

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

**Table 3 Residents Comments**

<b>Respondent Identification Number</b>	<b>Section/ Policy Number</b>	<b>Support/ Object/ Comment/</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>PC Consideration</b>	<b>Changes to NDP</b>
1.1	HOU1	Comment	The Llangrove "village envelope" is well thought out and should be respected.	Noted.  The settlement boundary will be reviewed as part of the NDP review.	The settlement boundary will be reviewed as part of the NDP review - no further change at this stage.
1.2	HOU1	Comment	Understandable that the preferred location of new residential development is concentrated in Llangrove due to it being the larger village with a school, pub and church.  However, the volume of proposed new houses seems rather too heavily focused on Llangrove and not enough on Llangarron, Llancloudy or Three Ashes. These three communities might take a slightly larger proportion of the housing requirement to lessen the strain on Llangrove.	Noted.  The NDP review will consider new proposed site allocations and settlement boundaries but these need to be in general conformity with the policies in the Core Strategy which identifies Llangrove as the main focus of proportionate development and Llancloudy and Llangarron as other settlements where proportionate	No further changes at this stage until the NDP Review has been completed.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
				housing is appropriate.	
1.3	HOU1 and others	Comment	<p>Llangrove is a rural village with little infrastructure, virtually no employment possibilities, minimal public transport and very poor, narrow country lanes.</p> <p>Over development will cause even more traffic problems than it does at present, especially during lengthy periods of construction which these proposals will produce. The road down to Whitchurch is already heavily used with frequent traffic jams, especially at school 'drop off' or 'collection' times often exacerbated by the coaches ferrying students to and from various senior schools. The surface of this key road is poor in many places and this is particularly dangerous when the A40 dual carriage is backing up (every Friday at least) and the Llangrove-Welsh Newton route is used as a 'rat run'. Improvements will need to be made to the Llangrove-Whitchurch road before many more houses are occupied in Llangrove.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As above the proposed site allocations will be considered through the NDP Review process.</p>	No further changes at this stage until the NDP Review has been completed.
1.4	ENV2	Comment	<p>It is vital that the type of houses built are within keeping of the original style in the village - sandstone &amp; render with painted windows and not 'red brick' or wood cladded houses with black metal windows as seen in the most recent development of 'The Close' which is totally out of keeping and should never have received permission. The village needs smaller houses rather than larger houses as people cannot afford the larger houses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Add local detail to supporting text and Policy.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Add further text to Policy ENV2:</b></p> <p><b>Amend criterion 4 to:</b></p> <p><b>" Preserve the character of each village particularly by using designs and building materials for new development which respect local building</b></p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
					tradition, features and distinctiveness. The use of traditional Herefordshire red sandstone and render with painted window frames preferred. Schemes which contribute to light pollution should be avoided.
1.5	ENV1	Comment	Being a rural village set in beautiful countryside, it is important that hedgerows are maintained rather than wood panelling between dwellings and wrought iron fences.	Accepted.  Insert reference to hedgerows in ENV1.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Refer to use of traditional hedgerows as boundary treatment in ENV1 as part of NDP review.</b>
1.6	HOU1	Comment	It is also of concern that there are already at least eight newly built houses for sale in Llangrove, some of which have been on the market for over a year, seemingly priced too highly for potential 'local' full time residents.	Noted.	No change.
1.7	TRA1 TRA2	Comment	There is also great concern that the impact of a large volume of new houses will result in 'traffic calming' measures or some sort. We do NOT want any form of traffic calming or pavements and street lighting in Llangrove. It is a peaceful, rural village and any such measures will create a suburban atmosphere.	Noted.  Policies TRA1 and TRA2 promote good practice in relation to traffic and promoting sustainable transport in new developments. Design policies should help to minimise light	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
				pollution and ensure new development including traffic management is designed sensitively to the rural context.	
2.1	General	Comment	We would both like to endorse the whole of the plan and thank those involved in its creation.	Noted.	No change although the NDP is subject to review.
2.2	Section 5.4 Housing Pages 31/32 Policy HOU2 and HOU3 Section	Support	We would strongly support all points numbered 1-7, but particularly number 7, regarding the need for applications to be supported by evidence of demand for the proposed number and type of dwellings.	Noted.	No change although the NDP is subject to review.
2.3	5.6, Community Facilities Page 42Policy CSU2.	Comment	We think it is very important that potential developers make contributions to new facilities.	Noted.	No change.
2.4	Policy CSU3.	Comment	That this will only be in exceptional circumstances.	Noted.	No change.
3.1	General	Comment	Some of the biggest concerns about further housing development in Llangrove are:-  a. the inevitable increase in car numbers, possibly a further 30, travelling between Llangrove and Whitchurch along a narrow, winding road which hardly allows 2 medium cars to pass, let alone tractors, delivery vans,	Noted.  The proposed site allocations will be reviewed as part of the NDP review.	No further change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>school buses and 4x4s etc. This road is quite inadequate to cope with such an increase. The estimated increase in car numbers does not include those from the two newest, as yet, unoccupied developments in the village. It appears that this has been overlooked in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>b. the main village sewer is old and, as I understand it, narrow. There have already been incidents of sewage overflow onto the road outside Laburnam Cottage and at the bottom of Llangrove Road in Whitchurch, after heavy rainfall. It appears that this has also been overlooked in the Draft Plan. These matters are of great concern to the residents of Llangrove.</p>	Refer to Welsh water's comments and proposed changes to the NDP in Table 2.	
4.1	Section 5.4, Housing	Object	<p>I congratulate the authors on producing an admirably clear and well written and presented draft, and I have one substantive comment. The draft Plan makes several references to the need to protect the rural environment in the Parish and within the existing villages, which I applaud.</p> <p>However, in Section 5.4, Housing, we read: "In order to achieve affordable housing it will be necessary to accept at least one form estate scale development within the village of Llangrove.", which I deplore.</p> <p>However, one massages the wording, these two requirements are mutually exclusive. I submit that it is not possible to retain the rural character of a village while urbanising that village with estate style developments. In fact, the Plan tells us that there are projected to be two of these developments in Llangrove, totalling 25 dwellings. If these developments are to proceed, as no doubt they will notwithstanding the objections of many</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Policy wording is to be reviewed as part of the NDP review and policies related to the need to protect local character as part of this work should be strengthened.</p>	No further change although the NDP is subject to review.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			people in Llangrove, the Plan should make it absolutely clear that the 'protection of the rural environment' has been compromised.		
5.1	Issues and Options Housing Sites	Comment	Whilst we understand that there is a need for more housing our main concerns are that our small village has no amenities, i.e. shop, school etc. Our closest village is Llangrove where there is a primary school and pub. Also, more housing creates more traffic and if planning were to be given we feel that sleeping policeman or other traffic calming measures should be carefully deployed in and around the village. Cars race through the village at the moment, cutting through from the main Hereford road to Llangrove etc. On a number of occasions. I have personally been forced to take evasive action when out walking or cycling and it feels to me that it is a matter of time before a serious injury or fatality occurs. We also think that if planning was granted they should be not too high (like the terrible three storey housing in the centre of Llangrove) and in keeping with the small, cottage properties surrounding. We would strongly oppose any applications that replicated the planning approval for the three storey properties next to the public house.	Noted.  The proposed site allocations will be reviewed through the site assessment and NDP review process but the plan has to be in general conformity with the Core Strategy which focusses new development on Llangrove as the main focus and then Llancloudy and Llangarron.	No further changes at this stage until the NDP Review has been completed.
6.1	HOU4	Comment	Firstly we would like to thank all of those who put in so much of their own time and effort over the years to bring this plan to fruition. Well done.  Generally we feel that the plan has done the best it could within the dictates of the County Council with respect to increased housing in Llangrove. However, although very relieved to see a requirement for no more three storey houses and various other requirements for the HOU2 and HOU3 developments, we do feel that an opportunity has	Noted.  The supporting text and Policy ENV2 could be strengthened to provide more local detail about local character as part of the review process.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Provide more local detail to supporting text and Policy ENV2 to describe local character in more detail.</b>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>been lost by failing to define the character of Llangrove’s style more specifically in HOU4 so that this would apply to any further building that will surely happen in the village during the life of this report.</p> <p>As it stands HOU4 simply states general aims of ‘local architectural features, materials, scale and character’, which worthy sentiments already existed in the old unitary plan and the Core strategy, yet despite this we have seen developers flagrantly disregard them and Hereford Planners seem to be totally powerless, or unwilling, to stop them. We feel that unless more specific requirements are put in place, targeted specifically to each area – Llangarron for example has a very different architectural style to Llangrove - then we will have yet more totally unsympathetic building dumped upon us. Darley Developments seem to have understood and quantified this very effectively, and some plagiarism from their presentation would not go amiss to ensure that Llangrove, historically a village of farm workers and small holders retains its modest country style.</p>		
7.1	HOU2 &3	Comment / support	<p>First of all we would like to thank the Parish Council and all those who have been involved in the preparation of the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is both comprehensive and informative.</p> <p>While we have not been resident in the Parish for that long we do believe that there is a desperate need for some form of housing within the Parish that can be described as either shared ownership, private rented or social rented as there seems to be a lack of this type of property. The plan reflects this desire on page 28 but we</p>	<p>HOU1. Housing need will be considered as part of the NDP Review process.</p>	<p>No further change at this stage - house types, sizes and tenures will be considered during the NDP review process.</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			wonder if this can be reinforced explicitly in Policy HOU2 Land Adjacent Bay Tree Cottage and Policy HOU3 Land opposite the Royal Arms Public House in addition to the general statement that it should comply with the Core Strategy.		
7.2	Section 5.5	Comment	This section states that motor car use is the main form of transport in the parish. The proposed new housing developments will inevitably increase the number of cars using the narrow roads that link to the more major routes. We are concerned about this increased volume of car use and wonder if anything can be done to improve the roads such as the creation of passing places.	Noted.  The NDP cannot require the creation of new car passing places and the rural lanes are an important feature of the parish. However the NDP promotes more sustainable patterns of travel including walking and cycling for short journeys, where new development opportunities arise.	No further change.
8.1	5.4 Housing/HOU1 Housing umbers	Comment	The draft plan states that the Herefordshire Core Strategy requires a minimum of 14% growth in Llangarron parish in the period to 2031, meaning in effect that there is a requirement for 64 new dwellings. It says that there have been 13 commitments and completions to the present day (the draft plan is dated December 2016) so that this minimum requirement is reduced to 51.  I still think that this figure of 13 seems on the low side, given it covers the period from 2011 and that as well as	Noted.  The updated housing requirement will be included as part of the NDP Review process and this will inform the proposed site allocations.	No further change - the most up to date housing figures will be included in the revised NDP.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			permissions for new builds etc, there have been quite a few changes of use of business, holiday lets and agricultural buildings to domestic housing in that period (I think these may come to more than 13 in Llangarron village alone, without taking into account permissions for new builds in Llangarron and Llangrove), so that it may need to be amended. I may be misunderstanding what should be included in the commitments and completions figure but given how important it is to the plan, thought it worth double- checking, otherwise someone is bound to pick fault with it and it may undermine the whole plan.		
8.2	Para 5.8	Recommend change	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two of the figures in the Energy section (5.8 on page 43) under Policy Justification appear to be wrong (so the energy policy as well as the figures may need amending). 65% of respondents were against commercial wind turbines not for them and 67% rather than 61% supported biomass. There was also no distinction in the questionnaire between commercial and domestic solar/pv but people did comment that they didn't want commercial solar/pv.</li> <li>While checking the questionnaire responses for energy, I noticed that in the response to a question relating to important buildings, places or view, that the view to St Deinst church/Llangarron was by far the most frequent response.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The PC will check the figures in 5.8.</p> <p>The view could be added to the important views noted in Policy ENV2.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>PC to review figures form Questionnaire.</b></p> <p><b>Note important view in Policy ENV2.</b></p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
8.3	Questionnaire	Comment	I only had information on “environmental” questions, so didn’t look at the responses for other areas.	Noted.	No change.
9.1	Policy HOU1 Housing numbers	Comment	<p>The plan quotes a specific number of new dwellings in particular locations. Should this be included? How can this be enforced particularly as detailed planning applications have not yet been submitted?</p> <p>Site Two Land opposite the Royal Arms – Mention is made of “the most recent being 6 large 3 storey, 4 bedroomed properties which dominate the surrounding homes. This development has resulted in an increase in traffic on this narrow section of the road and there is concern that a further estate scale development would put undue pressure on this section of the highway, leading to conflicts between existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic.” The proposed dwellings both opposite the Royal Arms and adjacent Bay Tree Cottage will only further exacerbate the problem - NOT all of the new traffic will go up and down the hill to Whitchurch. How will the plan prevent more 3 storey being built? The precedent has already been set.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed site allocations will be reviewed through the site assessment and NDP review process but the plan has to be in general conformity with the Core Strategy which focusses new development on Llangrove as the main focus and then Llancloudy and Llangarron.</p> <p>Policies with design criteria could be strengthened.</p>	<p>No further changes to site allocations at this stage until the NDP Review has been completed.</p> <p><b>Policy ENV1 should include more detailed references to height of new development (up to 2 stories) with improved evidence in the supporting text.</b></p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
9.2	Policy TRA 1 – Transport Requirements related to Development	Comment / Object	<p>This policy is vague. It is clear the quality of the road surfaces in the area is poor and maintenance is irregular and insufficient.</p> <p>Damage to car wheels (including mine) and suspensions are often quoted by local residents and local garages. Developments generate both increased traffic by contractors and new residents. Erosion of roadsides is very obvious. There is no evidence of systematic repairs to the side banking of the roads and to the edges of the road surfaces. Damage to the areas surrounding manhole covers is also obvious with no apparent repair regime unless one includes repair only when the manhole cover collapses!</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP cannot address maintenance of roads - this is a highways matter and should be referred to Herefordshire Council.</p>	No change.
10.1	General	Comment	<p>I have no objection to the continued development of the Llangarron Parish area, for without development the area will only decline especially for amenities such as the school, churches, the village pub and community halls.</p> <p>My main reservation is - are the supporting services such as the road infrastructure and water drainage of sufficient quality to support the increase in development particularly in Llangrove. I think present council activity is lacking maybe because of financial constraints but this should not be offered as an excuse. The old adage of “if you cannot afford it, don’t do it” should be heeded.</p> <p>The Llangarron Parish Neighbourhood Plan has a number of good points but should be regarded as a “to do” document and not a “wish” list. I think it needs to be more specific in several areas especially those relating to safety such as the provision of pavements for pedestrians</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP has to be in general conformity with the Core Strategy which sets out housing growth targets for parishes and identified settlements within them.</p> <p>The NDP cannot address road maintenance but can promote more sustainable transport alternatives such as</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			and increasing the width, removal of bottlenecks, increasing number of passing points and regular maintenance of roads not just in this parish but to roads in adjoining parishes providing access to this parish.	encouraging walking and cycling.	
10.2	Langrove	Comment	<p>The question of additional housing in the village is questionable since at the time of writing there are fourteen properties for sale in the Village, ten of which are new and remain unsold and two of the four other properties have been offered for sale for some time. These properties cover a broad spectrum and yet still they remain unsold. The development of the six properties at 'The Close' caused utter chaos on the narrow road fronting it and indeed the road leading down to Whitchurch. The road is difficult at best, but when huge articulated lorries use it, it becomes almost impossible.</p> <p>Appreciating that the Plan has been made with growth in mind, I would like to suggest that before further permission is given to housing development that a full overview is undertaken to see if</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. there really is a need for additional housing taking into account my previous observation.</li> <li>b. a traffic survey be undertaken.</li> <li>c. road improvements should, in any event, be undertaken as the road from Whitchurch through to the top of the village is barely fit for purpose with huge potholes, flooding, and very tight passing places.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP has to be in general conformity with the Core Strategy which sets out housing growth targets for parishes and identified settlements within them.</p> <p>The NDP cannot address road maintenance but can promote more sustainable transport alternatives such as encouraging walking and cycling.</p> <p>Decisions about the proposed site allocations will be</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>Interestingly, when the road was closed for six weeks last year to accommodate BT work, it would have been a perfect time to repair the potholes or at least fill them with aggregate to avoid road users having to replace very expensive wheels and tyres caused by unavoidably hitting them when avoiding oncoming vehicles especially in the dark.</p> <p>To suggest that further dwellings be permitted at the top of the village, with the increase in vehicular access seems to me to be ludicrous. Indeed, when the six dwellings at The Close are sold, there is a potential for up to eighteen vehicles (4 bedroomed houses are normally occupied by families with children and young adults that have their own vehicles) using the road. Aside from the fact that there is nowhere for such a number of vehicles to park, those vehicles will be adding to the congestion. It must be remembered that this is a farming community and as such large plant and machinery use the road, and those users do not wish to be held up by construction plant whilst going about their business. Indeed, if ten dwellings were to be built on the land opposite the Royal Arms there is potential for a further twenty plus cars vying for access onto an already busy road.</p>	made following further public consultation.	
11.1	Objection	Field opposite The Royal Arms, Llangrove (Policy HOU3)	<p>We own this business and are therefore familiar with the proposed site and the amenities referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Royal Arms is believed to be of early 17th century origin, the building was erected in 1625 as a smithy and dwelling house, and subsequently evolved into a beer house named 'The Smith's Arms'. Over the years there</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All site allocations are to be reconsidered as part of the NDP review.</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>has been investment in the building and this has allowed for the original features to remain and the experience of those using the pub to be enjoyable, comfortable and relaxing. As the only pub and restaurant in the village, the establishment remains the hub for village life. We took over as owners in September 2016 and we reside in the flat above the pub. We market the business so it not only continues to attract the important already-established customer base but also appeals to other villagers including those buying new properties.</p> <p>The pub's future success and survival is dependent on a thriving business therefore it may appear unwise for us to object to the development of a further ten dwellings immediately opposite the property. Our objection is that these dwellings will not only overlook our property but will completely block the remaining view for our customers who currently enjoy the beautiful landscape across the fields and valley.</p> <p>Our current position is already less desirable than in previous times since we have three large two-storey houses in Chapel Meadows blocking the view to the south and six large three-storey houses blocking the view to the east. The development of further properties so close to the pub will mean we are fully encapsulated by 'new builds' and there will have absolutely no view remaining. Moreover, whilst some of the 'new builds' in the village are more in keeping with the older properties, there is a fear the builders will be as aggressive as those who built 'The Close' and these buildings will be an inappropriate design and visually overbearing. From our home our living area windows look out directly onto external walls of the</p>		

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>current properties. We are equally concerned at losing the last remaining view for our customers since we market our business as a 'country pub with stunning views' all of which will be lost if this build is allowed to go ahead. Throughout the year we have villagers who stand on the patio and enjoy the landscape and we have tourists, ramblers and cyclists who stop at the pub to have a drink or food outside to enjoy the beautiful view across the valley. There will be less incentive for them to use our pub once the view has been taken from us; something which will be quickly publicised via social media such as Trip Advisor. The pub is heavily reliant on a buoyant summer trade which is driven by tourists who visit a beautiful village; the building of the houses will create a town-feel to the pub and therefore it will lose its charm. The village would be a very different place without the pub and we feel strongly that it should be protected. The Plan states 'the site shall be developed for frontage development only'; we assume this is to protect the properties on the north side of the field; there is no acknowledgement in the plan of the protection of the pub and it's customers.</p>		
12.1	All	Comment / Support	<p>Broadly in favour of the identified areas for development in Llangrove and Llangarron.</p> <p>Feel that further strip development along the roads into the village should be avoided I also believe that any development along the very small single-track roads around the village should be avoided and could be dangerous.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p>	<p>No further change at this stage.</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>It is important not to allow development in the Garron flood plain as already houses near the edge of the village are periodically seriously affected by flooding. I do not agree that Llangarron has many facilities or infrastructure for development. The Garron Centre is a community venue but offers no services.</p> <p>I am surprised that 65% of residents support sustainable energy projects in the area. I believe most would support such small-scale projects suitable for a dwelling but not something bigger.</p> <p>The identified sites and village envelopes seem suitable. I hope any further sites are carefully considered and would not affect the areas as mentioned above.</p>	Policy wording will be strengthened in relation to flood risk and site assessments will include consideration of flood risk areas.	
13.1	All Housing / Site Allocations		<p>We are concerned that the addition of at least 25 new houses to Llangrove will aggravate the already strained traffic situation. Twelve new houses have been added to the village in about the last year. Every new house brings with it an average of two cars so the proposed and recent additional housing will add at least seventy four new cars to a village with essentially a single track road running through it. With the minimal available bus service, cars get used a lot. Is there an upper limit to the number of additional cars that the council considers acceptable? Housing estates are out of character with the village which has been built up of individual houses, and they will put too much strain on the infrastructure. Adding a smaller number of affordable houses on an infill basis would be a preferable solution.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p>	No further change at this stage.
14.1	All / General	Comment / Support	<p>We would like to say thank you very much indeed to the stalwart group who lasted the course and have produced</p>	Noted.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>such a comprehensive plan. Your efforts are very much appreciated.</p> <p>Have a number of minor comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the dates on the front cover correct as we are now in 2017 and we still have to go to the vote?</li> <li>2. We do hope you are able to count website hits and feedback to assess the % of residents who have participated in this round of consultation. We would not want this online approach to undermine the effective turnout for a final vote (or can we also do that on line?)</li> <li>3. We are delighted to note that new development will need to take into account traffic calming measures but we are concerned about the existing traffic, particularly visitors to the village who are growing due, in part, to the increase in holiday accommodation and also the increasing number of delivery vans. These drivers do not appear to understand how to drive in narrow and badly maintained lanes. They travel far too fast, often down the centre of a lane. In the last 3 months, 2 cats have been killed in the vicinity of our home (Penguithal) and I lost a wing mirror last week due to a careless visitor from Penarth. We have lived here 23 years and have never had any problems of this nature before, so can only assume the traffic is getting worse.</li> </ol>	<p>The date on the front cover will be revised to 2019 as part of the review.</p> <p>The final (post examination NDP) will be subjected to a local referendum and all those in the parish on the electoral register will be invited to vote on whether the NDP should be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>The NDP cannot restrict visitor traffic to the area but cannot promote more sustainable transport methods linked to new development.</p>	<b>Change front cover to new dates.</b>
15.1	All	Comment / Support	The Parish must support the Herefordshire core strategy to identify opportunities for 5,300 new dwellings. The proposed solution creates the opportunity for 14%	Noted.	No further change at this stage.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
	Housing		<p>growth, which is extremely generous. However, it must be emphasised that the parish is rural with limited infrastructure and the only ways in and out are by small country lanes. Furthermore, the bulk of the development will be in Llangrove, where the growth will be nearer 20-25%, making the impact proportionately greater. There is a danger that overdevelopment will overstretch infrastructure &amp; take away the character of our lovely village, of which we are all so proud. This must be guarded against at each stage of the planning process &amp; construction. Also, are there really no more sites for development, elsewhere in the parish, to take the strain off Llangrove?</p> <p>The proposed development should not be seen as a precedent, for further expansion at this scale. There should be close liaison between developers &amp; the parish to ensure that all work is carried out with sensitivity and respect. The design of new buildings should blend with the local character, 'Red brick' or 'wood facings' should not be acceptable. Rather, developers should aim for stone facing, or rendering. The development opposite the old post office is an example worthy of emulation, whereas the development at 'The Close' is certainly not</p> <p>We fully agree that two stories is the maximum height of any new buildings and they must be sited in such a way as to respect the privacy and outlook of existing neighbouring houses. It is vital that ample space is allocated for parking on each development. There is simply no additional space on the lanes which run through our village.</p>	<p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p> <p>Revised design policies will include references to height.</p>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>The Llangrove village envelope is well thought out. We approve the result &amp;, once agreed, it must be respected. It is important that development boundaries are hedged with a deciduous/holly mix, in keeping with this rural area and not wooden fenced. In particular, on site two (opposite The Royal Arms) the North-west boundary hedge should be retained and professionally 'laid', with further planting to thicken the cover, ensuring that the development is screened to the NW, towards Old Shoppe Cottage.</p> <p>We are a quiet, rural village. 'Traffic calming measures' must not be unsightly or excessive as we do not want Llangrove to end up looking like a town suburb. Minimise unsightly speed signs &amp; the like, and no speed bumps or chicanes, please. NO street lights! We really value our dark skies.</p> <p>In summary, this is a well thought out piece of work on which the Parish Council is to be congratulated. Good luck in taking this project forward and we look forward to being consulted on the forthcoming phases.</p>		
16.1	All	Comment	<p>Document is very long and often repetitive to make sense of what this Llangarron Parish Neighbourhood Plan is going to achieve. As one of many who strongly objected to the recent Freemans development in Llangrove which was designed with no respect to the style and character of the village, I fail to have confidence in 'Localism legislation' which came into force in April 2012 and is supposed to give us more say in our local area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p>	<p>No further change at this stage.</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>No one wants a big housing development in a village - people normally choose to live in villages because they want to get out of a busy town and have a more secluded and peaceful environment in which to enjoy life.</p> <p>What are the measures <i>'for pedestrian and cyclists' safety and ensure there is no detrimental impact on highway safety for all road users'</i>? By increasing the number of houses in Llangrove by the proposed amount of 35, the car population will increase exponentially. This will have a detrimental impact on highway safety especially as Llangrove is accessed by steep narrow roads from Whitchurch (with passing places). Equestrians and cyclists will face greater danger. Public transport comprises of one bus to Ross-on-Wye and one to Monmouth each week and even this service is under threat so in effect there is no public transport to support.</p> <p>In terms of community facilities much is made of the Village Hall in Llangrove and this is indeed a much used community space but it is now in desperate need of renovation and indeed expansion. A committee is trying to raise money with a grant to achieve this but this is by no means absolute.</p> <p>The greater numbers of cars in the village will NOT enhance the natural environment –more accurately, they will generate unwanted noise and air pollution in a rural environment.</p> <p>Site Two Land opposite the Royal Arms - As the Royal Arms already now has the 6 large 3 storey properties to the side with the potential to cause serious parking</p>	<p>Refer to Table 2 for comments about proposed improvements to the village hall.</p>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>problems, the proposed houses opposite would have an adverse impact on the pub's business as customers enjoy sitting outside and the new houses would create an overbearing effect. As previously stated, there is also the serious concern on road safety, with the volume of traffic and resulting pollution.</p> <p>Do not assume that all those who come to live in Llangrove will use the school, visit the pub or attend events at the Village Hall. Llangarron has a Village Hall as well as a new community centre that needs more local use; living in the surrounding areas does not preclude residents from using any of these facilities in Llangrove.</p> <p>In summary, those of us that already live in the area know how lovely it is, so we should fight hard to maintain the character of our villages. New developments may well be needed but should NOT be concentrated in one area or as estate style housing leading to over development. Any future design that is inappropriate to this environment and any plan that fails to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of our area, should definitely not be accepted.</p>		
17.1	5.4 Housing	Comment	<p><u>Llangrove – Bay Tree Cottage site.</u> Road access to / from the village to A40 at Whitchurch is a major concern, already inadequate without extra traffic. <u>Llangrove – opp Royal Arms – widening of the road</u> alongside this 10-property development does not solve the bottleneck before / after this section of road.</p>	<p>Noted. Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
				comment on suitable sites coming forward.	
17.2	5.5 Roads & Traffic	Comment	<u>Public transport</u> –with a climate of subsidy cuts improved public transport is a non starter. <u>Cycle paths</u> – not a viable option for travel, other than for the keen & very fit, with the hilly topography of the area. <u>Road quality</u> – no mention made of the actual access roads to Llangrove or Llangarron – quality of road surfaces / road width both to A40 & A4137 are inadequate for present use & certainly not for more traffic (not just to new housing but also the extra traffic such as deliveries & visitors).	Noted.  The NDP can only promote more sustainable transport patterns and not better / repairs to road surfaces.	No change.
17.3	5.6 Community Facilities	Comment	While it is laudable that ‘Where appropriate developers should contribute towards the provision of new community facilities and infrastructure both onsite and offsite, to help support sustainable growth’. There will need to be consultation with communities re what will be useful and contribute to real improvement (unlike the speed indicator erected near the completed development which was at first incorrectly calibrated and now does not work at all).	Accepted.  Further consultation with local people will be undertaken as part of the review of the NDP and as and when developer contributions are forthcoming.	No change.
17.5	General	Comment	In principle I am not against appropriate housing development in Llangrove but, as you can see from the above comments, I am concerned that infrastructure (especially roads) needs to improve in step and developers do not have control over this. Commitment from Herefordshire Council is needed to provide appropriate infrastructure.	Noted.	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
18.1	5.4 HOUSING (LLANGROVE)	Comment / Support	Reinstatement of village envelope as shown is an excellent idea. Apart from the developments earmarked in the Plan, no further planning permissions should be given until the Plan is in place. If the Plan's intention is properly fulfilled, this will mean that residents will have a say in what is appropriate and what is not in the hope that their voice will be heard.	Noted.  The settlement boundary will be reviewed as part of the NDP Review process.	No further change at this stage.
18.2	5.5 ROADS AND TRAFFIC	Comment	Traffic calming – please not speed bumps. Llangrove - reconsider a 20mph limit perhaps? Road safety: the main routes Thorn/Llangarron/Llangrove/Whitchurch are now in need of maintenance to a decent standard, and this will become more urgent as traffic inevitably increases. Poor road conditions already create safety issues as people drive in the centre or offside to avoid potholes, especially where the surface is bad on both sides of the road on the approach to blind corners. It is important to keep our three-a-week bus services which are relied on by regular users for access to shops, surgery, bank, library.	Noted.  Traffic management and road surfaces are a matter for Herefordshire Council and the PC supports the continued provision of the bus service if possible.	No change
18.3	Infrastructure	Comment	All Section 106 benefits should be granted initially and in full to the community or parish in which they are generated.	Noted.  This is a matter for HC and is dependent upon negotiations with developers.	No change.
19.1	Housing  HOU1	Comment	My sole comment is the absence of any proposal on social housing in the plan. Given the broadly unaffordable reality of much affordable housing, I would have hoped that some social housing inclusion would reflect the need to maintain a genuine mixed and local community of different aged and sized households.	Noted.  This may be addressed through the NDP Review. Affordable housing provision can only be	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
				required on larger schemes (10 or more units in line with the new NPPF) or 11 or more as set out in the Core Strategy.	
20.1	Page 14 Policy SUS1 – Sustainable Development	Comment	Add – all buildings should be of no more than two storeys high. Mitigation measures should be provided to support such proposals in all but the most exceptional situations. <i>(where it is considered appropriate : replaced for stronger wording)</i>	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.2	Page 18 Policy ENV1 – Landscape and Biodiversity	Comment	Add to 4 – all buildings should be of no more than two storeys high. 5. New proposals should protect the setting of villages and the character of the open countryside while preserving some open spaces within the village boundary. New development should be limited to within or on the edge of villages unless there is special justification as identified elsewhere in the plan, for example for agriculture or tourism.	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review. "Some open spaces" is not specific but eh NDP review may help to identify any open spaces of particular significance eg as Local Green Spaces.
20.3	Page 20 Policy ENV2 - Historic Assets and Village Character	Comment	4. .... permeable surfaces should be used on all developments.	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review. May not be appropriate for all new development - refer to EA and WW comments.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
20.4	Page 21 Policy ENV3 Flooding	Comment	Add 4 - <i>That the infrastructure of utilities are not compromised and that mechanisms are in place to neutralise or mitigate any possible pollutants. (considering some businesses may need additional water supplies or disposal of effluents, create noise, smell, dust etc.)</i>	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review. (Although this may already have been picked up in HC and consultation bodies comments - see Tables 1 and 2.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.5	Page 23 Policy EMP 1 Rural Enterprises Page 26 Policy EMP4 Tourism	Comment	They are on a small scale suitable for the character of the area;	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review. (Although this may already have been picked up in HC and consultation bodies comments - see Tables 1 and 2.)	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review. However this may be unduly restrictive.
20.6	Page 29 LLANCLOUDY 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph –	Comment	The main road runs through Llancloudy and there are no pavements so there is little opportunity to walk to any facilities.	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.7	Pages 40/41 LLANGARRON-	Comment	The Garron Centre, a recently (constructed) community facility attached to the church a recently converted community facility	Accepted.	Amend NDP.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			Llangarron Village Hall –ADD- Improved parking facilities have created more opportunities for use. Llangrove Village Hall –ADD- has an outdoor play area and parking facilities but the access road requires improvement..	Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.8	Page 33 Policy HOU4 Residential Development Criteria	Comment	Add 9. Consideration should be given to the safety of pedestrians in all situations.	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.9	Page 37 5.5 Roads and Traffic (last paragraph.)	Comment	Llangrove traffic calming measures and/or safe places for pedestrians should be introduced to minimise .....	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.10	Page 38 Policy TRA 2 – Promotion of Sustainable Transport	Comment	2. providing where possible new surfaced pedestrian and cycle routes	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.11	Page 41 Top of page –	Comment	LLANGARRON Village Hall add improvements to car parking have enhanced the possibilities at the village hall.	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.12	Page 41 Policy CSU3 – Loss of Community Facilities	Comment	.. with the community first given the opportunity to declare an interest through ‘Community Right to Bid’ (in the past various facilities have been lost, sold or closed, with no consultation.)	Accepted.	Amend NDP.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
	through an agreed marketing strategy		<a href="mailto:communityrighttobid@herefordshire.gov.uk">communityrighttobid@herefordshire.gov.uk</a> <a href="https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200139/community/509/community_rights/3">https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200139/community/509/community_rights/3</a>	Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.13	Page 42 Policy COM 1 Communication	Comment	supported subject to there being; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area,</li> <li>2. no adverse impact on the setting of villages and heritage assets and residential amenity</li> <li>3. and where it can be clearly demonstrated that mast sharing is not an appropriate option.</li> </ol> <i>(Punctuation – possibly list for ease of reading)</i>	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
20.14	Page 43 Policy ENG1 proposals for renewable energy	Comment	This could include but is not limited to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Solar or photovoltaic panels,</li> <li>2. Ground source heat pumps,</li> <li>3. Biomass boilers</li> </ol> <i>(Punctuation – possibly list for ease of reading)</i>	Accepted.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.	Amend NDP.  Consider additional wording as part of NDP Review.
21.1	All	Comment	First of all thank you to everyone who worked on this which has clearly taken a great deal of time and effort.	Noted.	No change.
21.2	Housing	Comment	I feel that Llangrove will struggle to accommodate the number of new homes allocated to it. I appreciate that the village is classified as one that can sustain more residents due to the pub, school, etc however this classification does not seem to take the access and transport issues into account. Another 70 cars travelling on either the road to Whitchurch, which is a narrow and hazardous route, or even the wider one through Llangarron seems to be potentially very dangerous to me. The construction of the number of homes proposed in Llangrove is going to cause huge disruption for existing residents for many, many months if not years.	Noted.  Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
21.3	Housing	Comment	I would have been happy to see more development in Llangarron. I understand that it doesn't have the facilities that Llangrove does but access is easier and the reality is that most people travel to work by car - it's simply a fact of life. I don't object to the Farr development site but hope that it doesn't encroach too much beyond the existing properties into the adjacent pasture. I wonder whether the land between John Payne's and Garronfield and on the opposite side of the lane wouldn't have provided another site. Access onto the main road is easy from there and it forms a nice cluster of houses to add to those already there without spoiling their view.	Noted.	No change.
21.4	Housing	Comment	Would it not have been possible to investigate a small group of homes off the St Owen's Cross - Broad Oak road. This route has good access and might enable the number of homes in Llangrove to be reduced	Noted.  Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.  Only those sites put forward for consideration by landowners and agents can be considered as part of the NDP process.	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
21.5	Housing	Comment	I am not sure whether this falls in your remit but I would be opposed to the plans tabled by XXX at the last Parish Council meeting. That view down through the village towards the church should be protected I feel and I wonder if he's trying to sneak in before the plan is finalised. I don't have any objection to development of the XXX area itself and that has always seemed to be a likely place to put one or two more homes.	Noted. Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.	No change.
22.1	Housing	Objection	I would like to oppose the Proposed Development for the land adjacent to Farr Cottages.	Noted. Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.	No change.
23.1	All	Comment	I'd like to thank all who've been involved in the development of the PNP – a huge amount of work has been undertaken over many years, and this report is a credit to all involved.	Noted.	No change.
23.2	Housing	Comment	My main focus of interest has been housing development – after the fiasco of The Close, understandably residents of Llangrove are wary of new building projects. I attended the pre-planning display for the area adjacent to Bay Tree Cottage, and whilst I sympathise with those living close to	Noted. Site allocations are being considered again through the	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			the site, felt that the developers had an insight into the village 'style', and were planning a thoughtful development.	NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.	
23.3	Housing	Noted.	One last point relates to housing sizes – I'm in favour of the inclusion of some smaller homes in new developments for older folk who would like to stay in the village, but can no longer cope with large homes and gardens. This would then release larger homes within the village for families. I realise that from a developers' point of view this doesn't make sound economic sense, but if there could be a bit of give & take instead of always being controlled by the 'bottom line' that would be appreciated.	Noted.	NDP should refer to smaller house sizes as part of review.
23.4	Housing	Comment.	<p>I am concerned for both Llangrove and Llangarron regarding any future housing development particularly so when I have seen the new houses recently built in Llangrove which I would go so far as to say are totally out of character with their surroundings and some may say an eyesore as they do not blend into the village at all in anyway.</p> <p>However, I do understand the decision was taken away from the Council. I also understand that these houses have won an award for their "sustainability" and "environmental" attributes. This is of concern as they appear to happily fit into the policies/definitions in this plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p> <p>The NDP review will look at the design and character related policies and should provide a greater level of detail.</p>	No further change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
24.1	Housing / Character	Comment	<p>In Llangarron I am concerned that this beautiful village and atmosphere could be spoilt unless great care is taken over how any new development blends in with their surroundings.</p> <p>At the present time, when there has been a great deal of rain, I am surprised how much water comes down the road from Herberts Hill and fields. This goes past my house and adds to the flooding in the village. At its worse it can encroach on my property so I am concerned that this is not increased by any proposed development and specifically the proposed development adjacent to Farr Cottages on the plan.</p> <p>I understand there is a commitment to avoid this as outlined in ENV 3 in the plan. I would suggest adding the point made in relation to the Langrove proposal of maintaining the present hedge.</p> <p>Also that any proposed new dwelling is set well back away from the lane, in order to maintain the present countryside/rural nature of this area.</p> <p>I note that HOU2 and 3 deal specifically with proposed developments in Llangrove whereas HOU4 is a general requirement to cover all proposed developments. I would therefore suggest that specifics points should apply to the proposed development adjacent to Farr Cottages, at least in a similar vain to points 2 and 3 in HOU2. I do know from observation how a great number of people, dogs, horses walk up and down this lane in their day to day life and leisure. I would suggest it would be detrimental to the village to lose these important rural features. It</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP review process offers opportunities to strengthen policies on design and flooding and retaining features such as hedgerows.</p>	<p>Consider referring to setting back properties as part of design policies in NDP review.</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			would of course come under the environmental objective in the plan “to protect and enhance the landscape setting and character of the village”.		
24.2	Housing / Character	Comment	I understand that in the general requirement of HOU4 point 2 states, “that the design of these dwellings reflect the character of the village in terms of architectural features, materials, and character of other properties in the village.” This is to be welcomed. However, I am not sure whether it is confusing and somewhat alarming to then suggest in the next sentence of the plan “proposals for sympathetically designed modern buildings.....will be supported”. In terms of the proposed 5 dwellings mentioned adjacent to Farr Cottages, I would suggest that 5 new dwellings appears to be too many in this location and could seriously challenge the village environment and atmosphere as it is so near to the Church and centre of the village.	Noted.  Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.	No change.
24.3	Infrastructure	Comment	There is of course, an issue of infrastructure and the increase in road use for all the proposed developments which obviously has to be thought through with the relevant authorities.	Noted.  The NDP review will include some revisions in relation to infrastructure but highways are largely a matter for Herefordshire Council.	No change.
24.4	All	Comment	In the current climate I recognise the importance of having a Neighbourhood Plan and I also recognise that this area has a rich heritage which it would be disastrous to see disappear. Llangarron village like the surrounding area appears to have been in existence for hundreds of	Noted.	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			years and has grown in an organic way without any notion of concepts such as “balanced communities”.		
25.1	All HOU4	Comment	<p>I've read the plan and am very supportive - the scale and location of areas for new development in the parish is appropriate.</p> <p>One item is of particular interest, on P36, discussing permitted development rights for barn conversions, it states: "It is considered however that sympathetic extensions to barns of a scale and design in character with the existing barn would be acceptable subject to meeting the policy requirements of Policy HOU4."</p> <p>This is important, as given the number of barn conversions in the parish (especially around Llangarron), a flexible approach to conversions could help towards fulfilling policies HOU4 (for example by providing an extra bedroom) and EMP1 (by providing home office and other work space). Does this mean this item re extensions to barn conversion is worthy of its own policy item?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This Policy will be amended - see Table 1 Herefordshire Council's comments.</p>	No further change.
26.1	All	Support	You and your colleagues are to be congratulated on a realistic and well thought through document.	Noted.	No change.
26.2	Housing - Settlement boundaries	Comment	Seeks a clarification of the new status of Biddlestone - In the past this was a single entity, a farm specialising in orchard fruit growing. Since planning permission was granted for the conversion of apple storage barns to dwellings, the sale of the former farm house and the sale of the associated land it has become a new rural residential community. It is part of Llangarron, albeit isolated by the road structure from it. It needs to be	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Biddlestone is not one of the settlements identified in the Core Strategy as suitable for new housing and</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			protected by planning regulations as if it was Llangarron itself. We worry that unless this changed status is specifically and clearly enshrined in your document the historic situation will be in the minds of civil servants and others when development is considered. Accordingly, what happens around Biddlestone should no longer be a purely agricultural issue and the residents need to be protected from adverse impacts of large scale agribusiness, noise and environmental changes such as polytunnels. Polytunnels, for example, would completely change the rural landscape character of Biddlestone. We are not sure where this issue might be best addressed in your document but perhaps the first paragraph above (or something similar) could be added under the Llangarron heading in section 54 Housing.	so the rural area policies would apply (RA3 -5)	
26.3	ENV2	Comment	<p>Requests a clearer Dark Skies policy for Llangarron be introduced and for the rural area covered by our Parish Plan as part of ENV1, ENV2, EMP1, EMP2, EMP3 and SUS1. -</p> <p>Within our rural areas and open countryside there is hardly any external lighting, and our village centres have very little or no street lighting. Where there is external lighting it can be extremely invasive, prominent and visible from some distance. Its effect is to introduce an urban appearance from the upward glow to an area, which for the most part is unlit at night. This could be addressed by a dark skies policy. This aspiration should apply to existing and new developments. Artificial lighting can affect the wider environment through 'light spill' into the night sky which results in the phenomenon known as 'sky glow'. There is particular concern about the impact of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy ENV2 refers to light pollution.</p> <p>Could include comments in supporting text.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Consider comments in revised supporting text for ENV2 as part of NDP review.</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			light spill on the environment, including ecology, and in particular, the European protected bat species. This policy could also prevent night time light activated crop growing in polytunnels as is practised by agribusinesses in the Far East. Greater prominence for this policy would help the Llangarron plan become future ready as this is likely to become an issue of increasing concern to residents in our rural haven. This impacts ENV1.		
27.1.	All	Support	We support the Parish Council in bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan and are encouraged by the proactive nature of the process being undertaken.	Noted.	No change.
28.1	Site allocations	Comment / Object	<p>Too many properties allocated to Llangrove. Why not more in Llangarron? Llangrove appears to be a dumping ground for newbuilds while neighbouring Llangarron escapes with just five new dwellings. Five!</p> <p>And this is despite Llangarron being a larger village with arguably better roads with significantly less traffic on the lanes and an access road network from all directions.</p> <p>Meanwhile, Llangrove has already accommodated at least 12 newbuilds within the last years (6 at The Close, 3 at Lavender Close, 1 opposite and 2 large detached houses by the school). We feel Llangarron should accept a larger number of properties. It would not be too difficult to find a field capable of hosting 20 properties with reasonable road access without upsetting the existing balance of the larger and more dispersed village - and significantly easier than Llangrove which has resembled a building site for the last year and is growing far too quickly for a small, rural agricultural village. We note that a further 10 properties are proposed for Llangrove Road on the green field site</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site allocations are being considered again through the NDP Review process. There will be further opportunities to comment on suitable sites coming forward.</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			opposite the Royal Arms, yet the infrastructure is inadequate support additional developments, and this would have a detrimental impact on the character and landscape setting of the village and surrounding countryside. It is also noted that of the 6 large properties at 'The Close' site adjacent to the Royal Arms, only one is actually reserved and of the three Lavender Close properties, none are yet sold, nor is the 3-bed newbuild property opposite which has been completed and on the market for three months which draws into question the demand for properties in Llangrove.		
28.2	Infrastructure	Comment / Object	<p>Inadequate Infrastructure - the Llangrove Road is already at capacity. The lane through Llangrove is already at capacity, especially at peak periods. Llangrove is accessed via a 2-mile single track lane with limited passing places.</p> <p>During wet weather, the lane is prone to flooding and is usually covered by thick mud in winter between the east of Llangrove to Talybont Lane. During peak times, ie 8-9.30am and 4-6pm, the lane already suffers from some congestion with cars reversing into the limited passing places and property driveways in order to permit approaching traffic to pass. However, the traffic is not typically light cars but also includes farm traffic, ie large tractors with/without trailers, balers, large heavy farm machinery, livestock vehicles which are part of normal farm traffic movements on a lane accommodation three farms. The result of this is additional congestion because the lane is not sufficiently wide to allow cars and large farm vehicles to comfortably pass and the existing passing</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP review will include some revisions in relation to infrastructure but highways are largely a matter for Herefordshire Council.</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>places are proving inadequate. Llangrove has minimal public transport, ie a weekly bus to Hereford/Ross/Monmouth, therefore it is reasonable to assume that for each new property built there will be a minimum of 2 additional vehicles per property.</p> <p>If the 3-4 bed family houses are occupied by families with adult or older children, it is reasonable to assume they will also have their own car either now or in the near future thus bringing potentially 8+ additional vehicle movements per day - onto an already congested single-track access lane. This is in breach of the requirement for any additional development to have 'no detrimental impact' on the highway or highway safety. Although there is a potential to widen the Llangrove Road near the Royal Arms, this is only possible at this location and does not address the access issues between Llangrove and Talybont Lane where it is not possible to widen the road because many properties are built side-on to the road thereby defining its maximum width.</p>		
28.3	Infrastructure / Site allocations	Comment / Object	<p>Developments in the 'Llangrove envelope' - We note that the field adjacent to the nursery and Alyamaya House where another property is currently being constructed, falls within this envelope. However, the issue of access appears to have been completely overlooked. Currently the only access is the narrow 7' wide unsurfaced, unadopted lane running between the hedged boundary of Kiruna (our property) and Sunnyside House. While living here for the last 2.5 years, we have witnessed large delivery vans and lorries reversing blindly onto the increasingly-busy Llangrove Road unable to see traffic approaching from either side which we feel is an accident</p>	See above - the NDP Review includes a fresh look at site allocations taking into account technical assessment of any submitted sites.	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			waiting to happen. With the lane being just 7' wide, we have seen large vehicles getting stuck and needing assistance. Some have become stuck in our hedge while others have scraped the neighbouring property, Sunnyside House. The attached video shows access is very tight and was filmed during March 2017 before the hedge experiences its spring and summer growth. Local residents have also commented that driving forwards out of the lane is blind but when two vehicles of any size including residents' cars, are present in the lane at the same time, due to the complete lack of passing places, one is forced to reverse out blindly into the path of oncoming traffic representing a dangerous hazard.		
29.1	All	Support	Firstly I would like to congratulate all those involved in getting the plan to this stage. I think everyone involved has managed this entire project very well. It is clear that this plan when finalised will be a great help in guiding councillors and future councillors in their decision-making role within the community. It is also much appreciated that all the residents within the parish now have an opportunity to comment on this document after much of the hard work is completed. Great care has been taken by the Council in preparing the document and I do not underestimate how difficult it is to reflect a cohesive view across the parish. Overall, I share much of your output and only give a few points on which you might wish to reflect.	Noted.	No change.
29.2	Housing	Comment	I think your views on development both from a housing and commercial basis are sound but perhaps could be a little more definitive. We should make good use of redundant agricultural buildings and housing always seem to be the easy answer, but it would be very good if	Noted.  This could be picked up in the NDP Review employment policies.	Amend NDP.  Consider references to rural crafts in revised NDP /

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			any form of rural crafts could be encouraged as they would bring local jobs.		Employment section and policies.
29.3	Infrastructure	Comment	The small lanes in and around the parish will not/cannot be improved substantially therefore it is quite correct to keep housing development within the network to a minimum. It is already apparent that school runs do in reality cause congestion on very small lanes and on occasions these very drivers are the very perpetrators of speeding when late. (The Whitchurch – Llangrove road being a prime example). A radical view is to suggest if larger scale development is ever required it should be adjacent to “A” or major roads which can more easily carry increased volumes of traffic.	Noted.  Access should be considered as part of the site assessments.  The NDP review will include some revisions in relation to infrastructure but highways are largely a matter for Herefordshire Council.	No change.
29.4	Policy ENV 1	Support	I applaud this on all bullet points and when appropriate Mitigation should be a planning condition.	Noted.	No change.
29.5	EMP 1 EMP 2 & EMP 3	Comment	In EMP 1 your first point is about appropriate scale and or use which could not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents. This is such a crucial point that I think it is essential this is added to EMP 2 & 3 to say <b>“They are not of a scale or use which could affect the amenity of nearby residents.”</b> I appreciate you already comment on scale in EMP 2 & EMP 3 but I think you need to go further.  In addition, I think it would be helpful if a statement could be added to both which mentioned “Where increased employment opportunities existed for the <b>Local</b>	Noted.  These points should be considered as part of the NDP Review process.	Amend NDP.  Consider points made as part of NDP Review - Employment section.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p><b>Community</b>". A vibrant community needs jobs as much as housing and encouraging small local industry is essential. I am not sure if agriculture offers this as its diversification seems to need itinerant overseas workers that do not contribute to the community. Unfortunately whilst in is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood plan perceived immigration is of concern to local communities and cause and effect is a consequence of some development. This is especially so where there is no community integration because of transience and thus no local community benefit. I fully appreciate this is a controversial subject but it should be faced and dealt with rather than ignored.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the possible introduction of a planned Polytunnel development could see our community increase by 250 people at its peak. This is industrial scale development and the Neighbourhood plan should cover this type of development. This is equivalent to building an additional 100 home housing estate. The Neighbourhood plan needs to address and have provision for such potential agricultural proposals. The Parish Council appear to have given great care over increased housing needs and what is appropriate for the Parish. Please can you give the same care when considering agricultural and business development.</p> <p>When considering new Agricultural and Business development the following aspects should be of the greatest consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These should include an environmental gain to the local community</li> </ul>		

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a proportionate work/jobs gain for the local community</li> <li>• There should be no dilution of amenity enjoyment of the local community</li> </ul> <p>Small scale start up business as promoted by the Prince's Trust seems to fit better with our Neighbourhood plan. Planning interpretation and application can help encourage this type of development at a local, regional and national basis. It has to start somewhere so why not champion it within our neighbourhood.</p>		
29.6	<b>Page 25</b>	Comment	As a long-suffering business that moved to the area with the hope of Fastershire Broadband delivery I am four years later still very disappointed. Better connectivity is vital for the future both by Fast Broadband and Mobile Phone coverage. The government and the Herefordshire Council have invested in this area but oversight or holding to account seems lacking. It is right this key element for development should be a focus of our plan but how and who can we hold to account for non-delivery? We should speak and lobby as one.	Noted.  This is not really an NDP matter - refer to Parish Council / Herefordshire Council.	No change.
29.7	<b>Pages 37 &amp; 38 – Transport</b>	Comment	There is little or no rural transport and the appetite for anybody Government or Private to invest in this is non-existent. The car is the only possible transport solution whether owner drivers or taxis. We should therefore embrace this and see how we can improve life around the motor vehicle. I see no validity in talking about cycle ways and encouraging cycling in our region other than for pure leisure by the very fittest. In urban areas cycling works well. In flat areas this works well but the percentage of	Noted.  The NDP Review process should include consideration of car parking in new developments.  The NDP promotes alternative methods	Amend NDP.  Consider references to car parking standards as part of NDP Review process.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<p>people who would or could cycle from Llangarron to Llangrove is tiny. Even those that do will most probably use a motor vehicle most of the time for work and leisure. Cycling along our roads is not always safe as we have no protected cycle ways.</p> <p>If we are to embrace the car and accept it is essential to modern life our housing planning needs to address this point. Most households have two cars today and a three or four bedroom house could have three cars. We then have to consider visitors to houses and delivery vans and lorries. Modern housing development should cater for this with sufficient space not the minimum space. Some of the new developments in Llangrove illustrate all too well a lack of realistic parking.</p> <p>The priority for new housing should ensure adequate parking not bike storage facilities. This is about understanding the reality of life not some perception based on a world that does not exist. Accept it understand it and find a solution that works for the community do not simply create issues further down the line.</p> <p>There will always be pressure from developers to place the maximum number of houses they can on a given plot. This should be resisted and quality of life in our community should be remembered. One development in Llangrove has the smallest areas around each house imaginable. Once families, children and pets move in this will create a stressful environment due to noise and lack of space. In another area I think the PC are already suggesting three story development is also questionable and out of character with the local villages.</p>	<p>of transport to the car in line with sustainability objectives.</p>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
29.8	Page 47 Points 3 & 4	Support / Comment	I particularly support these points and hope that everything the Parish Council considers works towards a sustainable and vibrant rural community that all those living around us will enjoy and support. Progress and change is inevitable as our County evolves but change does require careful thought and management for all in the long term not just short term commercial gain for the few.	Noted.	No change.
30.1	Vision	Support	I strongly agree with the Vision statement - and would like to express appreciation for the considerable body of work which has been produced by your Steering Group.	Noted.	No change.
30.2	EMP2, EMP3, EMP4	Comment	EMP1 Rural Enterprises starts with 'The proposal is of an appropriate scale and or use which would not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents'. Why is this not also the opening sentence for these policies? purely the same standards should be applied to the different categories? We should all seek to attract new employment opportunities to the parish to avoid communities atrophying - but this does surely have to be done in a way that promotes the use of local businesses and encourages social cohesion wherever possible.	The Employment section and policies will be considered during the NDP Review. Following comments from HC about duplication with the Core Strategy it is likely that the number of policies will be reduced, probably to just one, which picks up relevant local detail.	Amend NDP.  Consider comments about wording as part of NDP Review.
30.3	New policy	Omission	The Neighbourhood Plan does not discuss or promote any response to the inclusion of large encampments of 'Seasonal' Workers associated with proposed polytunnel developments.	Noted.  This should be considered as part of	Amend NDP.  Review process should include consideration of accommodation for seasonal

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			The new proposal for Biddlestone Orchards includes the importation of 250 overseas workers into a closed environment of 120 fixed pods, who are ferried in/out to local towns for supplies - this does nothing to support social cohesion or to promote local businesses or facilities. The residents of the parish are however expected to tolerate additional noise & light pollution, degradation of landscape setting, additional commercial traffic on the A4137, etc. A re-examination of this area by your Steering Group would be appreciated.	the NDP Review process.	workers under the rural employment section if a policy is included about agricultural workers dwellings.
31.1	Vision Objectives	Support / Comment	<p>I am broadly in agreement with the visions and objectives of the plan and would like to thank the council for the consideration and thoughtfulness that it has clearly been taken in developing proposals for future development.</p> <p>I am concerned about Policy EMP 2 and EMP 3 as they do not include an impact assessment on residents. EMP 1 has a requirement that any proposal is of an appropriate scale and or use which would not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents. I would like to see this objective included in EMP2 and EMP3. The development of polytunnels in the parish could require accommodation for hundreds of workers on a campsite. These are no longer seasonal businesses, some now operate 10 months of the year and at peak times 20hrs a day with the subsequent noise and traffic. Housing 100's of people on a campsite will impact on our parish. As a council you have been very diligent in considering the development of 65 homes for long term residents and the impact this would have on village life. Please can the same care be given to the development of business and agriculture?</p>	The Employment section and policies will be considered during the NDP Review. Following comments from HC about duplication with the Core Strategy it is likely that the number of policies will be reduced, probably to just one, which picks up relevant local detail.	Amend NDP.  Consider comments about wording as part of NDP Review. See above re seasonal workers accommodation.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			I am not against the development of business but we need to apply the same standards for all. So that we can create a 'vibrant sustainable rural community, providing a high quality of life for people who live, work and visit the parish'. Thank you once again for your time in developing this document.		
32.1	HOU1	Comment	The Plan states that <b>developments will be no more than 5 units</b> . BUT, 'The Close' which is nearing completion comprises 6 <i>contemporary 4 double bedroom detached homes</i> , and the proposed Darley development of 15. How is this reconciled to the NP? The Darley development notice states up to 20 house; why this discrepancy?	Noted.  Housing allocations are being reconsidered through the NDP Review process.	No change.
32.2	HOU1	Comment	The Plan states that <b>new developments will complement the character of the village and reflect the scale and character of surrounding properties</b> . BUT, 'The Close' which is nearing completion comprises 6 <i>contemporary 4 double bedroom detached homes</i> . They are 3 storey 'town houses'! How is this reconciled to the NP?	Noted.  The NDP cannot influence schemes which already have planning consent and are being built.  Design and Character policies are being reconsidered through the NDP Review process.	No change.
32.3	ENV3	Comment	<b>Development on all sites should be accompanied by detailed drainage proposals setting out the approach to foul drainage, storm water, SUDs and any proposed flood alleviation, and infrastructure improvements</b>	Noted.  The NDP cannot influence schemes	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			<i>including permeable surfaces, and how these will be delivered effectively.</i> Why did The Close not comply with this requirement; as a consequence the height of this development, which should have been restricted to frontal development (as proposed for HOU3), was additionally compromised?	which already have planning consent but the NDP review will strengthen sections on flooding and drainage - see Table 2 comments from Welsh water.	
32.3	CSU 1, 2 and 3	Comment	<p><b><i>New developments should seek to improve quality of roads and infrastructure.</i></b></p> <p>NP describes provision of Sector 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy. The small amount of development over the last 2 years has well illustrated the detrimental impact on village life, roads and bridleways.</p> <p>This has not been counterbalanced by any 'improvements'; why not? This is an important feature of further village development and I propose that these matters need to be further explained and clarified as follows. The system needs to be 'transparent' for the benefit of both residents, the PC and the Developer. The amounts of money must be quantified and proportionate to the development, the work to be done must be described and agreed at the Planning stage and completion part of the signing off process,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The PC will continue to work to secure developer contributions to support infrastructure improvements but this will depend on negotiations with HC.</p>	No change.
32.4	TRA2	Comment	NP does not include any quantification (ie extent and timescale) of <b><i>provision for maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways.</i></b>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not a planning policy matter - refer to PC for action.</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
32.5	General comments	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strictly speaking this document describes a Strategy, and not a Plan. A `plan` requires quantification of timescales, costs and actions and responsibilities.</li> <li>2. Much of the significant content is too imprecise, eg new housing should complement the character of the village etc requires clearer and measurable description for clarification.</li> <li>3. Many Strategies contain fine words are and written with good intent but generally fail because the implementation plan has not been thought through or because of poor project management – see comments under HOU1 and ENV3 above. This Neighbourhood Plan could be improved by including this aspect.</li> <li>4. There are 2 aspects to village development on this scale (ie &gt;10%). Firstly, the design of the development and secondly, and just as important, is the impact on the village during the development. The recent development at The Close, Llangrove illustrates (in a negative way) both aspects. The houses themselves are totally out of character to anything else in the village and are more suited to town locations. Secondly, the impact during construction was/is awful, in particular on the local roads/byeways in terms of damage to sidewalks and verges, mess and damage to surfaces etc.</li> <li>5. (<a href="http://www.llangrove.org.uk/llangrovevillageplan2008.pdf">http://www.llangrove.org.uk/llangrovevillageplan2008.pdf</a>) is the link to Llangrove</li> </ol>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This is a planning policy document and not an action plan. It will be used to help determine planning applications in the parish.</p> <p>The NDP Review will consider site allocations and there will be further opportunities to comment on any proposed sites.</p> <p>Design and character policies will be reviewed.</p>	No change.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			Village Plan, and Section 2 and Appendices E and F describe data re Housing and Future Developments. The NP does not acknowledge the existence of this document (in itself representing a significant proportion of the residents – 163) which summarises and specifically notes <b>low roof lines</b> as a feature of properties in the village.		
33.1	Housing	Comment	Just for the villages reassurance, we would not be thinking of handing land over to a large developer and having no control over what was being built in the centre of the village. It's so easy for rumours to get around and people to get the wrong ideas. Having been born in Llangarron and with family still living there I would never want to spoil Llangarron's unique appeal. If we decide to apply for planning it will be very much to build sustainable houses which blend into the countryside. Rural in character and not at all suburban.	Noted.  The NDP Review should strengthen sustainability in new buildings.	Amend NDP  Review sustainable design policies.
33.2	Housing / Sustainability	Comment	New houses aiming to meet at least AECB Silver & up to passivhaus standards, taking advantage of having a south facing field/plot. Smaller houses with gardens and trees between and not squashed into a plot for maximum profit, this is not our aim at all! We have given this much thought and are in touch with forward thinking architects who specialise in sustainable eco-friendly housing up to passivhaus standards. Houses which are aimed at taking into account the countryside around and designed to blend in. Our intention would be to enhance the village with some low impact, very eco-friendly sustainable houses aiming for the future. Hopefully this would	Noted.	Amend NDP  Review sustainable design policies.

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/	Representation	PC Consideration	Changes to NDP
			encourage some new young life into the village to support the local area.		