



Mavesyn Ridware Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Lichfield District Council and Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council joint response to Examiner's clarification letter 12 November 2024

The following joint response is provided to the queries contained within the [letter received from the independent examiner](#) on 8 November 2024.

Policy MR01

- 1. Part 1a of the policy refers to amendment of the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary. Please explain what this is an amendment from, and where I can see the criteria used and the basis of identification of the amended boundary.**

The neighbourhood plan proposes an extension to the existing village settlement boundary which is illustrated on the Local Plan policies maps which can be viewed on the [district council's website](#).

The only amendment to the settlement boundary is to reflect the proposed housing allocation proposed through Policy MR02. The proposed amendment to the settlement boundary has been drawn around the area of proposed built development and not the area of associated open space. This is shown on Fig 3.1 within the submitted Neighbourhood Plan.

Should the neighbourhood plan be 'made' then the Local Plan policies maps would be updated to reflect the village settlement boundary as amended by the neighbourhood plan.

- 2. In that part 1a of the policy supports residential development within the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary please explain why part 1c of the policy is necessary.**

Part 1c was originally drafted to apply across the Neighbourhood Area however following consultation part 1a was amended to refer specifically to Hill Ridware. In light of this change, it is agreed that part 1c is superfluous.

- 3. In that part 1a of the policy supports residential development within the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary does part 1d of the policy only apply outside the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary?**

Part 1d is intended to apply across the Neighbourhood Area. Replacement dwellings, in principle would be supported both within the settlement boundary of Hill Ridware and beyond.

- 4. Please explain how Part 1d of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy which provides for the demolition of heritage assets in stated circumstances. See paragraphs 207 and 209 of the NPPF.**

It is agreed that part 1d does pose a level of conflict with NPPF paragraphs 207 and 209. In light of national guidance, it is suggested that the reference to the demolition of a heritage asset is deleted.

5. Please explain the term “the requirements of design and other policies” in part 6 of the policy.

‘The requirements of design and other policies’ refers to other policies within the development plan including Policy MR05 (Sustainable Design).

Suggest this be reworded as follows for clarity: *“Residential development should demonstrate high standards of design to create a locally distinctive sense of place, meeting the requirements of Policy MR05: Sustainable Design and other local and national policies.”*

Policy MR02

6. In the context of the recommendation relating to Policy MR02 in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report May 2024, and in the context of the Regulation 16 representation of the Environment Agency I am mindful to recommend a modification to add a requirement that any proposed development scheme for the site must be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment that demonstrates the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient and the development will not result in flood risk to any existing properties outside the site. I invite comment on this intended modification.

Content with a proposed modification to the policy to state that a site-specific flood risk assessment would be required at the planning application stage. Given the likely scale of development this would be required by national guidance, as therefore consider it could be included in the explanatory text rather than the policy itself.

7. Please explain the term “an active frontage” as used in part 3a of the policy.

The term ‘active frontage’ seeks to ensure that development fronts on to Uttoxeter/Ridware Road and doesn’t back on to the road through a line of rear boundary walls/fences.

Policy MR04

8. Please explain how a house that is a “self-build” to meet specific local need includes significant measures to offset the unsustainable location.

A house that is ‘self-build’ would provide no significant measures to offset locational sustainability. However:

- There is a relatively small need for self-build properties as demonstrated by the District Council’s self and custom build register (5 persons in 2022/23 and 2 persons in 2023/24).
- Of those that are on the register, many are seeking a plot in the rural area.
- Evidence produced by the NaCSBA has demonstrated that ‘self-build’ properties result in lower energy consumption and reduced CO2 emissions over typical new build properties. In addition, through construction self-builders are more likely to purchase materials locally and utilise local labour through SME trades.

It should be noted that a new hourly bus service has been secured within the Neighbourhood Area. The Chaserider service (63) stops at Blithbury and connects the village to Abbots Bromley and Uttoxeter to the north and Armitage with Handsacre, Hednesford and Cannock to the south. The site is approx. 400m from the Blithbury bus stop but is not connected by an existing footway.

Policy MR06

9. Please explain how the approach adopted in part 2 of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy relating to listed buildings.

It is noted that national policy only seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets, including their settings. National policy does not seek to avoid harm.

10. What listed building Grade are the buildings and structures referred to in parts 2a and 2b of the policy.

- High Bridge – Grade II* (Feature 10 on Fig 4.1)
- Ridware Hall, attached coach house and stables – Grade II (Feature 17 on Fig 4.1)

These buildings and structures are those of greatest importance to the Neighbourhood Area that lie outside of the Mavesyn Ridware Conservation Area covered in part 1 of Policy MR06. An alternative, acceptable approach would be to replace with a generic paragraph that covers all heritage assets e.g. Development should conserve and enhance heritage assets, including their setting, in a manner appropriate to their significance.

11. Are the heritage assets identified in part 3 of the policy being identified as non-designated heritage assets, and if so, what were the criteria for their selection?

The heritage assets identified in part 3 of the policy are being identified as non-designated heritage assets that are locally listed. Their selection has been guided by feedback through consultation (including engagement with The Ridwares History Society) and evidence set out in the [Mavesyn Ridware Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan](#) published by the District Council.

The following criteria were considered in identifying the proposed non-designated heritage assets, as set out in the CAA&MP:

- Special architectural or landscape interest i.e. is it the work of a particular architect or designers of regional or local note? Is the building/designed landscape a particularly good example of its type/style?
- Special historic (social, economic, cultural) interest.
- Association with well-known local historic persons or events.
- Contribution to the streetscape/townscape i.e. a group of unrelated buildings that make up an aesthetically pleasing group or a view that offers an attractive scene. Buildings may be illustrative of a range of historic periods which, taken together, illustrate the development of the locality. Views may be famously recognisable and regarded as an historic asset in their own right for example, views of Lichfield Cathedral from various points around the city.
- Group value of buildings designed as an architectural entity, especially as examples of town planning (e.g. model villages, squares, terraces)

The above criteria were applied to buildings within the Neighbourhood Area beyond the Mavesyn Ridware Conservation Area.

Policy MR07

12. Please explain how part 4 of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy as set out in paragraph 186 of the NPPF which refers to ancient woodland.

The NPPF, at paragraph 186c, provides policy in respect of the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees). Within the Neighbourhood Area there are two areas of ancient woodland (Pipe Wood and Spring Cawarden Farm). These two areas of woodland are also designated as Sites of Biological Importance. Part 4 of Policy MR07 is intended to be complementary to national policy by seeking to provide a level of protection on other, locally valued, non-ancient woodland within the parish. Whilst these other areas of non-ancient woodland may not be considered irreplaceable habitat, they form an important element of the rural landscape within the parish.

Consider additional text could be added to the policy or interpretation text to make this clear such as “Beyond areas of Ancient Woodland and areas including ancient or Veteran trees development should have no significant adverse impacts on existing woodland areas.”