

Edenfield Masterplan & Design Code (September 2023 Update)

Table of Responses to Council Comments

Colour Key
Comment fully addressed/ incorporated in document.
Comment partly addressed (where some elements are not deliverable, policy compliant or proportionate for a high-level Mplan & Dcode)
Comment not addressed (where request is not deliverable, policy compliant or proportionate for a high-level Mplan & Dcode)

Bullet no / H66 policy criteria no	Council Comment	Response in Mplan & Dcode
Planning Comments – Michael Atherton – 10.08.2023 (bullet points numbered in order)		
1	Key features – Arrangement of dwellings around junctions/nodal points with specific design features/materials to create visual interest and form a character of development.	Included in last para of 'Junction Design and built form response' section of Site Wide Codes (page 74).
2	Cluster of dwellings with some harmony in design features and use of detailing to form character groups.	Included in last bullet of 'General built form & urban design principles' section of Site Wide Codes (page 76).
3	House types need to be high quality designs throughout the development(s), and should incorporate innovative designs and feature glazing. There should be a range in the design of dwellings across the development and it should not just feature standardised house types which could be found anywhere – this needs to be a prestigious development of a high standard, on high-value land released from Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, and there is no viability case here to warrant any low-cost designs / materials.	Included in 2nd and 3rd paras of 'Homes and Building' section of Site Wide Codes (page 77).
4	Building materials in all areas to comprise a mix of natural stone, reconstituted stone, brick (of different shades), timber, render, slate and roof tiles.	Included in second para of 'Identity' section (page 58) and in all character areas – Area Type Codes AT/EC O6 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS O6 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS O6 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN O6 for Edenfield North (page 88).
5	Roofs should only feature high quality materials such as slate or a high quality modern equivalent, or innovative high quality materials appropriate to the character of the area. The use of standard, thick, concrete roof tiles will not be permitted.	Included in second para of 'Identity' section (page 58) and in all character areas – Area Type Codes AT/EC O7 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS O7 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS O7 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN O7 for Edenfield North (page 88).
6	Boundary treatments in all areas to include stone walls. Also retaining walls which are visible from the street/footpath network should all be natural stone faced.	Included in last para of 'Walking and cycling' section of Site Wide Codes (page 68).
7	There needs to be a commitment to permeability within streetscapes.	The 'Pedestrian and cycle connectivity' section (page 48) the Masterplan (page 51), and site Wide Code MO O2 (page 68), confirm a commitment to a proposed link shown through the site (subject to land ownership constraints), with various potential routings and options shown. The requirement for a north south route is not a formal policy requirement, nor are the prescriptive requirements for it to be full width, off-street, suitable for equestrian etc. It is also pertinent that the topography and site constraints of the central parcel mean an off-street link that is suitable for equestrian is simply not possible.
8	The proposed cycle link through the development should be upgraded to be a suitably surfaced, full width, off street, multi-user path, suitable for equestrian, cycle and pedestrian use and should avoid sharing streets with vehicular traffic, as far as possible.	Included in first bullet point in 'Surface Materials' section and 'Surface Materials palette' table in Site Wide Codes (page 73).
9	Driveways need to be high quality permeable block paving (e.g. Tobermore Hydropave) for visual and drainage reasons – and not tarmac.	Included in criteria 5v of policy compliance table at page 9 and 5th bullet of 'Landscape Design Principles' section in Site Wide Codes (page 60).
10	Private drives (i.e. unadopted parts of access roads) need to be a higher quality type of paving (e.g. Tobermore Hydropave) – again, not tarmac.	Included in NPPF section in Context chapter at page 15 and 11th bullet of 'Landscape Design Principles' section in Site Wide Codes (page 60).
11	Development should incorporate useable public open space within the developed areas/streets themselves (such as small landscaped/tree planted seating areas and small orchards/ Incredible Edible-type vegetable or herb planters, etc) and not just limit the POS to bring a separate entity on the periphery of the developed area.	Included in second para of 'Westward views.' section and 'Design Influences box' within Context chapter (page 26).
12	Tree planting within the street scene should be included in the proposed built up areas.	Included in 14th bullet of 'Landscape Design Principles' section in Site Wide Codes (page 60).
13	The importance of long views to Peel Tower and Emmanuel Church (Holcombe) should be recognised and reflected in the aspirations for the layout of the development.	Included in first para of 'SuDs' section of Site Wide Codes (page 62).
14	Clarity should be provided whether native hedge or drystone wall boundaries are going to be used at the interface between the new development and the perimeter of the Green Belt.	Included in 'Biodiversity' section of Site Wide Codes (page 63).
15	A commitment to raingardens and other SuDs features such as permeable paving, water butts, green roofs, green walls (which could be a very useful way of treating retaining structures) should be included.	Included in 4th bullet of 'Access and parking typologies' section in Site Wide Codes (page 74).
16	The section on biodiversity is extremely brief and provides little guidance regarding habitat creation. Some habitat interventions are described, however, there should be a commitment to measures such as: hedgehog/small mammal gaps under boundaries.	Included in second bullet of 'Off site highway improvements' section in Masterplan chapter (page 46).
17	Access and parking typologies: The use of formal hedges to separate parking bays where space is limited can provide useful green infrastructure and visual impact benefits.	
18	Areas of aggregate chippings are proposed at key points. It states that the colour of the aggregate and exact detail to be agreed with the LA engineer at design stage. The range of materials and colours proposed should be included now, within the Masterplan/Design Code to ensure consistency. The images shown need further explanation describing what is illustrated.	
Policy Comments – Forward Planning – 18.08.2023 (points numbered in order as per H66 criteria in order, including Design Guide headings for criteria 2)		
1 – The comprehensive development of the entire site is demonstrated through a masterplan with an agreed programme of implementation and phasing		

i	Expect document to provide guidance for the entire allocation and related land (e.g. possible school extension, Richard Nuttall, Alderwood land). Suggest that these owners are invited to participate in the production of this document and would have the opportunity to make their views known through the consultation process.	Document does provide guidance for the entire allocation, including Richard Nuttall and the Alderwood site, and these landowners have been invited to participate and their views have been heard (alongside Taylor Wimpey, Anwyll Land and Peel/ Northstone); with all 5 parties endorsing the updated (September 23) document.
ii	Document repeatedly refers to further details being provided in subsequent planning applications. Again, it is necessary to stress that we expect the Masterplan and Design Code to establish the overall framework for the development of this allocation.	The updated (September 23) document does just this, in establishing an overall framework for the allocation, to be developed in subsequent applications.
iii	There does not appear to be an agreed programme of implementation and phasing with specified time periods - to support the delivery of the allocation. Although the table and map are useful (pp54-55), they lack this specific detail.	The phasing section (pages 54 and 55) has been updated to confirm the current agreed phasing and the key deliverables of each phase. However we reiterate that each parcel can be delivered independently without prejudicing any other, and therefore the phasing could change/ overlap without significant impact. As such, there is no need (or policy requirement) to specify time periods, and it is not reasonable or practical for a multi phase, multi ownership allocation to commit to this at this stage of the process anyway.
2 - The development is implemented in accordance with an agreed design code		
Context	i	Notes that Edenfield NP has been through Reg 14 consultation, and AECOM Design Code includes useful information in relation to the context of the site and to the other 9 characteristics of a design code. ECNF's work benefits from participation by the local community in its preparation. Ideally it would be beneficial if the developer's masterplan could be assessed against the work published by ECNF, and the comments that were received during the consultation.
	ii	A further landowner has submitted an application (2022/0577) at Alderwood, which is within the site allocation boundary and should be identified in the Masterplan as land with the potential for development.
Identity/ Character Areas	The document identifies three character areas for the existing Edenfield settlement: north Edenfield, Market Street and South Edenfield. This differs from the four proposed in the draft Design Code of the Neighbourhood Plan which are the village cores, the traditional terraces, the piecemeal domestic development mainly in south Edenfield and the rural fringe. The Masterplan explains the differences between these in much more detail, justifying these Character Areas.	The 'Edenfield Neighbourhood Plan' section at page 18 clarifies that the Edenfield NP/ AECOM Design Guide has been accounted for, particularly the local comments and analysis of existing building vernacular and settlement character, which have been incorporated in the Context Chapter; however the proposed Area Types and Design Codes do diverge from the NP work, as this broadly seeks to retain the existing open and rural character to the west of Edenfield, and fails to properly acknowledge this strategic housing allocation H66, and Edenfield's elevation to an Urban Local Service Centre. We also note the NP has not been on formal Regulation 16 consultation yet and we have not yet seen the Council's own comments on the Reg 14 consultation, so it is not possible to give it any weight at this stage (and this was agreed with Officers at the point the last version was submitted in June 2023). The Alderwood scheme is included within the Masterplan, noting the detail is to be confirmed/ agreed (noting outstanding objections) with a potential access route through to Market Street from the TW land. TW have met with the Alderwood applicant and their dialogue continues.
Built Form	i	Layout - We note the internal road layout in the southern parcel near Chatterton Heys has a south-west to north-east axis which may help protect views to Peel Tower as set out in the Landscape Assessment Study and the allocated site specific assessment. This key view needs to be highlighted in the key characteristics for this area.
	ii	Building Heights - The ECNF Design Code states that the height of new properties situated within Area A of the landscape assessment study (the central parcel of the site) where landscape impacts have been assessed as being significant, should be no more than 2 storeys to mitigate adverse impacts. We note the additional detail of building heights in the revised document and would only seek to stress that we would expect to see landmark buildings which don't obscure direct views of the surrounding countryside.
	iii	Boundary Treatments - The use of dry stone walls and hedges should be used in the character areas along Market Street and Blackburn Road in keeping with the village cores and traditional terrace character areas of the Edenfield Neighbourhood Area Design Code.
	iv	Setbacks - Acceptable distances between properties and the road should be provided. The setback should be small for properties along Blackburn Road and Market Street to be in keeping with the local character of the village cores and traditional terraces. The setback should be more important in the central and rural edges of the development to include large front gardens.
Movement/ Active travel and public transport	i	Annotation and arrow included on 'Strategic Principles: Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity' plan at page 48. Area Code AT/CF 08 in Chatterton South includes for key views to be considered, including to Peel Tower. General requirement to protect key views in second para of 'Westward views.' section and 'Design Influences box' within Context chapter (page 26).
	ii	Area Codes on height (AT/EC 04; AT/VS 04; AT/CS 04 and AT/EN 04) confirm max 10-20% 2.5 storey or where 'appropriateness can be demonstrated'. Included in second para of 'Identity' section (page 58) and in all character areas - Area Type Code AT/EC 07 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS 07 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS 07 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN 07 for Edenfield North (page 88). The need for variation in set back distances is set out in first para of the 'General built form and urban design principles' section of the Site Wide Code (at page 77) and within all character areas - Area Type Code AT/EC 05 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS 05 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS 05 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN 05 for Edenfield North (page 88). The secondary street character section (second para at page 70) also sets a regular set back for this street typology to allow for generous front gardens with frontage parking and tree planting as appropriate.
i	In terms of pedestrian and cycle provision, a north to south walking and cycling route through the site will provide a safe, off-road connection through Edenfield, linking into the wider walking and cycling network branching to Rawtenstall, Haslingden & Irwell Vale.	The 'Pedestrian and cycle connectivity' section (page 48) the Masterplan (page 51), and site Wide Code MO 02 (page 68), confirm a commitment to proposed link shown through the site (subject to land ownership constraints), with various potential routings and options shown. However we note that the requirement for a north south route is not a formal policy requirement.
ii	We would like to see greater reference to the improvements to the footpath and bridleway networks as discussed in the Green Belt Compensation Paper and with regards TW's current application. The creation or enhancement of existing footpaths and cycle ways to Edenfield Primary School and to the Edenfield Neighbourhood Parade (as shown on Policies Map) and south to Stubbins and north to Rawtenstall are important to ensure good accessibility to local services from the development site. Improved routes between Edenfield and Stubbins would also be appropriate, as this would link the southern part of the allocation with Stubbins and the facilities there, including the Primary School. These should be appropriately lit, direct and overlooked by properties as much as possible.	The 'Green Belt Compensation' section in Masterplan Chapter (page 48) and criteria 7 of the policy compliance table (page 9), includes a commitment to improvements to PROW/Bridleway network and local sports and recreation facilities through proportionate contributions to be secured through S106 agreements from individual applications as they are determined. There is no policy justification to provide any more detail at this stage, nor is it necessary for this high level document.
i	Car parking should include the provision of electric vehicle charging points in line with the Local Plan policy TR4, with one electric vehicle charging point to be provided for every new house. Three community car parking areas are now included in the Masterplan. All of these must also comply with Policy TR4, providing the appropriate amount of electric vehicle charging points for the number of spaces provided.	Included in Site Wide Code RE 02 in 'Resources' section (page 77).

<p>Parking</p>	<p>ii A discrepancy also exists between the "Market St Corridor Improvement Plan" and the most recent site layout for Planning Application 2022/0451, specifically regarding the community car parking area in the TW parcel, with Corridor Improvement Plan showing a one-way system flowing West to East, and the TW app showing it East to West. Clarification is sought on this discrepancy, with the preferred option being the one shown in the Market St Corridor Improvement Plan. However, it is considered important to note that the position of the car parking facility requires a right turn across an oncoming traffic flow, giving rise to potential tail backs onto Market St. Further information regarding this may be provided by Lancashire County Council.</p>	<p>The arrangement in the 'Market St Corridor Improvement Plan' is what is proposed, in line with the Councils preference, and the detailed layout for the TW application will be amended accordingly. LCC have raised no objection to this arrangement in terms of traffic flow/ tailbacks, and detail can be refined and agreed through the detailed application.</p>
<p>Waste Collection</p>	<p>The Masterplan and Design Code does not set out how bin storage and collection is to be provided throughout the site. Guidance is available from the NHBC2.</p>	<p>Included in Site Wide Code RE 04 in 'Resources' section (page 77), detailed to be included and addressed within individual planning applications.</p>
<p>Nature</p>	<p>i Green Infrastructure – We note this section has been expanded, however, there is still no reference to any on-site water courses. We note that the proposed scheme still contains two ponds, which originally was not supported by the LLFA.</p> <p>ii Biodiversity – The woodland along Church Lane is shown as a Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat on the Magic Map website. As such, any proposals to destroy part of this woodland as shown to the north of Church Lane to accommodate housing will not be supported. It is however considered that the provision of a cycle way / pedestrian link from the central parcel of the allocated site to the northern parcel, via this woodland, could be acceptable providing that the minimum number of trees are felled and each tree is replaced to the ratio of 1 tree felled to 2 trees replanted. It appears that the area of woodland between the central and northern parcels has been reduced. Can this be clarified?</p>	<p>Included in 'Green and blue infrastructure plan' (page 43) and 4th para of 'Green and blue infrastructure' section (page 42). Commitment at page 60 that existing watercourses must not be culverted (13th bullet point of 'Landscape Design Principles' section. LLFA are no longer objecting to the Mplan & Dcode.</p> <p>Treatment of woodland between central and northern parcels is addressed in 5th paragraph of 'Green and blue infrastructure' section of Masterplan chapter' (page 42) and criteria 5i of policy compliance table (page 8) – notes how selective thinning of non native trees will allow native trees to flourish and increase biodiversity (with replacement trees replanted at a 2:1 ratio).</p>
<p>Nature</p>	<p>iii Biodiversity – The masterplan does not indicate where or how within the allocation will the measures to address biodiversity net gain be positioned. This would seem to be an unfortunate omission.</p>	<p>There is no policy justification for the Masterplan to incorporate specific BNG measures/ receptor sites, as it is not mentioned within policy H66 which covers the Masterplan & Design Code and other detailed application requirements within the Edenfield allocation, nor is it inherent in policies ENV1 or ENV4. Nor is it achievable or realistic to expect this at the Masterplan stage as this is intended to be a strategic high-level document; whereas identifying BNG measures and sites is a matter of detail that can only be confirmed when detailed proposals have been worked up across the full allocation, with associated metric assessments to confirm the off-site mitigation required both in terms of quantum and habitat type (grassland, woodland etc). We would only be able to provide this level of detail in the Masterplan if the allocation was being brought forward as one detailed phase/ application, however this is not the case given the multiple ownerships and developer interests within the allocation (nor would this be desirable given the clear aspiration within policy H66 and the local community that this site be brought forward in multiple phases over a longer period of time).</p>
<p>Uses</p>	<p>i The Masterplan should set out that 30% of the dwellings should be affordable in accordance with Policy HS3 of the Local Plan, and the tenure of these units.</p> <p>ii Also at least 10% of the plots in the new development should be made available for custom or self-build for people wishing to build their own homes. Since our original responses, the number of people on the Rossendale Self-Build Register has increased to 47 (as of 10th August 2023). Amongst these, three people identified Edenfield as their first choice of settlement, seven as their second choice and 5 as their third choice. 1 other person identified Edenfield as one of their choices. As such a total of 16 people identified Edenfield as one of their preferred location to initiate a self-build project.</p>	<p>Included in Site Wide Code US 01 (page 58).</p> <p>Included in 3rd para of 'Homes and Buildings' section in Site Wide Codes (page 77). Potential for smaller sites to deliver self build also mentioned in Site Wide Code US 01 (page 58).</p>
<p>Homes & buildings</p>	<p>The Masterplan and Design Code should set out that at least 20% of the dwellings should be built according to the standard M4(2) of the Building Regulations in order to be compliant with Policy HS5 of the Local Plan. We note that TW's application exceeds this.</p>	<p>Included in Site Wide Code US 02 (page 58).</p>
<p>Resources</p>	<p>i The Masterplan should consider the orientation of properties to maximise the use of solar technologies whilst preserving key views to Peel Tower in the southern section and to the western tower of Edenfield Parish Church in the central part of the site. We note the insertion of RO1 and RO2 but consider these should be strengthened, and the schemes to go beyond the minimum Building Regulations standards.</p> <p>ii It is expected that 10% of energy requirements from the new development will be met by on-site renewable energy provision such as through the use of solar panels and/or air source heat pump as set out on the Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document. A full assessment will be required to accompany any planning applications to show how this proposal accords with the Climate Change SPD. It is the Council's hope that the development of this former Green Belt land would be an exemplar scheme, not just for Rossendale but wider afield.</p>	<p>Included in Site Wide Code RE01 in 'Resources' section (page 77).</p>
	<p>POLICY H66 CRITERIA 3-11</p>	<p>It is inherent in policy H66 that only criteria 1 and 2 (above) are directly applicable to the Masterplan and Design Code itself, with the remaining criteria 3-11 (below) concerned with application documents and matters of detail to be refined and confirmed through subsequent planning applications. This point is made clearly within the Exec summary (page 6) of the document and endorsed by Officers previously. Indeed the Council are the authors of this policy and if they wanted it to say something different, this should have been introduced through the Local Plan Examination. All comments below must be read in this context. Notwithstanding this points 3-11 are addressed within the policy compliance table (pages 8-9) and clarified further below.</p>
<p>3 – A Transport Assessment is provided demonstrating that the site can be safely and suitably accessed by all users, including disabled people, prior to development taking place on site</p>		

i	We note that a full transport assessment is expected. If the Community Car Parking Areas are proposed for existing residents of Edenfield who may have vehicles displaced due to proposed on-street parking restrictions on Market St, we would expect to see details on how these new parking spaces will be retained and secured for these existing residents.	A Full Transport Assessment has been submitted alongside the Masterplan & Design Code (with a summary included at Appendix C) and this has been largely endorsed by LCC (in their comments dated 25.08.2023), subject to some minor amends to the 'Market St Corridor Improvement Plan' which have been incorporated in the updated (September 2023) document. The 7th bullet in the 'Access and parking typologies' section of the Site Wide Codes (page 74) confirms that the level of new visitor/ community parking will exceed that displaced as a result of the development. The current TW application meets this commitment and the detailed arrangements for how these spaces will be managed will be negotiated and agreed with LCC through the individual planning applications for each phase.
4 (although actually relates to criteria 5) – Design and Layout i. Landscaping of an appropriate density and height is implemented throughout the site to 'soften' the overall impact and provide a buffer to the new Green Belt boundary vi. Materials and boundary treatments should reflect the local context		
i	We maintain that the use of natural stone and not just reconstituted stone or stone effect should feature within the material pallet in the design code especially for properties fronting Market Street and Blackburn Road.	As per response to Mike Atherton bullet 4 – requirement for natural stone included in second para of 'Identity' section (page 58) and in all character areas – Area Type Codes AT/EC 06 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS 06 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS 06 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN 06 for Edenfield North (page 88).
ii	Timber wall boundary treatments will not be acceptable alongside the principal elevation of dwellings. The use of boundaries which will enhance biodiversity should be encouraged, for example, permeable for wildlife to minimise the impact of the development on small mammals	As per response to Mike Atherton bullet 6 – use of stone boundary walls in prominent locations included in second para of 'Identity' section (page 58). Use of stone walls and hedgerows in all character areas – Area Type Codes AT/EC 07 for Edenfield Core (page 82); AT/VS 07 for Village Streets (page 84); AT/CS 07 for Chatterton South (page 86) and AT/EN 07 for Edenfield North (page 88).
5 (actually criteria 6) – An Ecological Impact Assessment is undertaken which identifies suitable mitigation measures for any adverse impacts particularly on the Woodland Network and stepping stone habitat located within the site		
i	The woodland area to the south and north of Church Lane should be retained and strengthened.	Included in 5th paragraph of 'Green and blue infrastructure' section of Masterplan chapter (page 42) and criteria 5i of policy compliance table (page 8) – notes how selective thinning of non native trees will allow native trees to flourish and increase biodiversity (with replacement trees replanted at a 2:1 ratio).
6 (criteria 7) – Compensatory improvements must be provided to the Green Belt land in proximity of the site in accordance with Policy SD4		
i	As cited previously the Masterplan should identify the locations of proposed Green Belt compensation measures and set out further information about the nature of these measures and a timescale for their implementation. A schedule should be prepared for the whole allocation showing which measures are being provided, and by which developer(s) for green belt compensation where appropriate, and for biodiversity net gain. Specific measures which are required to mitigate impacts of the development should also be distinguished.	The 'Green Belt Compensation' section in Masterplan Chapter (page 48) and criteria 7 of the policy compliance table (page 9), includes a commitment to improvements to PROW/Bridleway network and local sports and recreation facilities through proportionate SIO6 contributions from individual applications. There is no policy justification to provide any more detail at this stage, nor is it necessary for this high level document.
7 (criteria 8) – Geotechnical investigations will be required to confirm land stability and protection of the A56, and consideration paid to the suitability or not of sustainable drainage systems on the boundary adjoining the A56		
i	As noted previously the Masterplan and Design Code are not accompanied by geotechnical investigations to confirm the suitability of sustainable drainage systems along the A56. This should be addressed.	As confirmed in criteria 8 of the policy compliance table (page 9), the Masterplan accounts for ground conditions and land stability across the allocation based on technical work undertaken to date. The TW Phase 1 application includes a detailed Site Investigation worked up in dialogue with relevant consultees, as will subsequent applications to allow detail to be refined/agreed. There is no policy justification to provide any more detail at this stage, nor is it necessary for this high level document.
8 (criteria 9) – Provision will be required to expand either Edenfield CE Primary School or Stubbins Primary School from a 1 form entry to a 1.5 form entry primary school, and for a secondary school contribution subject to the Education Authority. Land to the rear of Edenfield CE Primary School which may be suitable is shown on the Policies Map as 'Potential School and Playing Field Extension' Any proposals to extend the schools into the Green Belt would need to be justified under very special circumstances and the provisions of paragraph 144 of the NPPF.		
i	It is our understanding that Edenfield is the preferred school for expansion by the Education Authority. Comments have been received from the Education Authority and further work is being requested from them to look specifically at the impacts on school provision in Edenfield from the entire H66 allocation. The masterplan needs to indicate how and when on-site expansion at Edenfield or Stubbins would be considered and delivered by the developers. It should be noted that the developers will still need to apply for planning permission and justify special circumstances as to why this land which is within the Green Belt should be developed.	The Masterplan identifies the land to the rear of Edenfield CE Primary School for potential expansion (page 51) and makes a commitment that this land can be made available should the local education authority identify a need, with detailed arrangements to be agreed through subsequent planning applications (5th para of 'Land Use' section of Masterplan chapter (page 44). This confirms that the costs of providing the land for the benefit of the allocation, and subject to proven need, will be borne by the developers.
9 (criteria 10) – Noise and air quality impacts will need to be investigated and necessary mitigation measures secured		
i	We note that the acoustic barrier has been removed from the masterplan, without any explanation for this.	The acoustic barrier was removed from the previous version of the Masterplan, as at the time it was not required for the TW phase and unclear if it would be required on later phases; however it has now been included on the main plan at page 51 as 'A56 acoustic mitigation corridor' to reflect that various mitigation measures could be brought forward along this boundary (which is recognised as a noise source in the constraints and opportunities plan at page 39), with the noise section at page 38 confirming "Development should, where necessary, incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to reduce noise to residents to appropriate levels. Mitigation measures may include considered building orientation and stand off, appropriately designed bunding, acoustic fencing and landscaping." This approach is summarised in criteria 10 of the policy compliance table (page 9).
10 (criteria 11) – Consideration should be given to any potential future road widening on the amenity of any dwellings facing the A56.		
i	In addition to the noise buffer between the A56 and the proposed development, there should also be a buffer to consider potential future A56 widening on the amenity of the proposed dwellings alongside the A56 (such as gardens).	As confirmed in criteria 10 of the policy compliance table (page 9) the Masterplan does not directly consider the widening of the A56 as there is no committed or costed scheme for this; however it does include a stand-off along the western boundary, which would not physically prejudice widening of the A56 in the future.