

First Regulation 14 Consultation - 6 Feb 2017 - 20 March 2017

Table 1 Herefordshire Council Comments

| Respondent Identification Number        | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation   | Parish Council Consideration  | Changes to NDP  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| S.7<br>Herefordshire Council<br><br>7.1 | Policy<br>SUS1         | Comment and Object        | <p>Not in general conformity with HCS of NPPF - Criterion 3 would appear to suggest that development can take place outside defined settlements in the Core Strategy, subject to a "justified need".</p> <p>It is not clear what this need would be. Suggest re-word or delete this as 'justified need' is vague and not supported by clear evidence.</p> <p>Specify where majority of development will go. I would look at rural housing policies RA3, and RA5 again to inform the bullet point in paragraph 3.</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Revise Policy SUS1 to refer to the settlements identified in the Core Strategy as suitable for development ie Llangrove in Table 4.14 (one of the settlements identified as the main focus of proportionate housing development) and Llancloudy and Llangarron (other settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate.</p> | <p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Criterion 3 to:</p> <p><b>1. New residential development should be located within the settlement boundaries of Llangrove, Llancloudy and Llangarron and should be:</b></p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Outside these settlements development will be considered to be in Herefordshire's countryside and will be required to comply with Core Strategy Policies RA3, RA4 and RA5."</b></p> |
| 7.2                                     | Policy<br>ENV1         | Comment                   | <p>In general conformity with HCS. How do you define important views, visually sensitive skylines? This is quite subjective, if you have an idea of where and what the important views are in Llangarron it may be beneficial to map these, so the policy will be easier to implement.</p>   | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council will identify the important local views for protection in the NDP in</p>   | <p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>PC to identify important views in consultation with residents and stakeholders.</b></p>  |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration                        | Changes to NDP   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                  |                        |                           |   | consultation with local residents and stakeholders. | <b>Insert into v2 of the Draft Plan.</b>   |
| 7.3                              | Policy ENV3            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS - Development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be subject to the Sequential Test and (where appropriate) Exception Tests in accordance with National Policy. It must also have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Herefordshire (SFRA) 2009. | Accepted.<br>Amend Policy ENV3.                     | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Amend Policy ENV3.</b><br><br><b>Delete criteria 1 and 2 and replace with:</b><br><br><b>"Development proposals should be located in areas at low risk of flooding wherever possible. Development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be subject to the Sequential Test and (where appropriate) Exception Tests in accordance with National Policy. Proposals also should have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Herefordshire (SFRA)."</b><br><br><b>PC - please check with HC - I think they are reviewing this shortly and looking at the rural areas but couldn't see it on the website.</b> |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation   | Parish Council Consideration  | Changes to NDP  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 7.4                              | Policy EMP1            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS - the policy, while in conformity with HCS is quite generic and does little to supplement the criteria of their equivalent in the Core Strategy. This would call into question whether their inclusion is necessary when their respective issues are already sufficiently covered in the Core Strategy. | Accepted.<br><br>Delete EMP1 as duplicates Core Strategy policies and does not provide any useful local detail. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete Policy EMP1.</u></b>  |
| 7.5                              | Policy EMP2            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS -the policy, while in conformity with HCS is quite generic and does little to supplement the criteria of their equivalent in the Core Strategy. This would call into question whether their inclusion is necessary when their respective issues are already sufficiently covered in the Core Strategy.  | Accepted.<br><br>Delete EMP2 as duplicates Core Strategy policies and does not provide any useful local detail. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete Policy EMP2.</u></b>  |
| 7.6                              | Policy EMP3            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS -the policy, while in conformity with HCS does little to supplement the criteria of their equivalent in the Core Strategy. This would call into question whether their inclusion is necessary when their respective issues are already sufficiently covered in the Core Strategy.                       | Accepted.<br><br>Delete EMP3 as duplicates Core Strategy policies and does not provide any useful local detail. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete Policy EMP3.</u></b>  |
| 7.7                              | Policy EMP4            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS -the policy, while in conformity with HCS does little to supplement the criteria of their equivalent in the Core Strategy. This would call into question whether their inclusion is necessary when their respective issues are already sufficiently covered in the Core Strategy.                       | Accepted.<br><br>Delete EMP4 as duplicates Core Strategy policies and does not provide any useful local detail. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete Policy EMP4.</u></b><br><br><b>Consider writing new Policy EMP1 which addresses issues of local detail.</b> |
| 7.8                              | Policy HOU1            | Comment / Object          | Not in conformity - Limiting development to single dwelling proposals in Llancloudy and Three Ashes is unnecessarily restrictive.  | Accepted.<br><br>This Policy will be completely re-written and updated following the new call for sites         | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Re-write HOU1 and rename "Site Allocations".</b>  |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration                              | Changes to NDP  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                  |                        |                           | <p>Growth of a scale that is proportionate can be achieved at these locations without placing such a restriction. For example, schemes of 2 semi-detached properties. The policy would also appear to identify hamlets located outside of the main villages that are not identified in the Core Strategy for housing growth. In policy terms these locations should be treated as open countryside, and therefore subject to the criteria of policy RA3.</p> <p>Llangarron settlement boundary, not convinced, reference recent PP and assessment of character.</p> <p>More specifically, the settlement boundary on the map could be explained in detail of how you got to selecting the boundary, also is development within the settlement or is it within and adjacent to the settlement boundaries? I would explain the settlement boundary further in a policy itself, this can be potentially defined in HOU1.</p> <p>Housing in Three Ashes and Llancloudy for only 2 to 3 dwellings is quite restrictive as they are areas identified for proportionate growth within the Core Strategy, 2/3 dwellings does not appear to be proportionate to the existing settlements. I would try to make this policy more flexible and open this up instead of restricting there to individual houses. As there may be small scale suitable scheme in that is appropriate to the character of Three Ashes and Llancloudy that are two or three houses on a plot. I would also clarify if the allocation of sites have any received planning permission or are they all allocations.</p> <p>Remove housing allocations in Herberts Hill, Tredunnock and Langstone as they are not identified settlements in the Core</p> | <p>process, site assessments and public consultation.</p> | <p><b>Policy should concentrate development in settlements identified in Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>Delete references to other settlements. - delete last 2 paragraphs.</b></p> <p><b>Policy should include clearly defined settlement boundaries and proposed site allocations.</b></p> <p><b>Supporting text should justify settlement boundaries.</b></p> <p><b>Delete 5 identified locations and windfall allowance and insert new proposed site allocations.</b></p> <p><b>Consider extension / outbuilding policy for neighbourhood area.</b></p> |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration  | Changes to NDP   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                  |                        |                           | <p>Strategy, this housing can be moved to Llancloudy and Three Ashes, as they are areas identified within the Core Strategy. This will fall under rural areas policy RA3, housing will delivered in these areas via windfall.</p> <p>Have you considered settlement boundaries for Llancloudy of Three Ashes? Along with sites?</p> <p>Have you considered an extension or outbuilding policy for Llangarron neighbourhood area other than extensions on converted barns?</p> |   |  |
| 7.9                              | Policy HOU2            | Comment                   | <p>In general conformity with HCS</p> <p>Site One; U2 Land Adjacent Bay Tree Cottage - This site appears from a review of Ordnance survey historical plans to have historically been used as orchards. By way of general advice, I would mention that orchards can be subject to agricultural spraying practices which may, in some circumstances, lead to a legacy of contamination and any development should consider this.</p>  | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Delete HOU2 site allocation - site allocations will be included in new revised HOU1.</p> <p>Legacies of contamination from spraying of orchards should be addressed through the site assessment and development management processes.</p> | <p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b><u>Delete HOU2.</u></b></p>                               |
| 7.10                             | Policy HOU3            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS  | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Delete HOU3 site allocation - new site allocations will be included in the revised HOU1.</p>  | <p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b><u>Delete HOU3.</u></b></p>                               |
| 7.11                             | Policy HOU4            | Comment                   | <p>In general conformity with HCS.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to risk from contamination. There has been no detailed investigation or desk study to</p>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy HOU4 will be revised and updated as part of the review of</p>   | <p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Review and update HOU4 and refer to contamination</b></p> |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration   | Changes to NDP   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                  |                        |                           | consider risk from contamination. Information about the former uses should be submitted for consideration. Applicants and those involved in the plan should refer to the pertinent parts of the NPPF and be familiar with the requirements and meanings given when considering risk from contamination during development. The developer and/or landowner is responsible for securing safe development where a site is affected by contamination.   | the NDP. Refer to contamination - see NPPF.  | <b>risks - see latest version of NPPF.</b>   |
| 7.12                             | Policy HOU5            | Comment / Objection       | In general conformity with HCS - As with EMP1-EMP4, these policies add little to the existing criteria of the Core Strategy's equivalent policies, making their inclusion seem superfluous.   | Noted.<br><br>Delete HOU5 as duplicates Core Strategy policies without adding any detail.    | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete HOU5.</u></b>  |
| 7.13                             | Policy HOU6            | Comment / Objection       | Not in conformity with HCS - If a dwelling proposal is located outside of a defined settlement in a countryside location, it should be subject to the criteria of CS policy RA4.<br><br>It does not stand up to scrutiny and is open to abuse, allowing a dwelling in an open countryside location. Live/work outside defined settlements should be subject to same criteria as agricultural or essential dwelling and time period to remove conditions is unacceptable. As with agricultural, should be subject of S106 agreement. | Accepted.<br><br>Delete HOU6. Perhaps refer to Live / Work units in revised HOU1 or similar. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b><u>Delete HOU6.</u></b><br><br><b>Consider including Live / Work units in other housing / employment policies as part of NDP review.</b> |
| 7.14                             | Policy HOU7            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS  | Noted.   | <b>No change arising from HC comments but policy will be subject to review.</b>  |
| 7.15                             | Policy HOU8            | Comment / Objection       | Not in conformity - Proposals for further supplementary housing development that delivers beyond the minimum growth target should not necessarily be restricted to single dwelling schemes.   | Accepted.  | Amend NDP.   |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration   | Changes to NDP   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                  |                        |                           | As with the case made in response to policy HOU1, this is restrictive and could prevent perfectly sustainable and proportionately scaled schemes (such as semi-detached) from coming forward. The growth target should be viewed as a minimum, and not a cap on development.  | Delete reference to single (individual) dwellings in first sentence. | <b>Delete reference to single (individual) dwellings in first sentence.</b>  |
| 7.16                             | Policy HOU9            | Object                    | Not in conformity - To conform with policy RA3, proposals involving the replacement of an existing dwelling must be comparable in size and scale with, and within the lawful domestic curtilage of the existing dwelling.   | Noted.<br><br>Amend Policy HOU9 to be in conformity with RA3.        | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Amend HOU9 - refer to wording in RA3 and add any local detail as required.</b>   |
| 7.17                             | Policy HOU10           | Object / Comment          | Conformity questionable - allows extensions to barn conversion – “... <i>capable of conversion without significant structural alterations or extension, requirements for ancillary buildings or areas of hard standing or any development which would adversely affect the character or appearance of the existing building or have a detrimental impact on its surroundings...</i> ” | Noted.<br><br>Review policy wording in line with HC advice.          | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Review policy wording of HOU10 in line with HC advice.</b>   |
| 7.18                             | Policy TRA1            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS  | Noted.   | <b>Review and update TRA1.</b>   |
| 7.19                             | Policy TRA2            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS. Point 4, add to cycle storage –‘where appropriate the provision of secure cycle storage in all new developments.  | Accepted.  | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Amend TRA2.</b><br><br><b>Point 4, add to cycle storage –‘<u>where appropriate the provision of secure cycle storage in all new developments.</u>’</b> |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation   | Parish Council Consideration   | Changes to NDP  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 7.20                             | Policy CSU1            | Comment                   | <p>In general conformity with HCS</p> <p>- Are there any particular facilities for which there may be an identified need that could be sought through contributions?</p> <p>Supplementing the equivalent Core Strategy policy SC1 criteria with aspirations and needs unique to the plan area (where possible) can give the inclusion of the policy more purpose and make it more effective. Specify which community facilities you intend to safeguard.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Parish Council to identify which facilities need to safeguard and which if any require investment.</p> | <p>Amend NDP.</p> <p><b>Refer to Parish Council to identify which facilities need to safeguard and which if any require investment.</b></p> |
| 7.21                             | Policy CSU2            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS – as above  | Noted.   | No change but Policy will be subject to review along with rest of NDP.  |
| 7.22                             | Policy CSU3            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS - Similarly to above, the policy could be given more purpose and effect by identifying facilities in the plan area to be protected/valued under the criteria.   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Parish Council to identify which facilities need to safeguard and which if any require investment.</p> | <p>Amend NDP.</p> <p><b>Refer to Parish Council to identify which facilities need to safeguard and which if any require investment.</b></p> |
| 7.23                             | Policy COM1            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS   | Noted.   | No change but Policy will be subject to review along with rest of NDP.  |
| 7.24                             | Policy ENG1            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS – Suggest make this more flexible by adding in ‘Where appropriate or where possible’. As it may not be feasible in individual/ small scale cases.   | Accepted.  | <p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Amend HCS:</b></p> <p><b>Add ‘Where appropriate or where possible’.</b></p>                                  |

| Respondent Identification Number | Section/ Policy Number | Support/ Object/ Comment/ | Representation  | Parish Council Consideration                             | Changes to NDP  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                  |                        |                           |   |  |   |
| 7.25                             | Policy ENG2            | Comment                   | In general conformity with HCS  | Noted.   | No change but Policy will be subject to review along with rest of NDP.  |
| 7.26                             | All                    | Comment                   | Have you considered how you will monitor and review the plan? You could add this into the end of the document, plans are normally reviewed every couple of years by the parish council. | Noted.<br><br>Add in a section on monitoring and review. | <b>Amend NDP.</b><br><br><b>Add in section on monitoring and review - commit to review every couple of years by PC.</b> |