. However, as with the land making up sites 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, this forms part of the ‘corridor’ of land forming an important rural edge to the village. The development of this site without the development of sites 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 would create an ‘island’ of detached development which would not sit well in the landscape. I consider development of this site would cause unacceptable landscape impact.

Site 28 – I have not had an opportunity to visit this site. However, the land in question appears to be part of a large agricultural field beyond the southern edge of the village. The site is detached from the village and would look to extend the village significantly. Whilst I acknowledge there are other dwellings to the south of the site, this in itself is no reason to pursue such a site. I consider the development of this site would not appear ‘organic’ and would therefore appear incongruous in this rural landscape. I have concerns with this site and consider its development would result in unacceptable harm to the landscape.

Of course, these comments have been provided without a site visit and as before, this assessment has been included to provide a basic indication of potential harm to the landscape through developing or re-developing each site. This is the opinion of the author and does not fully analyse the more complex issues of appropriate/inappropriate development in the Green Belt or practicability of developing the site due to technical matters such as highways assess etc which would need to be assessed with other professional bodies to assess potential deliverability. It is merely information necessary to help ‘rank’ the sites assessed in terms of potential harm to new built form on the local landscape.

I hope this is of assistance. However, should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I hope these comments reach you in time for your consultation.

Kind regards,

Matthew.

Matthew Neal

Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Chief Executive’s Unit