

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/W1850/W/17/3170188

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1850/W/17/3170188

Appeal By MR JON HICKTON

Site Address
Land at Paradise Green
Marden
HR1 3DW
Grid Ref Easting: 351852
Grid Ref Northing: 247179

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR BERNARD EVANS

Address
1 Brook Orchard
Marden
HEREFORD
HR1 3EJ

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

This proposed development is outside of the Marden Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP) and on prime agricultural land.

Marden village has a soft fruit farm on its northern edge which to all intent and purpose is an industrial complex with its associated traffic and business activity. To add another large complex on the southern edge of the village would divide the village into three separate entities, two industrial/business complexes sandwiching a residential village area.

The village roads are already busy with large HGV movements occurring 24 hours a day. There is a lack of footpaths in the planned development area and HGV trucks quite often mount the pavements to pass one another on the narrow roads in the village where footpaths presently exist.

The MNDP Policy 1 states new housing will only be permitted within the settlement boundary or on allocated sites as shown on the Marden Village Policies Map. The proposed location is outside of the settlement boundary and for that reason should be rejected as the village has more than met its obligation to provide new housing under the MNDP.