

Reg. 14 Consultation responses

Response 1	Collected from Church 6/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?		
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	I think the plan has been extremely well thought-out and presented and I am happy with the conclusions.	Thank you for the positive feedback
Any other comments?	<p>Without wishing to seem patronising I think the Steering Group is to be commended on doing such a good job.</p> <p>My only comment (and my opinion is well known!) is that I fail to see the point of introducing “facilities” into the church building to cater for social activities when there is a more than adequate village hall a 100 yards up the road. But that is the domain of the C of E and not you, more’s the pity (Sorry <named steering group member>!)</p>	<p>As you recognize, it is the Parochial Church Council (PCC), on behalf of the Diocese, who are the responsible body for the church whilst the village hall also has its own management Trust. Nevertheless, the Parish Council and NDP Steering Group are supportive and interested parties in the on-going success of these two important assets for the parish – hence the policy in the NDP.</p> <p>As you may be aware, the PCC has agreed to become part of the Diocesan initiative ‘Mission and Mortar’. This will help sign-post the PCC to relevant agencies in helping maintain and further develop the church facilities so that they support increased use of this important building. The core purpose of the church, of course, is worship, and this will not change; however, sensitive improvement of facilities could benefit church users whilst complementing the role of the village hall.</p> <p>We are sure that the congregation and residents generally will continue to give the PCC important feedback about what sort of development is most appropriate.</p>

Response 2	Emailed to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 10/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?	Policy 3: Settlement boundary enlarged to include the land subject of a current outline planning application for two plots to the rear of Murrayfield, Cobhall Common – planning ref 182938 as a small site allocation for two or three dwellings.	It was the unanimous decision of the NDP Steering Group not to enlarge the settlement boundary in Cobhall Common as you propose – see below for further detail.
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?		
Any other comments?	Cobhall Common comprises a mixture of both linear and backland development. Backland development can be unacceptable if the plot is constrained by virtue of its restricted size or juxtaposition with existing dwellings but this form of development can also be an invaluable source of windfall housing land with minimal landscape impact. Our client's land is in the centre of the village next to the bus stop, has a safe access, will achieve very spacious plots with considerable distance between existing and proposed dwellings and ample space to achieve the required foul and surface water drainage arrangements. This summary is supported by the fact there are no technical consultee objections to the current application. Furthermore, the site is already used as garden for	Retaining the character of rural settlements is a key principle within the Core Strategy and this is also at the heart of what we are aiming to achieve in the Allensmore NDP. We accept that there are a handful of double depth houses in a small area of Cobhall Common where properties have been erected along the road-side, usually, in front of older dwellings – the original dwellings being set back down narrow, unadopted tracks. However, we believe that the basic characteristic of most of the built form in the NDP Designated Area, including Cobhall Common is linear (as set out in the 'Portrait of Allensmore' on pp12-13 of the Draft Plan). Most respondents (83%) in the Issues and Options consultation of January 2018 felt that the document provided a good summary of the local context compared with only 5% who did not [p9 First Draft Plan (Preferred Options) January 2019]. In consequence, we aim to conserve this settlement pattern which gives our parish its local distinctiveness, [also in line with Policy SS6 – Environmental Quality and Local Distinctiveness). The Steering Group have consulted extensively on the proposed Settlement

	<p>which planning permission was granted in the mid 90's to be used as domestic curtilage. Consequently, the landscape and visual impact is negligible compared with other housing sites allocated in the NDP. It is also important to note that this land has full permitted development rights and so 50% can be covered with buildings tomorrow should the landowners wish including buildings along the boundary with neighbours. In summary, the character of the village will not be unacceptably comprised with a modest development on our client's land which on a technical level, has been demonstrated to be acceptable in all respects. Moreover, development would ease pressure on other edge of village greenfield sites and allocations which have considerably greater impact than our clients land.</p>	<p>Boundaries and adjustments were made in response to residents feedback, for instance during the Issues and Options process – this included drawing the settlements boundaries fairly tightly to adhere to the principles within Draft Policy A4 – bullet point 1 - of keeping development linear – that is, not building more than one deep (see also p32, paragraphs 5.2.19-21 Regulation 14 Draft Plan May 2019). Consequently, there are many instances where the boundary has been drawn smaller than a land-owner's domestic curtilage or where individual houses have been left out of the settlement boundary for the purpose of deciding where development might best take place.</p> <p>We note that you only suggest enlarging the settlement boundary to include your client's site: were we to do this, it would introduce an inconsistency as the proposed settlement boundary on the other side of the road is only one deep and excludes the few houses dispersed down narrow tracks. As noted above, the settlement boundary is intended to preserve the local distinctiveness of the existing settlement pattern which is, in the main, linear and in doing so, protect against the urbanising impact of settlement that is more than one deep.</p> <p>The independent assessment by AECOM of site 13, which belongs to your client, judged it to be unsuitable and that development here 'could harm the character of the village' [AECOM summary p58 Regulation Draft Plan May 2019 / full report on village website]. As stated previously, following in-depth discussions of the points made by AECOM, we decided to accept their recommendations in full. Meanwhile, the planning application for this site is undergoing due process; we note the number of objections from residents, including from the Parish Council.</p>
--	--	---

Response 3	Emailed to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 11/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?		
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	<p>There has been a lot of work, and effort put in by the NDP group, however I feel they have strayed off topic, by being overly concerned with wildlife/environmental issues, which could be addressed by other organisations.</p> <p>The AECOM site assessments were not carried out in a diligent enough fashion. The report approved a site adjacent to Village Farm as acceptable, despite being a highly elevated piece of ground, and at the same time rejected a lower site opposite.</p> <p>I do not feel that enough local knowledge was taken into account for the sites, and in many ways all the NDP development sites are simply the acceptance of the AECOM survey.</p>	<p>Comment about wildlife/environmental issues Whilst the core purpose of an NDP concerns planning, such documents may also legitimately cover issues that are likely to be impacted by planning and development decisions. The requirement for us to consult with bodies such as the Environment Agency and the list of issues they believe we should take account of, gives weight to their inclusion in the documents. This has also been recognised through the consultation process with residents e.g. most respondents (80%+) felt that the NDP should include policies to protect wildlife and local landscape character (source: Issues and Options Consultation Jan. 2018 & First Draft Plan (Preferred Options) Consultation Jan. 2019).</p> <p>Comment about AECOM assessment of sites As stated in paragraph 5.2.10 of the Regulation 14 Draft Plan May 2019 (p23), AECOM are the nationally appointed consultants engaged to carry out technical site assessments under the Locality Technical Support Programme for neighbourhood plans. As such this body are completely independent and their methodology and criteria are externally determined and standardised in order to support consistent implementation across the country. AECOM produced a full report on the 23 sites put forward in the NDP Call for Sites process identifying both advantages and constraints for each site, as well as an overall conclusion; this is published on the NDP website. When the report was initially received, the Steering Group discussed the</p>

		<p>findings on each site (excluding members who had interests in sites as necessary from the discussions). After full and reflective discussions about the implications of the AECOM report, our minutes show that those in the Steering Group at the time, unanimously determined to accept their recommendations in full. This decision was reached because the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a completely independent and impartial evaluation of the sites put forward – particularly pertinent given that two members of the Steering Group had a vested interest in some of the sites. • Provided a geographical spread of sites within or adjacent to the main settlement areas across the parish thereby distributing potential development across the parish given that the Herefordshire Core Strategy Policy RA2 identifies Winnal as a ‘main focus for proportionate housing development (Table 4.14) whilst Allensmore and Cobhall Common are only identified as ‘Other areas where proportionate development is appropriate’ (Table 4.15). • Provided capacity to deliver <u>at least</u> the minimum growth target set by the Core Strategy with what we judged to be a reasonable, additional contingency built into the number of sites deemed to be suitable [see also response to ‘Housing Commitments and Growth Requirements’ below]. <p>The Steering Group membership continues to include a cross section of residents – with a broad range of skills and experience - from across the three main settlement areas. The group also includes long standing residents within the community as well as those who have chosen to live, work and retire here in the last decade.</p>
<p>Any other comments?</p>	<p>I cannot find reference to the number of properties approved for planning, or under development, or the number of properties required as a MINIMUM, to meet the NDP objectives.</p> <p>I believe that a number of properties outside the NDP</p>	<p>Comments about Housing Commitments and Growth Requirements Page 22 of the Regulation 14 Draft Plan, paragraph 5.2.7 sets out that Allensmore is in the Ross-on-Wye rural Housing Market Area and that, as such we have an indicative growth target of 14% up to 2031. This paragraph also gives the number of commitments across the parish at the time of writing the Draft Plan, leaving a growth target of providing ‘at least</p>

	<p>area have been included in the housing allocation, and this issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>I would like the numbers of properties under development, or approved for planning, to be included in the document, and if any are outside the area, I feel they should be excluded, and an explanation how this situation has occurred should be offered. This issue needs to be clearly addressed by the NDP committee before the plan can progress.</p> <p>The property numbers are, as I stated, a minimum, whereas most people are taking the figure as a maximum, or at least a target.</p>	<p>12 appropriate additional homes by 2031' (information provided by our planning officer at Herefordshire Council); whilst Appendix III sets out Recent [i.e. 2017 onwards] Planning Applications for Housing in the NDP Area – where these applications have been approved or refused is also stated; some are yet to be determined.</p> <p>The consultation process indicates that a majority of residents (e.g. 63% in the Issues and Options Consultations of Jan 2018) wanted us to plan for our 'floor target' [12 houses at that point] whilst 25% felt that 13-20 houses was more appropriate; a further 11% felt the number should be in the range of 21 to 30. Given that the number of housing commitments are changing constantly, especially as developers often seek to achieve planning consent before the NDP is adopted, then the Steering Group can only report on the information available at any given time. This fluidity is compounded in Allensmore in that the designated area for the NDP is slightly different to the parish boundary (noted in 2.4, p8 Regulation 14 Draft Plan May 2019); a small area of Poplar Road is included in the Clehonger NDP rather than that of Allensmore. With ongoing building in Poplar Road, we have sought clarification from our planning officer about any implications for Allensmore's NDP and - by planning for more than 12 houses (our minimum) - we are ensuring that sufficient development takes place within our designated area proper regardless of what happens in Poplar Road.</p> <p>Given the recent approvals made by the Council to planning applications within the NDP Designated Area, we have already met growth targets in terms of commitments assigned to us by Herefordshire Council. By accepting the AECOM conclusions, we would have in-built capacity for extra contingency on sites that were deemed the most suitable during the call for sites process.</p>
--	--	--

Response 4	Email to NDP@allensmore.org.uk (not on response form) 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What changes would you prefer to see?		
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?		
Any other comments?	<p>Sorry to send at last minute but please can you improve signage on road from Locks towards Kingstone where there is warning of a bend to the left approaching but nothing to say that there is a right turn to one minor lane just before the bend and a major lane to Cobhall Common immediately before the bend. I keep meaning to get up there with 2 short pieces of black tape to stick on the left hand bend warning sign</p> <p>Cycle path /footpath into Hereford is feasible and highly desirable but it has to be wide enough, well maintained enough and has to have the priority of the main road across the drives and minor roads along the A465 (including the Clehonger and Ruckhall turns) to be really useful like the Dutch cycle paths. Often cycle paths are not put in by cyclists - stopping and starting very frequently with kerbs, no priority over anything, crossing from one side of a busy road to another to continue, not swept by road cleaners then people are surprised when commuting cyclists won't use them. I guess any cycle path would be better than none when the children are younger but you really want people to commute by bike into Hereford and its fine anyway once you reach Belmont.</p>	<p>Whilst road signage and traffic issues are not, strictly speaking, the remit of the NDP Steering Group, it is clear through our consultations, that many residents are concerned and/or interested in such matters – these were documented in Appendix V of the various incarnations of the draft NDP. Consequently, the Parish Council have authorised a group of interested residents to liaise with the relevant agencies such as Balfour Beattie, to investigate what is possible. This work is in process and the group report back regularly to the Parish Council who will ultimately make decisions based on what the relevant agencies will permit.</p>

Response 5	Emailed response form to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 12/7/2019. See also attachment	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?	<p>5.2.14 Table 1 preferred option housing sites & Map 2: The settlement boundary for Winnal should be extended to include the paddock behind Springfield HR2 9BS (as you stand looking at the front of the house on the road) and also the field directly behind you that meets the B4348 (A separate attachment shows in red the extension to the settlement boundary within Map 2 that I propose). These sites were put forward after the ‘call for sites deadline’ for the reasons explained in the e mail to the clerk dated 7/3/2019. The request was subsequently denied.</p> <p>5.2.21/Draft Policy A4: The existing settlement boundaries for Winnal (Map2) should be relaxed to include <i>land adjoining the proposed settlement boundary</i> or at least the NDP could include wording to the effect that future planning applications on land adjoining the settlement boundary would be considered so long as it is in keeping with the objectives of the NDP. Winnal has a very low density of housing compared to the individual plot sizes and a relaxing of the settlement boundary would not adversely contradict the objectives of the proposed NDP.</p> <p>Map 3 & Map 4 clearly show properties are more densely packed than in Winnal and whilst I agree that the criteria for all three settlement areas of Allensmore should be the same, a more individualistic approach could be achieved by my suggestions for Winnal re the settlement boundary or the inclusion of ‘adjoining land’.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Draft Plan. We were unable to consider this site previously as it came forward after the AECOM site assessment had taken place and reporting was underway on their findings. This Call for Sites process elicited 23 sites of which 7 were deemed to be suitable by these independent assessors. By accepting the AECOM recommendations in full, our intention is to fulfil a core purpose for the NDP by having a sufficient supply of land available for evolutionary development up to 2031.</p> <p>As indicated in our reply to respondent 3, the number of commitments is constantly shifting e.g. several planning applications have recently been approved by the Council ahead of an NDP being adopted. At present we believe that we already have sufficient commitments to meet our quota and – if the plan is adopted – then we will have a reasonable planned contingency should residents and/or developers circumstances change over the period to 2031 – which, as you point out, is very possible.</p> <p>The settlement boundary is drawn fairly tightly around this property and, as frequently occurs elsewhere – it cuts across owners’ curtilage. This helps maintain the existing character of dwellings set within large plots whilst also protecting against unrestricted development of gardens. The latter is not desirable given that we already have sufficient, identified sites which the independent assessors deemed suitable for development based</p>

	<p>Out of approx. 566 residents, approx. 90 responded, of which approx. 14 were from Winnal – this is a very small number on which to develop such a restricted NDP for the next 10 + years. This lack of response could lead to a seemingly ‘paper exercise’ by committee rather than developing a NDP by resident input.</p> <p>Given the elderly age group of the current residents it is not incomprehensible that a younger generation may need to adapt or build specific retirement housing within adjoining land to support elderly relatives keep their independence – by including reference to adjoining land or relaxing the settlement boundary for Winnal, regeneration could be achieved by encouraging younger generations to move into the area.</p> <p>An unintended consequence of restricting future planning within existing gardens (due to the way the settlement boundaries are placed) could contradict the feedback already received and paragraph 6 of Policy A4, Criteria for Development.</p> <p>Draft Policy A4: Does the policy make specific provision for rural exceptions housing on land adjoining the settlement boundaries? Many NDP’s say that any housing proposals coming forward on land outside, but adjoining settlement boundaries will be acceptable subject to compliance with Core Strategy Policies RA3 and H2 – these include rural exceptions or affordable housing. I consider a clause such as this should be included in the NDP.</p>	<p>on nationally agreed, standardised criteria. This drawing of tight settlement boundaries is also on the recommendation of both our consultants Kirkwells and our planning officer at Herefordshire Council who provide expert guidance at all stages of our work.</p> <p>Achieving settlement boundaries that are agreeable to all is a difficult business especially as we have three main settlements in Allensmore and that the basic form of each of them is linear with green spaces often interspersed between dwellings. We have had to determine where the linear evolution might stop whilst trying to retain such characteristics as large plots, low density, open spaces etc. Winnal Common’s current housing density is particularly low (5.2 dwellings per hectare compared with 8.8 in Allensmore/east of A465 and 8.2 in Cobhall Common.</p> <p>We take the view that the new settlement lines you have suggested around this property – which is on the edge of the settlement area - would make a significant change to the character not only to Winnal Common but also to Winnal – in effect, joining up the two hamlets which are currently separated by green spaces [these fields also featuring in the Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Risk maps]. It was therefore, our unanimous decision, not to adjust the proposed settlement boundaries in line with your proposal.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment about rural exception housing which, as you recognise, involves different policies under the Core Strategy and through which proposals for affordable housing in rural areas <u>may</u> be permitted on land which would not normally be allowed for housing if there is a proven need for such accommodation. In Allensmore, as with other NDP’s, national and Core Strategy policies continue to apply. We also chose to keep site 14, as recommended by AECOM, as this does</p>
--	--	---

		have the potential to meet the trigger for affordable [rather than simply low-cost] housing should needs change in the period up to 2031 and this could be delivered without recourse to the rural exceptions regulations.
Up In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	<p>I recognise a great deal of work has been put into producing the NDP which is very much appreciated. Does a response from approx. 14 people (Winnal) satisfy <i>a clear and robust evidence base of local opinion</i> for the adoption of the Plan?</p> <p>The proposed plan doesn't seem to allow 'provision for change' in the future when land may become available or residents circumstances change.</p>	<p>Thank you for the recognition of the work that has gone into the plan and for your constructive feedback.</p> <p>We take your point that the uptake of respondents is relatively modest, however, we have made every reasonable effort to engage with the community since the original launch event at the village hall in July 2017! Our steering group meetings are always open to residents and the chair of the group reports back at each Parish Council meeting on progress (these too are open to residents). As well as the 90 replies to the Issues and Options Consultation we have also had previous consultations and two open events at the village hall which drew a good range of residents keen to give an input. This feedback over the past two years – along with the guidance of professional consultants and our planning officer at the Council, has enabled us to evolve a plan based on majority views of our respondents.</p>
Any other comments?		

Response 6	Emailed response form to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 12/7/2019 See also attachment	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?	<p>5.2.14 Table 1 preferred option housing sites & Map 2: The settlement boundary for Winnal should be extended to include the paddock behind Springfield HR2 9BS (as you stand looking at the front of the house on the road) and also the field directly behind you that meets the B4348 (A separate attachment shows in red the extension to the settlement boundary within Map 2 that I propose). These sites were put forward after the ‘call for sites deadline’ for the reasons explained in the e mail to the clerk dated 7/3/2019. The request was subsequently denied.</p> <p>5.2.21/Draft Policy A4: The existing settlement boundaries for Winnal (Map2) should be relaxed to include <i>land adjoining the proposed settlement boundary</i> or at least the NDP could include wording to the effect that future planning applications on land adjoining the settlement boundary would be considered so long as it is in keeping with the objectives of the NDP. Winnal has a very low density of housing compared to the individual plot sizes and a relaxing of the settlement boundary would not adversely contradict the objectives of the proposed NDP.</p> <p>Map 3 & Map 4 clearly show properties are more densely packed than in Winnal and whilst I agree that the criteria for all three settlement areas of Allensmore should be the same, a more individualistic approach could be achieved by my suggestions for Winnal re the settlement boundary or the inclusion of ‘adjoining land’.</p> <p>Out of approx. 566 residents, approx. 90 responded, of which approx. 14 were from Winnal – this is a very small number on which to develop such a</p>	Please see the reply to respondent 5 above.

	<p>restricted NDP for the next 10 + years. This lack of response could lead to a seemingly ‘paper exercise’ by committee rather than developing a NDP by resident input.</p> <p>Given the elderly age group of the current residents it is not incomprehensible that a younger generation may need to adapt or build specific retirement housing within adjoining land to support elderly relatives keep their independence – by including reference to adjoining land or relaxing the settlement boundary for Winnal, regeneration could be achieved by encouraging younger generations to move into the area.</p> <p>An unintended consequence of restricting future planning within existing gardens (due to the way the settlement boundaries are placed) could contradict the feedback already received and paragraph 6 of Policy A4, Criteria for Development.</p> <p>Draft Policy A4: Does the policy make specific provision for rural exceptions housing on land adjoining the settlement boundaries? Many NDP’s say that any housing proposals coming forward on land outside, but adjoining settlement boundaries will be acceptable subject to compliance with Core Strategy Policies RA3 and H2 – these include rural exceptions or affordable housing. I consider a clause such as this should be included in the NDP.</p>	
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>	<p>I recognise a great deal of work has been put into producing the NDP which is very much appreciated. Does a response from approx. 14 people (Winnal) satisfy <i>a clear and robust evidence base of local opinion</i> for the adoption of the Plan?</p> <p>The proposed plan doesn’t seem to allow ‘provision for change’ in the future when land may become available or residents circumstances change.</p>	
<p>Any other comments?</p>		

Response 7	Emailed response form to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 12/7/2019 See also attachment	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?	<p>5.2.14 Table 1 preferred option housing sites & Map 2: The settlement boundary for Winnal should be extended to include the paddock behind Springfield HR2 9BS (as you stand looking at the front of the house on the road) and also the field directly behind you that meets the B4348 (A separate attachment shows in red the extension to the settlement boundary within Map 2 that I propose). These sites were put forward after the ‘call for sites deadline’ for the reasons explained in the e mail to the clerk dated 7/3/2019. The request was subsequently denied.</p> <p>5.2.21/Draft Policy A4: The existing settlement boundaries for Winnal (Map2) should be relaxed to include <i>land adjoining the proposed settlement boundary</i> or at least the NDP could include wording to the effect that future planning applications on land adjoining the settlement boundary would be considered so long as it is in keeping with the objectives of the NDP. Winnal has a very low density of housing compared to the individual plot sizes and a relaxing of the settlement boundary would not adversely contradict the objectives of the proposed NDP.</p> <p>Map 3 & Map 4 clearly show properties are more densely packed than in Winnal and whilst I agree that the criteria for all three settlement areas of Allensmore should be the same, a more individualistic approach could be achieved by my suggestions for Winnal re the settlement boundary or the inclusion of ‘adjoining land’.</p> <p>Out of approx. 566 residents, approx. 90 responded, of which approx. 14</p>	Please see the reply to respondent 5 above.

	<p>were from Winnal – this is a very small number on which to develop such a restricted NDP for the next 10 + years. This lack of response could lead to a seemingly ‘paper exercise’ by committee rather than developing a NDP by resident input.</p> <p>Given the elderly age group of the current residents it is not incomprehensible that a younger generation may need to adapt or build specific retirement housing within adjoining land to support elderly relatives keep their independence – by including reference to adjoining land or relaxing the settlement boundary for Winnal, regeneration could be achieved by encouraging younger generations to move into the area.</p> <p>An unintended consequence of restricting future planning within existing gardens (due to the way the settlement boundaries are placed) could contradict the feedback already received and paragraph 6 of Policy A4, Criteria for Development.</p> <p>Draft Policy A4: Does the policy make specific provision for rural exceptions housing on land adjoining the settlement boundaries? Many NDP’s say that any housing proposals coming forward on land outside, but adjoining settlement boundaries will be acceptable subject to compliance with Core Strategy Policies RA3 and H2 – these include rural exceptions or affordable housing. I consider a clause such as this should be included in the NDP.</p>	
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>	<p>I recognise a great deal of work has been put into producing the NDP which is very much appreciated. Does a response from approx. 14 people (Winnal) satisfy <i>a clear and robust evidence base of local opinion</i> for the adoption of the Plan?</p> <p>The proposed plan doesn’t seem to allow ‘provision for change’ in the future when land may become available or residents circumstances change.</p>	
<p>Any other comments?</p>		

Response 8	Emailed response form to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 12/7/2019 See also attachment	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?		
What changes would you prefer to see?	<p>5.2.14 Table 1 preferred option housing sites & Map 2: The settlement boundary for Winnal should be extended to include the paddock behind Springfield HR2 9BS (as you stand looking at the front of the house on the road) and also the field directly behind you that meets the B4348 (A separate attachment shows in red the extension to the settlement boundary within Map 2 that I propose). These sites were put forward after the 'call for sites deadline' for the reasons explained in the e mail to the clerk dated 7/3/2019. The request was subsequently denied.</p> <p>5.2.21/Draft Policy A4: The existing settlement boundaries for Winnal (Map2) should be relaxed to include <i>land adjoining the proposed settlement boundary</i> or at least the NDP could include wording to the effect that future planning applications on land adjoining the settlement boundary would be considered so long as it is in keeping with the objectives of the NDP. Winnal has a very low density of housing compared to the individual plot sizes and a relaxing of the settlement boundary would not adversely contradict the objectives of the proposed NDP.</p> <p>Map 3 & Map 4 clearly show properties are more densely packed than in Winnal and whilst I agree that the criteria for all three settlement areas of Allensmore should be the same, a more individualistic approach could be achieved by my suggestions for Winnal re the settlement boundary or the inclusion of 'adjoining land'.</p> <p>Out of approx. 566 residents, approx. 90 responded, of which approx. 14 were</p>	Please see the reply to respondent 5 above.

	<p>from Winnal – this is a very small number on which to develop such a restricted NDP for the next 10 + years. This lack of response could lead to a seemingly ‘paper exercise’ by committee rather than developing a NDP by resident input.</p> <p>Given the elderly age group of the current residents it is not incomprehensible that a younger generation may need to adapt or build specific retirement housing within adjoining land to support elderly relatives keep their independence – by including reference to adjoining land or relaxing the settlement boundary for Winnal, regeneration could be achieved by encouraging younger generations to move into the area.</p> <p>An unintended consequence of restricting future planning within existing gardens (due to the way the settlement boundaries are placed) could contradict the feedback already received and paragraph 6 of Policy A4, Criteria for Development.</p> <p>Draft Policy A4: Does the policy make specific provision for rural exceptions housing on land adjoining the settlement boundaries? Many NDP’s say that any housing proposals coming forward on land outside, but adjoining settlement boundaries will be acceptable subject to compliance with Core Strategy Policies RA3 and H2 – these include rural exceptions or affordable housing. I consider a clause such as this should be included in the NDP.</p>	
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>	<p>I recognise a great deal of work has been put into producing the NDP which is very much appreciated. Does a response from approx. 14 people (Winnal) satisfy <i>a clear and robust evidence base of local opinion</i> for the adoption of the Plan?</p> <p>The proposed plan doesn’t seem to allow ‘provision for change’ in the future when land may become available or residents circumstances change.</p>	
<p>Any other comments?</p>		

Response 9	Emailed response form to NDP@allensmore.org.uk 12/7/2019.	Steering Group Response
<p>What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?</p>	<p>5.2/Policies, A3, A4, A5: Plans for new settlement are fair. They address the need for more housing, but are sensitive to its potential impact and genuinely take into account the things that people who live in and love the parish value. I am grateful for all the work that NDP members have put into producing this report. I am also pleased that other issues beyond the immediate need for housing have been identified. In particular, the need for a cycleway between Allensmore and Hereford. I believe this would have a real impact on reducing traffic on the A465, particularly during the periods when children are going to and from school. Safe cycling for children (and adults) would have many benefits – health, environmental, economic, social.</p>	<p>Thank you for the constructive and positive feedback including how an NDP can promote community issues beyond the core purpose of identifying areas for housing development.</p> <p>With regards to a cycle way – please see our reply to respondent 4.</p>
<p>What changes would you prefer to see?</p>		
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>		
<p>Any other comments?</p>		

Response 10	Emailed scan of response form and attached comments, see Resp 10 attached statement. Representations on Draft Allensmore NDP made on behalf of <named resident>	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?	See Resp 10 attached statement. Para 4.1 Objectives: Accord with NPPF Policy A1: Support for lower density development	We note your support for low-density development within settlement boundaries and how the objectives accord with required frameworks.
What changes would you prefer to see?	Policy A4: Settlement boundary of Cobhall Common should include Cobhall House (See attached statement). Policy A4: See attached statement. Policy A6: See attached statement.	Please also see our reply to respondents 2 and 5 above. After considerable discussion, it was the unanimous decision of the group not to include Cobhall House within the settlement boundary (see below for further information). Should the area around your client's property be included, it would have a presumption that development was acceptable. We consider that any such development would be likely to have an urbanising impact, potentially 'hemming in' the small number of properties that are 'two deep' down the unadopted, narrow tracks in this area of Cobhall Common.
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	See attached statement.	The description of the three main settlement areas in the designated area (see pp12-13 of the Draft Plan have been consulted on since July 2017). We believe that a key characteristic of the three settlements is that they are linear in form [as cited by the AECOM independent assessors], notwithstanding a few exceptions in a small area of Cobhall Common which includes your client's property, which is set well back from the road down a narrow track. Another characteristic of the settlement areas is that dwellings are often interspersed with green spaces which the linear form of development makes particularly apparent. As you rightly say, these spaces are not formally designated, however, we believe they are very

		<p>much valued as evidenced through the consultations to date e.g. 88% of respondents wanted to protect the local landscape character in the Issues and Options consultation (Jan 2018).</p> <p>As you will be aware, settlement boundaries do not have to replicate the exact built form of a given area; rather they are there to determine where additional housing development would be most acceptable/appropriate. With the Allensmore NDP this has been informed by the call for sites process which enabled us to draw proposed settlement boundaries that deliver our growth target whilst allowing for further proportional growth over the period to 2031.</p> <p>Had we included your client's property and the other two that you cite, one might argue that we should then also include site 13 opposite – lying behind other houses – which AECOM had rejected as it would break 'the established linear pattern of the village which is particularly strong to the east of Cobhall Common Road' (p58 Regulation 14 Draft Plan). Your own submission accepts that the eastern and southern sections of the hamlet are linear whilst you are desirous of expanding the small area which is the exception to this (i.e. where your client's property is). Our justification for wishing to maintain the linear nature of the three main settlements is that we believe this is a distinctive characteristic of the hamlets in the designated area and mitigates against the urbanising effect of a more nucleated micro-estate – which would significantly change the character of the settlement.</p> <p>As you will be aware, being within the settlement</p>
--	--	--

		<p>boundary gives the presumption that development will be acceptable. Further eroding the principle of linear development by building more houses in this section of Cobhall Common would, in our view, be detrimental to the small number of properties that are set between your client's property and the dwellings adjacent to the road. Omitting these few houses from within the settlement boundaries does not mean they are not integral to the village – rather, their exclusion is entirely consistent with wanting them to continue to enjoy the characteristics of the settlement that they currently do. Issues such as access and outlook could be affected should development occur in the area you propose for inclusion although this would, of course, be for professional planners to determine.</p> <p>Throughout this process, our professional consultants and planning officer at the council have urged us to draw tight settlement boundaries.</p>
<p>Any other comments?</p>	<p>See attached statement.</p>	

Response 11	Emailed response form 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
<p>What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?</p>	<p>NOT A GREAT DEAL. WITH NO DECENT BUS SERVICE INTO HEREFORD IT WILL MEAN MORE CARS AND INCREASE THE VOLUME OF TRAFFIC IN THE VILLAGE ON VERY NARROW ROADS.</p>	<p>Whatever the status of the bus services, our parish has been allocated a 14% growth target under the Herefordshire Core Strategy. Under this strategy, Winnal has been identified as a 'main focus for proportionate housing development (Table 4.14 Core Strategy) whilst Allensmore and Cobhall Common are identified as 'Other areas where proportionate development is appropriate' (Table 4.15). This means that development will happen and the most influential way for residents to affect this, is to have the legal protection of an adopted NDP.</p>
<p>What changes would you prefer to see?</p>	<p>SITE 14 WINNAL: NO BUILDING ALONG THIS SECTION OF THE ROAD. COMPLAINTS FROM RESIDENTS REGARDING EXISITING BUSINESSES IE.FARMING, PUB AND GARAGE WOULD BE AN ISSUE. DRAINAGE IS ALREADY AN ISSUE IN THIS AREA. IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE TO SCREEN THE SITE FROM ALL DIRECTIONS. KILPECK NDP ARE ALSO CONSIDERING BUILDING ON THIS STRETCH OF ROAD CAUSING EVEN MORE CONGESTION AROUND THAT AREA.</p>	<p>The independent assessors AECOM deemed that part of site 14 – in Winnal - was suitable for development, with the south west corner sitting lower in the landscape, having direct access to the road network and being well screened. We note that – unlike other parts of the parish - this site is on a school bus route and is in close proximity to services such as Locks Garage and the Three Horseshoes inn, as well as being adjacent to the built environment of Chimney Meadows (which is just outside our designated area). Kilpeck Parish Council are supporting the Allensmore Draft Plan and have commented that they think it is 'a very good presented and professionally produced plan'.</p> <p>As you have seen, the Steering Group decided to accept the recommendations of the independent AECOM report in full for the reasons outlined in our reply to respondent 3.</p>
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>		
<p>Any other comments?</p>		

Response 12	Response form dropped in Cobhall Common Box on or before 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?	Please look at comments page overleaf	
What changes would you prefer to see?	Please look at comments page overleaf	
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	Overall I think the draft plan has been well thought through to maintain the rural character of Allensmore with the appropriate development	Thank you for your positive comments on the Regulation 14 Draft Plan May 2019 – it certainly has been a lot of work to manage the process!
Any other comments?	The developments in Kingstone and Clehonger are a warning to us all! I have no adverse comments to make. It is obvious that a lot of hard work has gone into drafting the plan and am in total agreement with the results. Thank you.	You note the large-scale developments in Clehonger and Kingstone; the Steering Group believes that if residents help influence the NDP and then accept it when it reaches the final referendum, then at least we will have legally binding influence over future development in our own village. Like you, the Steering Group are all residents of our beautiful parish; we want to see it evolve in such a way that it retains its basic characteristics whilst being fit for the community that it serves in the 21 st century.

Response 13	Response form dropped in Cobhall Common Box on or before 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
<p>What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?</p>	<p>Draft policy A1: Protecting and enhancing local landscape character. Landscape and visual impact assessment. Retain hedgerows and tress. Views. <u>Safety</u> of residents.</p> <p>Draft policy A7: Flooding and drainage. Value (?) dark skies. Maintain ditches. Consider increase of traffic on lanes.</p>	
<p>What changes would you prefer to see?</p>	<p>“The relatively small increase in vehicle movements that will be brought about by development” – Really?!</p> <p>I say no to mains drainage to enable further building. It will no longer be a quiet hamlet then.</p> <p>I believe this statement should be incorporated as policy.</p>	<p>As a rough guide, each new property might be expected to have two vehicles although this of course may vary, depending on how many people there. We believe that <u>current</u> occupancy rates are relatively modest.</p> <p>There is no intention by the Steering Group to investigate mains drainage! However, with no mains drainage, flat topography and high-water tables throughout the designated area, the issues of drainage, flooding and disposal of sewage are apparent to all; this is why they warrant a distinct policy (A7) on p43 of the Regulation 14 Draft Plan. This includes adopting stringent standards for the installation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) on any new new developments [<i>Welsh Water have responded that they are ‘particularly welcoming of Policy A7 including the specific criterion on the requirement for SuDs’</i>]</p>
<p>In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?</p>	<p>I believe this is a very good draft plan. However, I find it at odds with the good of the hamlet of Cobhall Common when it comes to the building of sites 15 and 20. I think both developments were too large even with 5 – 8 houses each so I think the draft plan fails there.</p>	<p>Both these sites have already gained planning approval – and, given that the NDP is not yet adopted – it carried no weight in the planning process when these decisions were made. AECOM, the independent assessors, did judge that these two sites were suitable for development, albeit with a smaller number of houses on site 15 to what has already been approved. This is indicative of why we believe that having an NDP that has been supported and adopted by residents is so important, as it means we would have greater influence when planning decisions are reached.</p>

<p>Any other comments?</p>	<p>Only to stress that the aims and thoughtful issues addressed so sensitively in the draft plan seem to be completely at odds with sites 15 and 20. (Too late now with permission having been granted and no means of redress but it seems crazy without the infrastructure). The 2-3 houses on a site as mentioned in the draft policy A4 seem contradicted on page 30 of the NDP. Strange!</p>	
----------------------------	---	--

Response 14	Response form dropped in Cobhall Common Box on or before 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?	<p>A3: The sites chosen reflects the pattern of the existing pattern.</p> <p>A4: In keeping with the existing housing.</p> <p>A5: Plot density in keeping with existing local density.</p> <p>A6: Sensible use of redundant agricultural buildings.</p> <p>A7: Any proposed development need to take into account the high water table.</p>	We are pleased that you think the recommended sites reflect the existing pattern of the settlements and that the proposed density is in keeping with what is currently in place. This has been tricky given the dispersed nature of our settlement areas.
What changes would you prefer to see?		
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	Excellent piece of work	
Any other comments?		

Response 15	Response form dropped in Cobhall Common Box on or before 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?	We are happy with all of the proposals	
What changes would you prefer to see?	All is good. You have presented a good plan.	
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?		
Any other comments?	Keep an eye on the drainage as this is the most important thing in Cobhall and Winal.	Thank you for the supportive comments. We will certainly 'keep an eye' on drainage as you advise – see also our replies to Welsh Water [who welcome our policy on drainage, flooding and sewage] and the Environment Agency as well as respondent 13 above.

Response 16	Response form handed to SG member on or before 12/7/2019	Steering Group Response
What parts of the plan are you most satisfied or in agreement with and why?	Agree with overall Vision and Objectives and all policies. In particular, Draft policy A1, A4 & A7, as it clearly sets out what we really need to protect in our village, whilst accepting the need to grow and enable our farming community to diversify.	
What changes would you prefer to see?		
In a few words what is your overall view of the draft plan?	<p>We appreciate the importance of an NDP to enable parishioners to have a say in any development in their area, whilst also recognising the need to conform with strategic policies etc.</p> <p>Given the shortage of land for development and Herefordshire's housing targets that need to be met, we are of the opinion that our NDP is comprehensive, covering all aspects thoroughly and if adopted should be used to assist Herefordshire Council determining future planning applications in the parish.</p>	<p>Given that an NDP belongs to all the residents of the parish, we are always appreciative when people engage with the process. We believe that the draft plan would comfortably deliver the growth targets set for our parish with an in-built contingency for the coming decade whilst striving to retain the basic characteristics of our settlements.</p>
Any other comments?	Analysis / breakdown summary of the feedback from parishioners was very well done ... in fact excellent.	

THE FOLLOWING SECTION INCLUDES OUR REPLIES TO ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSES:

A. HEREFORD COUNCIL

Key comments by the Council include:

- Neighbourhood planning: 'overall the plan is well written and well researched It is clear that the plan takes a positive approach towards identifying settlement boundaries and allocation of housing in line with the Core Strategy'.
 - Draft policies A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7 and A8 are all deemed to be in conformity with the Core Strategy of Herefordshire Council. Draft policy A7 is compliant but deemed to be generic: Action point:- include the Environment Agency Surface and River Flood Risk Maps to help inform Policy A7. With regards to draft policy A8, the steering group recognises that the size of developments will not trigger any community grants from developers, however, increased housing numbers and 'footfall' are not deemed necessary to meet the aspirations for ongoing improvements to the church and village hall. The latter already enjoys a good uptake of lettings which are cost effective in supporting its maintenance and development. The church is involved in the Diocesan initiative 'Mission and Mortar' which is intended to help signpost the Parochial Church Council to potential revenue streams to support planned improvements. The PCC is responsible for this process but dialogue with the NDP Steering Group and Parish Council has been welcomed.
 - Natural England (see also our response to their individual communication below): This body 'notes and concurs with the screening outcome [and] with the conclusion of the report of no likely significant effect upon the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) – located approximately 2 km away. Action point: we will now include the Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps as specified above so as to support Policy A7.
 - Air, land and water protection: Sites 4, 6, 14 and 16. This assessment states that, historically the first two sites were used as orchards which may have been subject to agricultural spraying practices whilst site 14 is historically an area of 'unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river stream dock)'. Site 16 – a farm building – may have been used for the storage of potentially contaminative substances. These sites may therefore have all been exposed to contamination and this should be investigated prior to any development so that proposals can be fully considered. Action point: Add a statement within draft Policy A3 to the effect that developers will be responsible for carrying out potential contamination checks and arranging appropriate measures as necessary.
-

B. KILPECK PARISH COUNCIL

We are pleased that this neighbouring parish supports the Allensmore Regulation 14 Draft Plan, especially as site 14 abuts a settlement pocket within the boundary of Kilpeck parish. Thank you for the comments on the quality of the plan.

C. WELSH WATER

State that they 'are supportive of the aims, objectives and policies set out' in the draft plan. They are 'particularly welcoming of Policy A7 [on drainage, flooding and sewage] including the specific criterion on the requirement for SuDs'.

D. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

We are aware that a small part to the north of our designated area is within the River Wye catchment area, however, none of our recommended sites are near to or impacted by this. Notwithstanding this, we fully recognise and respond to the concerns that Allensmore has a high water table, no mains drainage and water only flows sluggishly across the flat topography. In consequence, the area is very prone to surface water flooding [with the Steering Group making full use of the Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps]; this is why the Regulation 14 Draft Plan has a specific policy about drainage, flooding and sewage (see A7, p41). The developers of specific sites would be required to fully evidence their proposals for management of these issues for example, fully documented porosity and percolation tests. Action Point: include the EA Flood Risk Maps into draft Policy A7.

E. HISTORIC ENGLAND

We appreciate the positive comments from this body about the commitment to support well designed, locally distinctive development that is sympathetic to the character of the area, including its rural landscape character, heritage assets and green spaces.

F. NATURAL ENGLAND

No specific comments made. The Steering Group believe that they have tried to take into account the list of environmental issues that this body attaches in their Annex to the covering letter e.g. landscape and wildlife habitats.

G. COAL AUTHORITY

No specific comments made by this body.