

Addendum to the Consultation Statement – July 2017

Response to Comments made in relation to Regulation 16(1) Representations

Representation by	Representation	Response
<p>Welsh Water</p>	<p>Concern over the inaccuracy of some of the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy S4: there is no hydraulic capacity issues on the length of the public sewer running from the field to the south of The Grove to the wastewater treatment works (WwTW)</p> <p>Para 5.6: There is no constraints in terms of the sewerage capacity in Shobdon. As outlined in our Reg14 consultation response we recommended amended to the text to Policy S10</p> <p>Para 5.8: As previously stated there are no hydraulic capacity issues with this sewer</p> <p>Para 7.2: As outlined in our Reg14 consultation response, whilst there have been historical incidents of sewer flooding, these were not due to hydraulic overload. Growth is monitored and if potential of hydrological overload the Council would be advised accordingly. At the current time there are no issues.</p> <p>Policy S10: whilst aspects of the policy were amended to take on board recommendations in Reg14 comments, it is not wholly accurate. Suggested new wording. As aforementioned, there is no hydraulic capacity issue with the sewer leading to the WwTw.</p> <p>Para 7.4: not aware of any issues with regards to leakage from the sewerage system but as outlined in our reg14 consultation response our recommend amendments to Policy S10 would future proof against any hydraulic capacity concerns.</p>	<p>These representations were considered at Regulation 14 stage and the community remains concerned that the issue is not taken seriously by Welsh Water. There remains concern about the reduction in the size of the sewer pipe before it falls to the WwTWs such that a precautionary approach needs to be taken, including the need to avoid potential pollution to the Pinsley Brook that flows into the River Lugg SSSI (unfavourable condition) and ultimately the River Wye SAC (failing and for which a Nutrient Management Plan has been prepared).</p>
<p>Herefordshire Council – Development Management</p>	<p>Land to the north of Moor Meadow – current planning application for 7, allocated for 12. Current objection on highways grounds.</p>	<p>The application was for only part of the site. The figure suggested in the plan is considerably less than that suggested in Herefordshire SHLAA. However, in light of comment – suggested figure reduced to 10 dwellings. It is understood the highways issue has been addressed as part of discussions on the planning application</p>

	<p>Land to the south of Bar Meadow – narrow parcel dominated by embankment. Would require significant engineering works and the tree may also be lost. Bar Meadow is a private drive and not constructed to adoptable standard, insufficient for additional dwellings. Question the deliverability of the site.</p> <p>Land at north west of end of The Grove – access to site is narrow and site is a children’s play area. Loss of this could be contrary to Policy OS3 of the Core Strategy. Potential third-party ownership issues.</p> <p>Land to the rear of the Calvi – has planning permission so potentially double counted in figures</p>	<p>suggesting that this was a matter of detail covered by policies included in the NDP.</p> <p>The engineering works suggested are over-emphasised and can be addressed through simple earth moving and building construction – confirmed with building professional. The site is similar to many that have been advanced across the County. Development can offer greater protection to the tree than current use where agricultural activity might accidentally cause damage. Land owner has rights over both the lane leading to Shobdon Airfield and Bar Meadow – confirmed by email correspondence.</p> <p>Housing Association landowner has advised the Parish Council that it wishes to develop the site for housing. It is no longer required as a play area in the light of the new village play area provided close by. However, in view of concern site deleted as an allocation and should it come forward at any time the site will count against the windfall allowance.</p> <p>Evidence forwarded to Herefordshire Council to show it has not been double counted. Development of the site is now underway.</p> <p>The above responses to these issues and the changes that would be made to ensure that the level of proportional growth could be met and exceeded were presented to Herefordshire Council at a meeting on 12th April 2017</p>
<p>Herefordshire Council - Environmental Health (contamination)</p>	<p>The five proposed housing sites have all been historically used as orchards. Orchards can be subject to agricultural spraying practices which may, in some circumstances, lead to a legacy of contamination and any development should consider this. Useful if site references were included on the maps.</p>	<p>Matter covered by Policy S4 f)</p> <p>The map format is that determined by HC’s Neighbourhood Planning team to be consistent across the County</p>
<p>Border Oak</p>	<p>Needs of those wishing to build or commission their own home could be explicitly supported within the main policies and text.</p>	<p>Policy S6 covers this point and uncertain whether anything further can be added.</p>
<p>CR Planning Solutions On behalf of Messers GH, AJ, EF, KJ Roberts</p>	<p>Concern regarding the deliverability /capacity of some of the allocated sites. Land to the north of Moor Meadow (12 dwellings): currently subject to</p>	<p>With the exception of the last issue, the matters are covered above under representations by ‘Herefordshire Council - Development Management’.</p>

<p>Land south of New Cottages</p>	<p>an outline application for 7 dwellings. This is five less than within the NDP and there is an objection from the highway authority recommending refusal based on site access. Therefore, concern that the site is not deliverable.</p> <p>Land to South of Bar Meadow (10 dwellings): Site is sensitive to development due to the topography and overhead cabling. No details of how the site will be accessed. New junction may be needed at Bar Meadow or via the community car park. Therefore, concern regarding the deliverability of this site.</p> <p>Land at northwest end of The Grove (4 dwellings); No clarity on how the land will be accessed. Bateman Close is not possible and would need to utilise a 3m wide cycleway. Access from The Grove would require third party land and track which provides access to the play area and utility cabinet. Concern over deliverability.</p> <p>Land to rear of CALVI (4 dwellings): Has planning permission which needs to have started by March 2017</p> <p>Land west of the Paddocks (10 dwellings): land promoted during reg14 as providing elderly persons bungalows. Therefore, not available to accommodate family housing.</p> <p>Para 7.4 / Policy S4 /Policy S10: Welsh Water have confirmed that there are no issues within regards to the public sewers or the hydraulic capacity issues in Shobdon. They have also confirmed headroom in the treatment works to accommodate foul only flow. Therefore, concern regarding the wording of Policy S4 and S10. Concern that sites will not come forward with the pre-commencement condition that are included within Policy S4.</p> <p>Inclusion of Land south of New Cottages as residential allocation within the defined settlement boundary. Site is sustainable and deliverable. Will not require connection to the public sewer dealing with foul on site and including sustainable drainage.</p>	<p>The inappropriateness of the suggested site in relation to the character of the village, access difficulties and relationship to the Registered Historic Park and Garden was highlighted in relation to representations at Regulation 14. It is not a preferred site. EA has advised it requires all development to connect to a public sewer where one is available.</p>
-----------------------------------	--	---

<p>Pegasus Group On behalf of MF Freeman Ltd Land south of Bateman Close</p>	<p>Policy S1: Object to the phasing of development.</p> <p>Policy S2: object to the policy on the grounds of phased approach to development Criteria ii) supports limited infilling at Ledcot, Easthampton and Uphampton. These are RA3 settlements and the Core Strategy does not permit infilling in these settlements. This will have implications on the windfall allowance</p> <p>Policy S3: may not always be possible to provide off-street parking. Rewording suggested for criteria c. Criteria e should be deleted or reworded.</p> <p>Policy S4: Ability to deliver windfalls for 12 dwellings is questioned. Additional site allocation should be made to ensure delivery. Land to the North of Moor Meadow has an application for 7 which is subject to a highway objection. Therefore unlikely to be deliverable for 12 dwellings Land south of bar Meadow is topography is significant and constrained. Unlikely the site will accommodate 10 dwellings Land at the north west of Grove Road does not appear large enough or suitable to serve the development. Not aware that alternative sites have been assessed or any comparative analysis undertaken. Policy seeks to restrict any development until sewer capacity is increase, this is a restrictive statement and should be delete. Welsh Water have confirmed there is no problem concerning the sewerage capacity. Para 5.5 – sites chosen will not deliver affordable housing due to their small size. Policy S5 –object and agree with the previous comments of the council that this is to restrict development. Policy S10 – policy should be rewritten because Welsh Water have confirmed that the capacity of the</p>	<p>Phasing considered important given significant previous growth and need for community cohesion.</p> <p>The level of windfall development is not affected by this element of the policy, either positively or negatively. If affordable or other local needs housing is required, the hamlets are likely to be better locations than the open countryside. This policy has been used elsewhere (e.g. see Humber, Ford and Stoke Prior NDP- adopted). The level of windfall has been adjusted to reflect recent permissions which indicate the allowance suggested is not unreasonable.</p> <p>Parking is a critical requirement and HC has guidance upon this.</p> <p>Covered above.</p> <p>This and subsequent issues (except last) issues have been responded to in previous representations above.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>sewer pipe is not a constraint to development</p> <p>Land south of Bateman Close</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the allocation of this site for residential development. Consider it an appropriate site to deliver housing and affordable housing. Could provide significant landscaping and public open space. Site form logical extension of the village and access could be achieved from Bateman Close.</p>	<p>The site suggested is far in excess of the level of housing required. Land drainage issues have arisen in relation to the development at Bateman Close which development of this site would exacerbate. The site offers fewer benefits to the community than the chosen sites.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group On behalf of MF Freeman Ltd Land north of Presteigne Road</p>	<p>Policy S1: Object to the phasing of development in criteria b</p> <p>Policy S2: object to the policy on the grounds of phased approach to development</p> <p>Criteria ii) supports limited infilling at Ledicot, Easthampton and Uphampton. These are RA3 settlements and the Core Strategy does not permit infilling in these settlements. This will have implications on the windfall allowance</p> <p>Policy S3: may not always be possible to provide off-street parking. Rewording suggested for criteria c.</p> <p>Criteria e should be deleted or reworded.</p> <p>Policy S4: Ability to deliver windfalls for 12 dwellings is questioned. Additional site allocation should be made to ensure delivery.</p> <p>Land to the North of Moor Meadow has an application for 7 which is subject to a highway objection. Therefore, unlikely to be deliverable for 12 dwellings</p> <p>Land south of bar Meadow is topography is significant and constrained. Unlikely the site will accommodate 10 dwellings</p> <p>Land at the north west of Grove Road does not appear large enough or suitable to serve the development.</p> <p>Not aware that alternative sites have been assessed or any comparative analysis undertaken.</p> <p>Policy seeks to restrict any development until sewer capacity is increase, this is a restrictive statement and should be delete.</p> <p>Welsh Water have confirmed there is</p>	<p>Except for the last point these representations have been considered above.</p>

	<p>no problem concerning the sewerage capacity.</p> <p>Para 5.5 – sites chosen will not deliver affordable housing due to their small size.</p> <p>Policy S5 –object and agree with the previous comments of the council that this is to restrict development.</p> <p>Policy S10 – policy should be rewritten because Welsh Water have confirmed that the capacity of the sewer pipe is not a constraint to development</p> <p>Land north of Presteigne Road Request the consideration is given to the allocation of this site for residential development.</p> <p>Appropriate site for housing and affordable housing, can provide significant landscaping and public open space. This is adjacent to the village and forms a logical extension to the village. Access from the Presteigne Road.</p>	<p>Regarding the request for land to be included within the NDP, this has been considered and an appropriate area agreed with the agent for the landowner in a location considered suitable to the village character and form.</p>
<p>Gladman Development Ltd</p>	<p>Policy S2: oppose the use of the settlement boundary if this would preclude sustainable development coming forward.</p> <p>Policy S4: development should not be delayed due to something beyond the control of the developer</p> <p>Policy S5: wording of the policy considered in conflict with the presumption in favour of development and there is no clear mechanism to implement the phased aspect of the policy.</p>	<p>Settlement boundaries is the preferred approach indicated in para 4.8.23 of Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy.</p> <p>The need to ensure appropriate utilities are available is considered relevant to the purposes of both planning in general and Shobdon in particular. There is no conflict with the NPPF in this regard.</p> <p>Policies on phasing in a similar form have been used in other adopted neighbourhood plans and is necessary in this instance to achieve community cohesion given previous high levels of development in the village. (See Upper Eden Neighbourhood Plan policy UENDP6) https://www.eden.gov.uk/media/2035/upper-eden-neighbourhood-plan-2012-2015-examination-proposal.pdf</p>
<p>Heaton Planning on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd</p>	<p>Development on Shobdon Airfield should not unduly sterilise mineral reserves in close proximity. Policy S1 should indicate the need for Environmental Impact Assessments.</p> <p>Policy S2 should recognise and consider potential impact on future mineral operations.</p>	<p>This is a matter for Herefordshire Council's Minerals Local Plan and not a neighbourhood plan. There is no Minerals Protection Area for Shobdon Airfield shown on Herefordshire Council's policy map. The need for any EIA is set by regulation not be any local plan policy.</p> <p>Again, this a matter for HC's Minerals Local Plan.</p>

	<p>The preamble to Policy S8 should include reference to include the former Shobdon Quarry workings.</p> <p>The Policy is negatively worded with a focus on development giving rise to adverse environmental impact. Point 6 would benefit from rewording to 'not give rise to unacceptable impact upon the highway network' to provide a quantifiable measure that will be assessed by the Highway Authority as part of the consideration of any potential future</p> <p>Planning Applications. Point 7 should be reworded to state, 'potential polluting effects of any enterprise should be minimised and mitigation imposed where necessary'.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.5 'increased noise and excessively high levels of traffic' should be quantified to make them useful planning tools. We would suggest the reference to noise levels is in context of impact upon amenity. As per our comments above.</p> <p>Policy S14 – items (f) and (g) be replaced and for development proposals to, 'conserve and where possible enhance biodiversity'.</p>	<p>Again, this a matter for HC's Minerals Local Plan.</p> <p>The whole policy should be referred to show the context in which it is framed, which is positive. The word 'effect' is more commonly used in relation to planning criteria than 'impact'. Either can apply to the need to quantify traffic or pollution consequences.</p> <p>The reference to pollution control is one requested by Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>The suggested change removes the local element which is important to the NDP. It is a very general statement more appropriate to the strategic level of the Core Strategy. It is appropriate to refer to those features that are important at the local level in a neighbourhood plan.</p>
--	---	---