

# **Border Group Neighbourhood Development Plan**

## **Consultation Statement – February 2018**

**Version 1.2 21st February 2018**

# Contents:

Description	Page
1. <a href="#">Introduction and Local Context</a>	3
2. <a href="#">Border Group NDP Consultation Timeline</a>	5
3. <a href="#">Schedule of Representations (second iteration)</a>	
a. <a href="#">Community Representations and Responses</a>	18
b. <a href="#">Stakeholder Representations and Responses</a>	63
4. <a href="#">Summary of Representations in response to Further Consultation on Sites at Adforton, Lingen and Walford - July 2017 - Community Representations and Response</a>	71
<a href="#">Appendices:-</a>	82
<a href="#">Appendix A</a> Neighbourhood Plan – Border Group Feedback from Public Meeting 29.10.13	82
<a href="#">Appendix B</a> Notes of sub-group discussions following Village Walks of October 2014	84
<a href="#">Appendix C</a> Feedback results for Adforton Drop-in Event, 2 <sup>nd</sup> December 2014	85
<a href="#">Appendix D:</a> Future Housing Needs in the Border Group of Parishes (Survey)	86
<a href="#">Appendix E:</a> Have you any land suitable for future development? (Survey)	89
<a href="#">Appendix F:</a> Draft Border Group Neighbourhood Plan Response Sheet	92

## Introduction and Local Context

### 1a. Introduction


- a. The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (Localism Act 2011) require a Consultation Statement to set out the consultations undertaken for the NDP.
- b. Part 5 Paragraph 15 (2) of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, defines a Consultation Statement as a document which includes:
  - i. details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed NDP.
  - ii. a description of how they were consulted
  - iii. a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
  - iv. a description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, if appropriate, addressed in the proposed plan.
- c. Guidance from Department for Communities and Local Government (10 Sept 2013) states that: *'the Consultation Statement submitted with the draft Neighbourhood Plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the Plan proposals.'*
- d. This Statement sets out details of all consultation and engagement activity. It lists how the local community and other stakeholders have been involved and how their input has informed the development of the Plan.
- e. The aim of the consultations in the Border Group of parishes has been to ensure the widest possible understanding of the purpose and content of the Neighbourhood Plan, and to ensure that every resident and stakeholder had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the Plan.
- f. This Statement demonstrates that there has been extensive community and stakeholder engagement and consultation throughout the process. There is evidence available to support all the statements regarding consultation summarised below.

## 1b. Local Context

- a. The designated area for the Border Group Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) covers a large, sparsely populated area in the North-west corner of Herefordshire on the border with Wales. It consists of six rural parishes covering the villages and hamlets of Adforton, Stanway, Paytoe and Grange, Brampton Bryan; Buckton & Coxhall, Lingen, Walford, Letton & Newton, and Willey. Because of its large area and its dispersed communities, communications, consultations and engagement in the NDP process have been challenging. The main settlements are Lingen, Walford, Adforton and Brampton Bryan.
- b. The community and stakeholders were kept informed and engaged via a range of mediums and events which are laid out in the **Section 2 Consultation Timeline** below. These included a NDP website, use of noticeboards, fliers, questionnaires, exhibitions and drop-in events. Steering Group Meetings were also open to the public to attend. Steering Group meetings are too numerous to all be listed in the **Section 2 Timeline**; only those that have some relevance to public consultation and engagement are mentioned below. A record of all Steering Group Meetings can be found on the Border Group NDP website at [http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/?page\\_id=2672](http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/?page_id=2672)
- c. The Plan took significantly longer than anticipated because of 2 major factors:-
  - i. A period of inactivity whilst awaiting the external scrutiny and final adoption of the County's Core Strategy – **See activities 23 to 25 in Section 2 Timeline below for details.**
  - ii. The Border Group Neighbourhood Development Plan went through 2 iterations of Regulation 14. This resulted from procedural errors **which are covered in Activities 30 and 31 in Section 2 Timeline below.**
- d. As a result, Representation Schedules exist for both iterations of the Regulation 14 pre-consultations, but this Consultation Statement only includes the second version at **Section 3 below**. The first iteration of the Representations Schedule can be found on the Border Group NDP website at <http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Reg-15-Table-1-Representations-V1.pdf> along with the original Schedule of Alterations ( [www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/List-of-Alterations-Changes-to-Draft-Plan-Following-Regulation-14.pdf](http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/List-of-Alterations-Changes-to-Draft-Plan-Following-Regulation-14.pdf) ). Following the second iteration of Regulation 14 a further consultation took place regarding housing sites in Adforton, Lingen and Walford in July 2017 which generated a separate list of representations and responses which can be seen at **Section 2 Timeline Activity 35** below and the full response in **Section 4** below.

## 2. Border Group DP Consultation Timeline

<b>1</b>	<b>28<sup>th</sup> May 2013</b>	Application from Border Group Parish Council to Herefordshire Council for the whole Parish Council area to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area.
	<b>Parish Council</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>18<sup>th</sup> July 2013</b>	Designation approved by HC with 3 objections. These were discussed at the meeting of 17 <sup>th</sup> September (See Activity 4 below).
	<b>Herefordshire Council</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	Election of Officers, formation of Project Plan and Communications Plan
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>17<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	The minutes refer to the public meeting held on 10th September where Sam Banks (HC Planning Officer) explained the purpose and process around neighbourhood planning and an initial Steering group comprising 6 Parish Councillors and 6 members of the public was elected. Others had expressed an interest in being involved but had not been able to attend this meeting. Border Group had had their area accepted for designation but 3 objections had been received based on the viability of 1 Plan covering 6 diverse Parishes. It was agreed to hold another public meeting to resolve this and also to try to involve more members of the community. The importance of Community consultation and good communication was emphasised.
	<b>Parish Council Meeting</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> October 2013</b>	Establishment of a Working Group to produce NDP information pack and prepare for public event in October.
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	
<b>6</b>	<b>22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013</b>	To prepare for public Drop in Meeting on 29 <sup>th</sup> October
	<b>SG Mtg</b>	

<b>7</b>	<b>29th October 2013</b>	<p>The purpose of the meeting was to give the public an insight into the aim of The Plan. Samantha Banks from Herefordshire Council’s Neighbourhood Planning Support Team, Parish Councillors and Steering Group Members were on hand to answer questions. Maps were laid out on tables showing parish boundaries and included one large map showing the whole of the Border Group area. Copies of the Core Strategy were made available. “Post-it” notes were provided for people to make comments and these were subsequently collated and analysed into a report (<b>See Appendix A below</b>). 41 notes in all were posted. A list of those at the meeting was kept. The comments received were used to inform the design and content of the questionnaire.</p>	
	<b>“Drop-In” Meeting at Lingen</b>		

<b>8</b>	<b>12<sup>th</sup> November 2013</b>	<p>Following on from the public meeting a vote was taken on whether to continue with The Plan. The Chairman called for a vote by a show of hands. Of those eligible eight voted in favour with two abstentions. Emma Lawrence from Herefordshire Council’s NDP team attended and gave advice on drafting questionnaires and organising other public consultations.</p>
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	

9	2 <sup>nd</sup> December 2013	Discussion of feedback from Drop in Event of 29 <sup>th</sup> October and how to take forward into a questionnaire.
	Steering Group Meeting	Steering Group Terms of Reference were agreed - these can be viewed at <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-Group-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan-Steering-Group-Terms-of-Reference-1-1.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-Group-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan-Steering-Group-Terms-of-Reference-1-1.pdf</a>
10	22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2014	Eardisley Questionnaire was tabled as an exemplar as it covered most of the topics raised in the first consultation. It was decided to proceed with a questionnaire along the lines of the Eardisley Group document and aim to get it out in the first week in June.
	Steering Group Meeting	
11	6 <sup>th</sup> May 2014	To discuss questionnaire.
	Steering Group Meeting	Data Orchard appointed as consultants
12	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2014	Final draft of Questionnaire agreed. This can be viewed at <a href="..\Questionnaires\Border Residents Questionnaire Final 200614.docx">..\Questionnaires\Border Residents Questionnaire Final 200614.docx</a>
	Steering Group Meeting	
13	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2014	Questionnaire Logistics; The Electoral Roll and a Council Address List identified some 300 homes to deliver to. Volunteers deliverers/collectors were identified for each community; i.e. Brampton Bryan, Adforton, Walford, Newton, Letton, and Willey. The aim was to have one volunteer for every 20 households and leave the forms with the householders for about three weeks. Sealable envelopes were provided for confidentiality and plastic sleeves provided to enable completed questionnaires (in envelopes) to be left outside the door if occupants wouldn't be at home on the designated day/time of collection.
	Steering Group Meeting	<p>A separate "Future Housing Needs" questionnaire, printed on coloured paper, was also delivered as part of the pack, with instructions for only one to be completed on behalf of each household. <b>(See Appendix D below)</b></p> <p>A "Land for Development" (Call for Sites) questionnaire was also included in the pack (one per household) <b>(See Appendix E below)</b></p>

14	24 <sup>th</sup> July 2014	Questionnaires returned ready for forwarding to consultants for processing. The response rate for the Adult Questionnaire was 73%, based on 2011 Census data for the number of adults aged 16 years or over, in the designated group of parishes.
	Steering Group Meeting	
15	26 <sup>th</sup> August 2014	Consultant's initial analysis of the Adult Survey returns e-mailed to the Steering Group members. A hard copy of the documents was tabled. A full analysis to follow in about three weeks' time. This can be viewed at <a href="..\Reports\Border Group Basic Report.docx">..\Reports\Border Group Basic Report.docx</a> Encrypted copies of the "Housing Needs" and "Land for Development" survey results were also provided to the Chairman.
	Steering Group Meeting	
16	7 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	Survey Reports available and discussed and a few amendments requested. Village Walks were planned to identify potential development sites. Potential sites to be marked on base maps to be provided by Herefordshire Council. It was agreed that possible sites needed to be checked out within three weeks to gather enough information to present at public meetings and/or exhibitions in the three villages the following month. An outline plan was tabled by the consultants for consideration at the next meeting. This can be seen at <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-NP-Versiion-1-updated.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-NP-Versiion-1-updated.pdf</a>
	Steering Group Meeting	
17	October 2014	Village walks in Adforton, Lingen and Brampton Brian to identify potential housing sites. This included the sites submitted via the "Land for Development" questionnaire
	3 Sub groups	
18	30 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2014	Village Walks were discussed, and an interim report presented for Lingen. It was decided to wait until all the village walk reports were available before deliberating further and to then compare to the submissions made via the "Land for Development" Questionnaire.
	Steering Group Meeting	
19	8th November	Attendees of village walks met to discuss and feedback. <b><i>See results at Appendix B below.</i></b>
	Sub-group	



20	13 <sup>th</sup> November 2014	It is proposed that three meetings would be held, consecutively, in Adforton, Brampton Bryan and Lingen on the second, third and fourth of December at which marked-up maps and Development Plan extracts would be displayed for comment. The meetings would be advertised in local newspapers and on the BGPC and Lingen websites. <i>See Activity 22 below</i>
	Steering Group Meeting	


21	27 <sup>th</sup> November 2014	Issue 3 of the Draft Plan made available on the Lingen and BGPC websites. This can be seen at <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-NP-Versiion-3.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Border-NP-Versiion-3.pdf</a>  Announcements were posted on the Lingen and BGPC websites and notices posted on Village notice boards to publicise the December 2, 3 and 4 evenings in Adforton, Brampton Bryan and Lingen, respectively.
	Steering Group Meeting	

BORDER GROUP PARISH  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
CONSULTATION EVENINGS  
IT'S DECISION TIME !!

- ADFORTON CHURCH ON 2<sup>nd</sup> DEC  
6-8 pm
- B. BRYAN V. HALL ON 3<sup>rd</sup> DEC  
6-8 pm
- LINGEN V. HALL ON 4<sup>th</sup> DEC  
6-8 pm

TEA & CAKE PROVIDED.  
Don't LET OTHERS DECIDE FOR YOU  
- COME AND GIVE YOUR VIEWS & IDEAS  
PLEASE COME ALONG.

22	2 <sup>nd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2014	The consultation evenings in Adforton, Brampton Bryan and Lingen attracted a total turnout of some 52 people. A good number of comments were received and there was a great deal of interest in the plan. The results to be recorded as part of the evidence base.
	Adforton, Brampton Bryan and Lingen Drop-in events	
23	11 <sup>th</sup> December 2014	Report on the Consultation Evenings.
	Steering Group Meeting	<b><i>Feedback Report for Adforton Event shown at Appendix C below.</i></b>  It was agreed that a final draft for Reg. 14 (pre-submission consultation) would not be completed until the Core strategy had been adopted.
24	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2015	The Chairman explained that there had been no progress on the plan since December last year as they were waiting for the effects of the latest changes to the Core Strategy to be assessed.
	Steering Group Meeting	
25	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	Core Strategy passed by the inspector and adoption planned for later in the month.
	Steering Group Meeting	Steering Group planned to have the Border Group Plan ready by November 8 and aim for consultation (Reg. 14) in early December with a view to submitting to Herefordshire Council (Reg. 15) in early March. The plan made available on the Lingen and Border Group PC websites and residents directed to these by fliers and posted notices. Hard copies made available for those who needed them. A list of Stakeholders was compiled for consultation, including Arriva Trains Wales, Welsh Water, Severn Trent Water, Western Networks, The Highways Department and Offa's Dyke (Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust).
26	18 <sup>th</sup> November 2015	It was agreed that the public consultation phase (Reg.14) should take place between 14th December 2015 and 8th February 2016. Fliers to be distributed to households and posted on notice boards. The plan to be available on the Bordergroup-pc.org and Lingen.org.uk websites and copies made available for study in village halls etc. Hard copies to be provided for those who request them.
	Steering Group Meeting	

<b>27</b>	<b>14th December 2015 to February 27th 2016</b>	Regulation 14 consultation	
	<b>Reg 14 publicity</b>	<p>Copies of the Regulation 14 Public Consultation Notice were placed on all notice boards and in all Community buildings together with the less formal Consultation Notice.</p> <p>Comment forms and a copy of the Plan were placed in the Community Halls over the weekend of 12 December 2015.</p> <p>A5 fliers with the same text as the informal Consultation Notice were distributed to all houses over the weekend of 12 December 2015.</p> <p><b><i>The Response sheet can be seen at Appendix F below</i></b></p>	

<b>28</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016</b>	Discussion on Finalizing the Development Sites. A meeting with Herefordshire Council was held to discuss their response to the Neighbourhood Development Plan Public Consultation Draft. The following documents were tabled for consideration by the Steering Group:- Schedules of Representations in response to Draft Plan, Feb. 2016. Border Group Parish Neighbourhood Plan Changes to Draft Plan following Regulation 14. Meeting Housing Need 2011-2031 (DRAFT). Some adjustments to development sites were proposed and the Schedule of Representations and Plan will be adjusted before being forwarded to Reg.15.
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	

		<p><b>The amended Schedule of Representations can be seen at:</b> <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Reg-15-Table-1-Representations-V1.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Reg-15-Table-1-Representations-V1.pdf</a></p> <p><b>The Schedule of Alterations can be seen at:</b> <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/List-of-Alterations-Changes-to-Draft-Plan-Following-Regulation-14.pdf">www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/List-of-Alterations-Changes-to-Draft-Plan-Following-Regulation-14.pdf</a> . <b>Both documents are also reproduced below in Section 3.</b></p>
29	June 2016	Report on meeting Housing needs published, in response to representations made by Herefordshire Council under Regulation 14. This was made available at: <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Meeting-Housing-Requirement-Report-June-2016-received-9JUL16.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Meeting-Housing-Requirement-Report-June-2016-received-9JUL16.pdf</a>
	Report	
30	20 <sup>th</sup> October 2016	<p>Extracts from the minutes:</p> <p>5. Chairman's Report: a) It was explained that at the meeting held in August 2016 a procedural error was discovered (this was when the Steering Group had voted to take the plan to Regulation 14 in November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015). The minutes were not strong enough and this caused the need for this Steering Group meeting tonight. Herefordshire County Council NDP feel that the plan is sound. The reason for this meeting tonight is therefore to check the plan and prepare it to go ahead to Regulation 14 <i>(for a second time)</i>.</p> <p>7. Discussion on Public Consultation matters prior to next Parish Council Meeting: a) Bill Bloxsome (<i>consultant</i>) explained the Regulation 14 process and timeframe and The Chairman agreed with his comments and felt, in light of some of the criticism that he had heard this evening, every household should be leafleted this time around.</p> <p>b) Councillor Brown added that she would like to see paper copies of the plan distributed in the villages, especially Walford, however The Chairman felt it would have to be limited as the document is lengthy. As well as being put on the websites it will be displayed in each village and a number of copies can be printed to be circulated. It was also felt that some discussion evenings at the beginning of the consultation period may well be useful.</p>
	Steering Group Meeting	
31	6 <sup>th</sup> December 2016	<p>A Regulation 14 consultation was run from 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to February 8<sup>th</sup> 2016, but this was declared invalid due to some procedural errors. A new draft plan was approved by the Parish Council on October 25, 2016 for publication as part of a repeat consultation starting in January 2017.</p> <p>However, at the meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016 it was agreed that a second consultation would run from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2017 and that copies of the plan and boxes for response forms would be placed in Lingen Village Hall; Adforton Village Hall; Aardvaark Books, Brampton Bryan and at Leintwardine Library. The Plan and other relevant documents would be posted on the Parish Council website and the Lingen website.</p>
	Steering Group Meeting	

Fliers for distribution to all households included the words “repeat consultation” to avoid possible confusion. An article also appeared in the Hereford Times. See below.

## Lingen

### BORDER GROUP PARISHES NEIGHBOURHOOD

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN** - The Border Group comprises the parishes of Adforton, Brampton Bryan, Buckton and Coxall, Lingen, Walford, Letton and Newton and Willey.

**Consultation on Draft Plan** - Herefordshire Core Strategy prepared by Herefordshire Council requires parishes with villages to accommodate some new housing. A Local Steering Group comprising a number of parish councillors and members from the communities involved have prepared a plan to try to accommodate the number of houses required.

Without a plan prepared by community representatives we would have to rely upon either developers putting forward their own proposals to meet and potentially exceed the Core Strategy targets; or wait until Herefordshire Council prepares a plan for the villages where development is required.

The Local Steering Group has tried hard to meet the housing target set in a way fair to all of the Group Parish and to cover other matters that had previously been identified as important issues within the Parish Plan.

Currently the draft plan proposes identifying opportunities for a similar number of new dwellings within each of the four villages, setting out policies on design, affordable housing, supporting business, renewable energy, flooding and the environment, among others.

You are invited to comment on the plan which is available on line at [bordergroup-pc.org](http://bordergroup-pc.org) and [lingen.org.uk](http://lingen.org.uk).

Copies are also available in Lingen Village Hall, The Community Hall, Adforton Church; and Aardvark Books, Brampton Bryan during opening

Send news,

<b>32</b>	<b>Jan 12<sup>th</sup> to Feb 27<sup>th</sup> 2017</b>	Second iteration of Regulation 14 Public Consultation on draft Plan.
	<b>Regulation 14 Version 2</b>	<p>The following appeared on the Border Group NDP website:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. Explanation of Public Consultation</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Border Group Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan</u> <u>Regulation 14 Consultation Process</u></p> <p>This is your opportunity as residents of the Border Group area to give us your thoughts on our draft plan.</p> <p>The draft plan has been drawn up by local residents and parish councillors from across our area and in consultation with both Hereford Council and Bill Bloxsome from independent NDP consultants, Data Orchard.</p> <p>Please take this opportunity to have your say on the way our communities in this beautiful part of the country should adapt to the challenges of the next 15 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. A link to an on-line response sheet (Survey Monkey) <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/FKS8VDS">https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/FKS8VDS</a></li> <li>3. A Response sheet for downloading. Apart from the dates, this was identical to the response sheet shown at Appendix F below.</li> </ol>

<b>33</b>	<b>25<sup>th</sup> January 2017</b>	Web notice of 3 short “surgery” sessions where residents were able to obtain guidance on how their comments on the Plan might be presented. Held on 7 <sup>th</sup> Feb
	<b>Reg 14 Surgeries</b>	

**DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN “SURGERY”  
VENUES**

On 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017 there will be three short “surgery” sessions where residents will be welcome and can obtain guidance on how their comments on The Plan might be presented.

Data Orchard consultant Bill Bloxsome will be on hand to give advice at:

Adforton Village Hall, St Andrew’s Church; 6pm to 7pm.

Leintwardine Reading Room, (Library building)  
7.15pm to 8.15pm.

Lingen Village Hall Meeting Room, 8.30pm to 9.30pm

**This will not be a forum for making representations which must be made as specified in The Plan or as publicised locally in the Regulation 14 Public Consultation Notice and on the [lingen.org.uk](http://lingen.org.uk) and [bordergroup-pc.org](http://bordergroup-pc.org) websites.**

The plan can also be viewed at Lingen Village Hall (Mon/Thurs am 9am-12); Adforton church and Leintwardine library.


<b>34</b>	<b>19<sup>th</sup> April 2017</b>	Bill Bloxsome, consultant from Data Orchard gave a presentation on the key housing issues and related representations received on the September 2016 Draft Plan. The presentation can be viewed at <a href="#">Border-Group-reps-received-11MAY17.pptx</a>
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	

<b>35</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017</b>	Further Consultation on Adforton, Lingen and Walford settlement boundaries. Notifications made via Border Group NDP website and fliers sent to properties affected by the proposed boundary changes
	<b>Consultation Events</b>	

**FURTHER CONSULTATION ON BORDER GROUP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (Adforton)**

The Local Steering Group has carefully considered residents' comments on the draft plan - for which thanks. Changes to the plan are being proposed to make the plan more likely to protect Adforton's special character, and more likely to pass formal examination (by an independent official examiner). It is proposed that we extend the settlement boundary for the village along Letton lane on its north side, allowing room for two houses. The plans below show the current boundary and proposed extension. Overall the proposed would add (net) one new house, because the allocation to another site has gone down. We hope this change will reduce the risk of development outside the settlement boundary, or the risk that an examiner will remove the settlement boundary entirely. The group is also proposing new design guidelines which will ensure development is high quality and fits the village's character, and if you have suggestions we would very much like to hear them.

Current boundary                      Proposed extension to the boundary



You are invited to comment upon the on the proposed change by either emailing your comments to the Parish Clerk at [clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com](mailto:clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com) or posting to Border Group Parish Clerk, Gotherment House, Wigmore, Leominster HR6 9UF

**All comments must be received by 12.00 a.m. on Monday 10th July 2017**


**FURTHER CONSULTATION ON BORDER GROUP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**Further Change - Lingen**

The Local Steering Group has carefully considered residents comments on the draft plan - for which thanks. As a result changes to the plan are being proposed to make it more likely to reflect Lingen's special character as a conservation area, and more likely to pass formal examination (by an independent official examiner). The steering group particularly want to promote development within the settlement boundary (rather than outside it), to respect the large open areas which penetrate the village, to encourage good quality housing development that respects the character of the village, and protect views from the church.

That means making the settlement boundary more robust by removing anomalies and finding additional housing land for the longer term. It is proposed that we extend the site at The Turn Farm to include all its buildings. The plans below show the current and proposed new boundaries. The change would increase provision on this site from an estimated 2 to 4/5 new dwellings but, we hope, reduce the likelihood of development outside the settlement boundary or the risk an examiner would remove the settlement boundaries and character protections entirely.

The group is also proposing new design guidelines for sites like this which will ensure development is high quality and fits the village's character, and if you have suggestions we would very much like to hear them.

Current boundary at Turn Farm                      Proposed boundary at Turn Farm




You are invited to comment upon the on the proposed change by either emailing your comments to the Parish Clerk at [clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com](mailto:clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com) or posting to Border Group Parish Clerk, Gotherment House, Wigmore, Leominster HR6 9UF

**All comments must be received by 12.00 a.m. on Friday 30th June 2017**

**FURTHER CONSULTATION ON BORDER GROUP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (Walford)**

The Local Steering Group has carefully considered residents comments on the draft plan - for which thanks. As a result the potential development site west of the Lingen road has been deleted. Other changes to the plan are being proposed to make it more likely to protect Walford's special character as a hamlet, and more likely to pass formal examination (by an independent official examiner). However, Walford still needs to find some land to meet the housing target. The plans below show the current and proposed new boundaries along the western side of Walford. The change would remove the site for 6-8 dwellings but add an estimated 3 dwellings to the 2 originally proposed at the southern end of Walford - so the Walford total falls from 8-10 to 5. This will also include space for a sustainable drainage system. We hope this change will reduce the risk of development outside the settlement boundary, or the risk that an examiner will remove the settlement boundary entirely. The group is also proposing new design guidelines for sites like this which will ensure development is high quality and fits the hamlet's character, and if you have suggestions we would very much like to hear them.

Current boundary                      Proposed new boundary



You are invited to comment upon the on the proposed change by either emailing your comments to the Parish Clerk at [clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com](mailto:clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com) or posting to Border Group Parish Clerk, Gotherment House, Wigmore, Leominster HR6 9UF

**All comments must be received by 12.00 a.m. on Monday 10th July 2017**

<b>36</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> August 2017</b>	A draft Schedule of Representations in Response to the Revised Draft Plan, dated April 2017 had been circulated to the Steering Group although time did not allow for discussion at this meeting. The responses to the June/July further consultations on Adforton, Lingen and Walford were summarised. <b>These are shown in Section 4 below.</b> As regards the Adforton development, Bill Bloxsome felt that the plan was stronger with the extension proposed for the June/July consultation
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	



<b>37</b>	<b>11<sup>th</sup> October 2017</b>	A Schedule of Representations in Response to the Revised Draft Plan, dated April 2017 had also been circulated to the Steering Group for discussion at this meeting. For completeness the Schedule of Representations from the previous Draft Plan dated June 2016 was also circulated.
	<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	

<b>38</b>	<b>13<sup>th</sup> October 2017</b>	Lingen Conservation Area Character Assessment October 2017 published on-line
	<b>Website Report</b>	

**End of Section 2**

## Section 3 Border Group Neighbourhood Development Plan

### 3a. Schedules of Representations in response to Revised Draft Plan (Regulation 14 Stage), April 2017

#### Schedule 1: Community Representations and Response

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.1 B Lewis	Policy BG5	Support	Fully concur with policy as set out	No change required in relation to this representation
			Noted with thanks	
	Policy BG6	Support	Agree that this site should be developed as proposed in the plan	No change required in relation to this representation
			Noted with thanks	
	General comment	Comment	The relative stability of the number of dwellings in the parish over the past 100 years is an indication that the settlement can develop to suit the changing nature and requirements of the inhabitants without necessarily expanding. New dwellings have been built and others have disappeared. The village plan pays attention to the current ridiculous County Council policy of resisting small developments designed to house members of the community who earn their livings in the locality. A sensible development policy, as this proposes, should allow limited new building which, in any case, ought to be limited because of the woeful lack of amenities, any form of public transport and the unsuitability of the badly maintained local roads which should carry weight restrictions barring large HGVs. Other than that, well done the Parish Council	No change required in relation to this representation
			Noted with thanks	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.2 J Davies	General comment	Comment	The parish urgently needs more affordable rented housing, mainly to encourage younger families into the villages and to enable local young people to remain in the area where they grew up. Also, from a more selfish position, people such as myself who presently live in accommodation connected to their employment face having to move away when we retire whether we want to or not as there probably won't be housing available locally at rents we can afford. The BGNP appears to recognise the need for more housing but will it ever be built and will local people be able to afford it?	No change proposed in relation to this representation
			<p><b>Although the proposed approach will not result in any large site(s) that would require an element of affordable housing, it is considered such development would be out of character with the Group Parish's settlements. The approach promotes self-build with affordable housing coming forward through Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy H2.</b></p> <p><b>Owners of sites have been approached to ascertain whether they are 'available' to be developed and only those with a positive response have been counted towards the level of proportional growth required.</b></p>	
C2.3 M Brown	Para 1.5	Comment and question	Why has the Parish Plan from 2003 been used as evidence to produce the plan, when the Housing Needs Survey for Border Group Parish Council prepared by Community First much more recently has not?	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>The Parish Plan was not the principle evidence base used to inform housing requirements and policies. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy indicates the minimum level of housing that is required and the residents' survey informed other related policy areas. The Parish Plan was only one of a number of inputs into the NDP</b>	
	Para 1.18	Suggest change	The final sentence does not make sense. "The policies and proposals that it for the Group Parish are set out in subsequent sections of this document."	Change made
			<b>Grateful for pointing out the typographical error</b>	
	Appendix 2 - Para 3.1	Suggest change	Please correct spelling of Lengthsman	Change made
			<b>Grateful for pointing out the typographical error</b>	
	Para 3.2	Suggest change	The following sentence is difficult to understand: "All four parishes containing settlements are fairly similar in size in terms of number of properties despites Adforton, Brampton Bryan and Lingen being larger than Walford which has a greater number of dwellings in its rural area."	Change made
			<b>A redrafting would assist understanding.</b>	
	Policy BG4	Comment and suggest change	Policy BG4 states "Infill opportunities will be restricted to gaps within the approach road from the south...." If infill will be allowed as per BG4, why has no settlement boundary showing this area been produced? (See 3.10 copied below) Please confirm the method behind the decision that Brampton Bryan, unlike the other villages in the plan, should not have a settlement boundary, and why no map of Brampton Bryan has been included in the Plan? 3.10 "A settlement boundary within which infill development might take place is not considered appropriate to this village in that this would have a significant adverse effect on its character and appearance."	Change made

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<b>It is felt that a policy definition is sufficient in this instance given that discussion with the owner of land along this road has indicated that sites will not be available during the plan period. The qualities of Brampton Bryan are considered such that it ought to be a Conservation Area and no doubt would have been designated such had there previously been development pressures. It would however be useful to explain in greater detail why a settlement boundary has not been defined for this settlement.</b>	
	Page 21 Figure 4	Suggest change	As first requested in October 2016, caption for Figure 4 Page 21 is misleading. Suggested change: Figure 4 - Barn Complex at Brampton Bryan for potential conversion to 8/9 dwellings. This request was first made in October 2016, and possibly could have been agreed at the BGPC meeting on 20 December 2016 prior to this consultation. As a result, anyone looking at this photo will be misled.  <b>There is no intention to mislead and a combination of the two descriptions might be included</b>	Change made
	General comment	Further information sought	Please provide evidence of methods used to consult adequately with residents of Brampton Bryan who may not wish to raise matters to a body which includes a representative of their landlord.  <b>Consultation arrangements will be set out in the Consultation Statement that must be submitted at the Regulation 16 stage.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Meeting House Need document / Site Reference B1	Comment and further information sought	Site Reference B1 says “Redundant barns of considerable historic and scenic value currently let to a tenant. Conversion to dwellings discussed with owners and agent.” If they are in use, what evidence has been produced that these agricultural buildings are genuinely redundant? Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Note 21 states “.....the site selection process should be carried out in an open and transparent way, including consultation with the community and the production of a full evidence base to support and justify the conclusions reached.” Please provide evidence of consultation with the community of Brampton Bryan on the selection of this site.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>The proposal came from the owner and agent who will be aware of the future of the buildings. The Meeting Housing Needs 2011-2031 report was made available with the Draft Plans at regulation 14 stage. This approach has been adopted for many other NDPs and found to meet requirements.</b>	
C2.4 S Brown	Policy BG3	Support and question	I thoroughly approve of site A1. Access to the main road from sites A2 and A3 look dangerous. Has the Highways Department been consulted? In my view safe access to the main road will not be possible and so both these sites are untenable.  <b>Herefordshire Council was consulted at both Regulation 14 stages and this included advice from the transportation section.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG4	Question	Are the barns at B1 really redundant?	

			<b>The proposal came from the owner and agent who will be aware of the future of the buildings.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
Policy BG5	Comment and question	<p>Recently an application at Yew Tree Cottage was refused partly on sustainability grounds. How can ANY development in Lingen possibly comply with sustainability objectives? It appears the village development boundary has been conveniently redrawn to follow ownership boundaries rather than more obvious and natural boundaries such as the Conservation area, resulting in a contrivance that extends the village unnecessarily to the north and south. L2 was recently refused and so should not form part of the NDP. That makes L1 a non-starter too. L3 is a sensible brownfield site and should be developed to the maximum if any development at all is justified in Lingen. L4 does not have sensible access to the road. Has the Highways Department been consulted? L5 is a sensible brownfield site but any proposal must meet the approval of near neighbours, again, if any development is justified in Lingen at all. L6 is an extremely poor proposal as it would be a ghastly visual intrusion at a sensitive point in the village and blight the listed church. It is also within the Conservation area and in principle there should be no further development therein otherwise what is the point of the Conservation Area? L7 is beyond ridiculous being outside a sensible development boundary (but included in the manipulated boundary).</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Council has changed its policies and identified Lingen as a location for housing development. The site at yew tree Cottage is considered to meet the criterion for housing to be 'within or adjacent to the main built-up area of the settlement. The settlement boundary does not have to follow the Conservation Area boundary. It reflects a previous boundary (Leominster District Local Plan) with some additions to take into account areas for development and some exclusions that were shown previously as protected from development. Herefordshire Council was consulted at both Regulation 14 stages and this included advice from the transportation section.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation	
Policy BG7	Objection	<p>Again, the development boundary has been manipulated in order to make wholly unsuitable proposals for sites W1 and W2. Both are in open country and the quality of life for inhabitants would be poor given their proximity to the A4113 and the surprisingly busy C1006.</p> <p><b>Walford has not previously had a settlement boundary defined for it. It was drafted to take into account the current form of the village and a limited number of sites understood to be available that are adjacent to it. Herefordshire Council was consulted at both Regulation 14 stages and this included advice from the transportation section.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Whole Plan	Comment	<p>Overall I think the proposed NDP is suggesting far too many dwellings in an area with virtually no services, no transport links to talk about and almost no job prospects. Houses on the market within the BGPC boundary are not selling so the assumption of high demand is erroneous, as is the assumption for the need for Affordable Housing. I am not convinced that any of the various alleged consultations has been in the least bit effective in reaching all parishioners. For example, I have had no leaflets or communications of any kind from the Steering Group or BGPC other than an initial visit from Geoff Bevan who was a parish councillor for Lingen at the time. Admittedly I did say that I was not going to co-operate with the NDP but that was not an excuse to end all communications. My subsequent questions to the Steering Group and its chairman Steve Chilman have been ignored and none answered directly. For example when I asked Steve Chilman for the promised maps showing selected sites I did not receive a reply for over a year and then it came via a third party and was "If Mr brown wants to know where the sites are he can always ask John"! The attitude of the Steering Group to any comments that were not exactly in line with the views of the Steering Group, with its "interested" member(s), was hostile and not commensurate with open and honest consultation. There is further evidence that awkward suggestions and alternative ideas were generally ignored by the Steering Group and that alterations made as a result of (unsatisfactory) consultation were not resubmitted to neighbours before final approval. This came to a head at a meeting on 19Jul16 when Mrs Christine Moore made an effective speech on the issue. See para. 3.4 of BGPC Minutes at <a href="http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/BGPC-Minutes-19th-July-2016.pdf">http://www.bordergroup-pc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/BGPC-Minutes-19th-July-2016.pdf</a> The whole process of producing the NDP has been desultory, inaccurate and ill disciplined with an attempt in June 2016 to initiate a "project fear" when it was publicly stated over and over again by Steve Chilman at a well-attended, but contentious meeting, that he could not understand why any BGP Councillor would vote against proceeding to the next phase and that delay may very well result in the sort of development being inflicted upon the parish that had been inflicted upon the village of Orleton. It transpired that the councillors who voted against proceeding to the next phase were wholly justified. (See above re: 19Jul16). Another criticism of the way the plan was produced and consulted upon was the one-to-one meeting held by the Steering Group with the Harley estate owners. No special arrangements or secretive meetings of that nature should have been held as the NDP is to be produced by open public consultation, not deals being struck behind closed doors, or actions leading to a perception that such deals may have been struck. I have included these comments on the whole process so that when the time comes the examiner will see that these views were made known to BGPC during consultation and therefore there was time to correct the poor consultation before submission of the plan for approval, if BGPC so wished.</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Council has set the current policy basis for new housing within the Group Parish and the Steering Group is doing its best to work within the framework set. A number of consultation events were undertaken, both formal and informal. All Steering group meetings were open to the public to attend and feed-back given on any meetings that the Steering Group asked to take place with landowners.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.5 S Jack	Whole Plan	Comment	My concern regards the infrastructure in this area, namely the roads. As they stand, they are in a bad state of repair, in many places they are narrow, a huge number of large heavy lorries use them, many drive on them as if they are motorways, many properties have bad access and in Adforton there is no footpath on which to walk on the A4110 (it is dangerous now!!). Now all these extra houses, not just in this parish but in other local parishes, will mean much more traffic on them. I understand there is a need for more housing but most of the above will not be addressed. Why aren't more Brown Field sites being utilised - a prime example is the one near Baron's Cross, Leominster.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Herefordshire Council has set the current policy basis for new housing within the Group Parish and the Steering Group is doing its best to work within that framework set. In setting this approach it was aware of the constraints. The approach was examined by a Government Inspector and found to be sound. It is understood the Brownfield site at Barons Cross, Leominster will count towards the housing target set for that market town.</b>	
C2.6 G Baker	Whole Plan	Support	Wholeheartedly support the provision of new housing, particularly affordable housing within the designated area. Villages will die if more housing is not made available.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.7 C Bordewich	Policy BG6	Comment	Construction work here would be close to the tributary of the Lugg and should be sensitive to the incredible wildlife in the stream and woodland which would be close by. <b>This matter is covered by criterion d) in the policy.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	November HRA amendments - Option 16	Comment	There are many accessibility and environmental reasons why Lingen would not be a suitable village for disproportionate levels of development. See general comments that follow. <b>Herefordshire Council has set the current policy basis for new housing within the Group Parish and the Steering Group is doing its best to work within that framework set. In setting this approach it was aware of the constraints. The approach was examined by a Government Inspector and found to be sound.</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	General comments	Qualified support and comment	I broadly support the proposed level of sensitive development in Lingen conservation area, but feel it is important that this wildlife-rich conservation area does not get any extra development beyond its proportional allocation. The 'level of need' for accommodation in Lingen is directly linked to the tranquillity and wildlife here. The village is remote, and regularly cut off by flooded roads on all access lanes. Many people in the village are either retired or home-based workers for whom transport / access is not a major issue. Those that work outside the village pretty much need four-wheel drive cars that can get through surface flooding if they are to get to work every day of the year! We rely on the air ambulance for emergency healthcare access. The wildlife here is present right in the heart of the village (I have seen a lone male otter, we have ravens, grey herons, welsh red kites, sparrow hawks overhead, and many garden and woodland birds including Lesser spotted woodpeckers, newts, lizards in the garden all within the conservation area, and the list could go on and on and on)- this is what makes it a place where young families might choose to live, even though accessibility is hard and facilities are lacking. The close proximity of woodlands make up for the lack of playgrounds. The dark skies, and quiet lanes are massively important both for residents and for tourists. The banks of the stream further downstream from the village have Early Purple orchids, Greater butterfly orchids and other native wildflowers. Any construction work and development needs to be sensitive and considerate to the wildlife in this area, especially where it concerns the stream and the woodlands.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>The approach taken is to try to locate the required amount of development throughout the Group Parish on sites that would have the least impact and fit their character both as individual settlements and the nature of the Group Parish as whole. Policies BG5 and BNG6 specifically in relation to Lingen and Policy BG9 more generally seek to ensure that features important to biodiversity are protected.</b>	
C2.8 P Chilman	General comment	Comment	I have looked at the plan many times and cannot understand why we are being consulted again as we have already been through this process. I support the plan as laid out and do not feel it needs any changes, we need this modest increase in the housing and I welcome the increased population which will make local services and businesses more viable. <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.9 C Bartlett	General comment	Support	Having been to presentations and read the full plan I think it is well thought out and a sensible way to meet our commitments for what is after all a very small increase in the housing in the area. I support the plan as it is and feel it should be implemented without further delay. <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.10 G Keown- Boyd	Whole Plan	Comment	Found document lengthy and uninformative. I wanted to see where proposed houses were to be built. Where are they going to be? I feel that precise location is of crucial importance. Please let me know location of planned buildings & what category they will be - starter, family or retirement.	No change required in relation to this representation



			<b>Housing can be built within the defined settlement boundaries or on allocated sites in both instances where they are identified and subject to the criteria set out in the policies. Those sites found to be available and thought likely to meet the criteria are identified in the Meeting Housing Needs 2011-2931 report that was made available with the NDP.</b>	
C2.11 P Roscoe	Site L4 (Housing Report)	Object	The roadside boundary of this site has already been identified as a possible traffic hazard. Consequently, the entire roadside length is bounded by 'visibility fencing'. Any development of the site would therefore have to be restricted to the south west corner of the plot, close to the existing (listed?) buildings. Any increase in traffic caused by regular vehicular access on or near the junction would further increase the hazard at this location. Suggest removal of L4 from the proposed plan.  <b>Herefordshire Council was consulted at both Regulation 14 stages and this included advice from the transportation section. It is possible that the site may not be able to comply with Policy BG5 f) which is why it is necessary to plan for a slightly greater number than the minimum proportional growth set.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Site L5 (Housing report)	Suggest change	Reduce the number of proposed dwellings from 5 to 2. The report acknowledges that Lingen would be expected to propose the smallest number of new developments within the Parishes. This would amount to a total of 8 or fewer developments. To concentrate the majority of those on one site puts the existing characteristics of the village at risk.  <b>It is considered that the site can be sufficiently well screened to accommodate more than two dwellings without adversely affecting the character of the village or Conservation area. The approach is based upon accommodating residential development across the four settlements within the Group Parish. There will be small variations between settlements according to site availability.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Appendix 1 Page 48	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having established the general principle of maintaining single depth developments within the village, a proposal to make an exception risks creating a precedent. Future proposals for other sites to be similarly developed would be more difficult to object to, the essential character of linear, street facing development, having already been eroded by this proposal.</li> <li>• The report alludes to visual amenity from the roadside and includes proposals to reduce the negative impact from this side. However, it fails to specifically address the visual impact of the ‘larger 3-bed units to the rear of the site’ when viewed from the public footpaths (beyond a general reference to screening), despite these being acknowledged as important amenities. Development away from the roadside proposals would be particularly detrimental to the character and amenity of the public paths.</li> <li>• This location of this site, a wildlife habitat and adjacent to a waterway, is particularly unsuitable for development at the density proposed. The intrusion on the current environment would be counter to the Border Group Neighbourhood Area Environmental Report (Nov. 2016) which contains relevant detail specifically discouraging development of similar sites:</li> </ul> <p>SEA topic 2 - Biodiversity:  <b>Habitats</b> and species of national, regional and local <b>importance are under pressure from development</b>  <b>Minimise loss of biodiversity and expand opportunities for wildlife everywhere.</b></p> <p>SEA topic 8 - Soil:  <b>Promoting development of previously developed land and buildings as opposed to greenfield sites</b> or agricultural land of the highest quality</p> <p><b>There are already variations in depth of development along the village street and it should be possible to ensure the character of the street scene is protected through good design. Similarly, good design can mitigate adverse impact on the public footpath. The brief sets out a requirement to provide measures to enhance the landscape and biodiversity of the Limebrook. It is considered that the suggested density can be accommodated satisfactorily through design to enable such associated measures.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation.
C2.12 P and S Davidson	General comment	Support	<p>We would welcome some new houses in Lingen to: ○ ease the housing shortage ○ improve unsightly areas ○ increase village community participation.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

	Policy BG6	Comment and concern	However, the number of houses on the nursery site concerns us as too many houses in one development would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ spoil the present fairly evenly distribution of houses throughout the village which has developed over the years and is so attractive</li> <li>○ change the overall view of new housing in context with the surrounding countryside</li> </ul>	No change required in relation to this representation
--	------------	---------------------	--	---

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ create new traffic problems associated with access to and from the road.</li> </ul> <p>Five houses in appropriate plots, as outlined in the draft plan, would be ideal. Any additional houses transferred from other sites within the parish would spoil the carefully made plan.</p> <p>As owners of cottages adjacent to the nursery site, let to locals, we are concerned about the change to the overall character of the site. Too many houses squashed in, mainly for economic reasons, would have a detrimental effect to the general character of Lingen.</p>	
		Comment	<b>There are already variations in depth of development along the village street and it should be possible to ensure the character of the street scene and the village's setting are protected through good design. Appropriate visibility can be provided and off-street parking will be required so that any impact will be minimal.</b>	
C2.13 S M Gray	Policy BG6 Paragraph f	Comment	To ensure that the new housing development does provide a mix of house types – ensuring that families/first time buyers can afford and be able to purchase houses in the village – that it is 2/3 bed houses that are built to ensure a new generation is able to move/live in the village.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted</b>	
C2.14 D Thame	General comment	Comment and question	The housing development is to have local people move into the village – how will this be regulated? - as the scheme does not mention this – once the houses are built will they just go on the open market of will there be interaction with the council to ensure locals have opportunity first?	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Only developments of 11 or more houses on any site can require affordable housing that might be retained for that purpose in perpetuity and it is considered that such developments would be out of character with the village. For this site, the intention is simply to seek a range of house sizes, comprising 2 and 3 bedrooms. Affordable housing retained as such in perpetuity would need to come forward through Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy H2.</b>	
C2.14 D Thame	Para 1.5	Comment	The 2003 parish plan is now historic, and is difficult to rely upon as evidence. There is no reference to the 2011 Housing Needs Survey which is considerably more recent – hence more reliable as evidence. This survey, conducted by a housing association with the co-operation of the parish council, indicated potential demand for 27 homes across the Group Parishes – predominantly low-cost or for rent – in the period to 2020. This ought to be part of the evidence informing housing allocations, both type and scale. Please see comments to para 7.2. Including a 2003 document in the evidence base but excluding a 2011 document seems perverse.	No change required in relation to this representation

			<b>The Parish Plan was not the principle evidence base used to inform housing requirements and policies. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy indicates the minimum level of housing that is required and the residents' survey informed other related policy areas. The Parish Plan was only one of a number of inputs into the NDP, and others included the evidence base produced for Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy. An example of this is Table 2 which is taken from Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment 2012 Update – November 2013</b>	
	Para 1.7	Comment	To maintain confidence in the plan, the 5-year review should be conducted with full public engagement – not simply a desk-exercise by the parish council. The plan should state a commitment to public engagement and consultation before a review is concluded.	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<b>It is considered that the approach set out in paragraph 7.6 of the NDP is most appropriate. Any review of the plan will be required to meet the public consultation requirements of the Regulations pertaining at that time as a minimum. The approach to such consultation should be agreed at the time it is decided to undertake a review.</b>	
	Para 1.12	Suggest change	Delete “and positive” – no indication is given of what those positive “influences” may be, nor is it shown how this is related to considerations of sustainable development. The plan – nor supporting documents – at no point show these influences, so the claim is unsupported by an evidence base. As with BG5 this reads a simply “softening up” for allocating housing to Lingen to make up for the deficiency of deliverable sites elsewhere, regardless of the acknowledged constraints on Lingen. <b>The sentence has little influence on policy and can be deleted if required</b>	Change made
	Para 1.19	Comment	I draw attention to my Freedom of Information requests. <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.7	Comment	Please see comments relating to BG5, below. <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.14	Suggest change	This risks looking contradictory. An identical reason (protection against inappropriate infilling) is given for *having* a development boundary in Lingen, and for *not having* a settlement boundary in Brampton Bryan (a decision taken by the steering committee at the explicit request of the dominant local landowner, see Steering Committee minutes 18 November 2015, although the plan does not give this explanation). The result is a policy contradiction that risks being overturned by an inspector. This paragraph would be less vulnerable to challenge – and make more sense - if the same criteria were applied to both villages. Since, in the survey referred to, the residents of Brampton Bryan opted by 44 per cent to 16 per cent, to support a settlement boundary, the best way to achieve consistency is to have a settlement or development boundary for both villages. This offers the best prospect of a policy capable of surviving proper scrutiny and the testing period before the first five-year review.	Change made

			<b>It is accepted that more information is needed to explain why and how settlement boundaries have been defined or not as the case may be.</b>	
	Para 3.2	Suggest change	Sharing the allocation equally between the villages – in effect, an arbitrary allocation – cannot be regarded as a decision based on sustainable criteria (which should respond to local circumstances in a way now fairly well understood by planners). Allocations need to respond to the conditions pertaining in each settlement, as the plan acknowledges (quite properly) elsewhere. Reasoned justifications for the extent of the allocation need to be made. <b>The plan has to respond to available and suitable sites, which are limited. It is proposed to respond to comments received as the NDP has evolved by changing the balance between settlements.</b>	Change made
	Policy BG4	Comment and question	I understand and appreciate the policy aims, but suspect that without some elaboration and a deeper evidence base this will not survive inspection (see my para 7.2 comments below for what I hope is a helpful approach). The emphasis on the village’s historic character (Brampton Bryan is*not* in a conservation area) contrasts with the more liberal approach to development in Lingen (which*is* in a conservation area). How can this be explained,	No change required in relation to this representation

<b>Respondent Identification Number</b>	<b>Section/ Policy Number</b>	<b>Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.</b>	<b>Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)</b>	<b>Propose Change or Not</b>
			because in planning terms it is Lingen, not BB, that has the enhanced character status? As with para 2.14 consistency in reasoning as between the villages is desirable (essential). One explanation – with the advantage of being true - is that the dominant landlord does not wish to develop and will not make sites available, and this ought to be relevant and recorded as part of the plan’s rationale. (again, see my comment on para 7.2). I suggest amending BG4 – or the supporting paragraphs – to make this point about the dominant landlord. <b>Although Brampton Bryan is not a Conservation Area there is no doubting its qualities are such that in other circumstances it would be designated such. It is understood that the former Leominster District Council included it in a review of conservation areas but decided to place its efforts into designating other settlements, because there were no pressures for development within it. That review took this approach for a number of settlements. Para 3.8 refers to the lack of pressure for development in the Brampton Bryan. There is a specific policy for Lingen’s Conservation area in the Plan.</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policy BG5	Suggest change	<p>Again, consistency with Brampton Bryan is desirable – and it is unclear why Brampton Bryan’s historic fabric should be specially signalled when it is *not* a conservation area, but Lingen’s should go unmentioned as the fundamental starting point of the policy context, when it *is* a conservation area. It suggests Lingen is to see housing development, regardless of its conservation area status, to compensate for the relative lack of development opportunities elsewhere in the Border group parishes, which would be to allocate additional sites to Lingen to compensate for landlord reluctance, or site unavailability elsewhere. That, too, would be vulnerable to challenge because it would respond to *other areas* development constraints, and not to Lingen’s very different circumstances, as per Meeting Housing Needs. The contradictory approach is perverse and calls the plan’s rationale into account in ways an inspector is sure (rightly) to question. Therefore, amend to reflect the same language as BG4, so that the policy opens:</p> <p>“Housing needs within Lingen over the period 2011–2031 should be provided in ways that retain the intrinsic and exceptional architectural and historic character of the village and will be accommodated within the development boundaries defined upon Lingen Village Map and in accordance with the following criteria:”</p> <p>Further comments on BG5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 2.7 very usefully identifies a series of (extremely popular – judging by survey results) design criteria which it is reasonable to apply in a conservation area (even if their applicability might be questioned elsewhere). BG18 is good – see comments below – but maybe amend BG5 to include a new sub-section: “Development will not be permitted that will overwhelm the existing character of the built environment by introducing a preponderance of one type of building style or material.” Maybe adapt BG6 to include this point?</li> <li>2. Para 2.7 indicates popular support for protecting views which form such an important part of the</li> </ol>	<p>Change made reflecting point 4.</p> <p>No other changes required in relation to this representation</p>

			<p>isolated village setting (especially in Lingen where landscape and village so conspicuously interpenetrate). The BGNP Habits Assessment remarks (Appendix 2, page 3 of 9) that “Any development site or criteria policy for Lingen will need to reflect the historic heritage aspects of the settlement. This could also have an impact on the wider landscape and quality of the surroundings within the area,” and adds “Additional criteria safeguards could be positively addressed within the accompanying policy wording.” This opportunity should be taken to expand clause (d) which simply refers to “setting” – see comments on BG16 and BG18.</p> <p>3. The Habits Assessment (appendix 2, page 6 of 9) notes of Lingen: “Criteria may be required with regards to development proposals within Lingen to ensure that water quality issues are taken account of.” There already concerns about the consequence for Lingen Brook of existing development – I have no personal knowledge, but others claim to have. The upper Lugg – designated a European Special Area of Conservation (SAC) due to the rare species - is already seeing rapid growth of phosphate levels beyond that set by relevant agencies (up to seven times that indicated by the Environment Agency). This evidence should be cited and the plan should be amended to include a new sub-section to ensure water quality is not endangered by new development: this is a technical area, so I hesitate to offer amended wording, but I am happy to help research and help draft appropriate wording, if that would help the steering committee?</p> <p>4. Clause (a) says that “With the exception of the area covered by Policy BG6” various criteria applied. I wonder if might be wiser (and more useful?) to say that “with the exception of any development of five houses or more covered by Policy BG6.” This would allow for meaningful guidance on what, if they happen, would be large developments in the context of a very small settlement protected by a conservation area, such as Lingen. Policy BG6 could therefore be extended to *any development of five houses or more* – because we have no way of knowing what would happen on other potentially large development sites like The Turn, for which the NDP ought to make sensible provision (as it does for the Nursery).</p>	
			<p><b>There is a specific policy for Lingen’s Conservation area in the Plan (BG18) so it is not ‘unmentioned. It is explicitly referred to in BG5(d). Designation of a conservation area does not mean that development should not take place within it. It requires such development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</b></p> <p>(1) – This suggestion is not positively worded as required by the NPPF</p> <p>(2) – Setting is referred to in policy BG18(3)</p> <p>(3) – This matter is covered in paragraph 5.6 by reference to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policy SD4 which is very comprehensive and need not be duplicated in this NDP.</p> <p>(4) – There will need to be a change in the light of changes to extend the site at the Turn</p>	
Para 3.11	Support	Strongly support, and I should not like it to fall through lack of a supporting evidence base. Point 2, above, might be	No change required	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>mobilised here to improve the evidence base: a landscape character assessment/ landscape and visual impact assessment, either formally, or through those with strong professional backgrounds in landscape and buildings? Please note that another Herefordshire parishes attempt to establish a distinction between green spaces and development spaces fell through lack of evidence.</p> <p><b>There is specific reference in the paragraph which refers to the areas importance within the Conservation area and to Policy BG18. It is uncertain what further evidence might be provided. The exclusion of the area from within any settlement/development boundary adds to the protection.</b></p>	in relation to this representation
	Para 3.12	Support and comment	<p>As above, para 3.11. Strongly support but the evidence base perhaps needs strengthening. Assertion isn't enough, probably.</p> <p><b>The plan should be read in its totality and other policies and supporting statements later in the plan, especially policy BG18, provide further evidence and information.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG9	Support and comment	<p>Support, but it feels a bit cut-and-paste, as if this does not respond specifically to the built (and landscape) environment of our villages, but to good design more generally. Identification of what we take to be the "locally distinctive features" would make this more robust: for instance, building heights are generally low, with a low roof line, even in two storey properties; rooves are generally of slate; properties are invariably equipped with chimneys or suitable flues; predominance of painted or plastered facades; fenestration occupying a relatively small proportion of façade area; no doubt there are others?</p> <p><b>The policy is to apply across the Group Parish. Greater detail for Lingen Conservation Area covers many of the aspects referred to.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG16	Suggest change	<p>Unless I've missed it, neither in BG16 (b) nor elsewhere does the plan say what important views entering and leaving the Lingen conservation area it intends to protect, and without this the landscape character protection is extremely vulnerable. For instance, it is characteristic of Lingen – see the Pevsner guide to Herefordshire, which can be cited as evidence? – that the wooded hillsides project down into the village and can be seen from the main village street, and therefore a consistent view of Lingen Vallet Wood and Oldcastle Wood from the main street, are important; should we not identify that as a protected view? The clarity of the southern approach is determined also by the visibility the two woods and Harley's Mountain, and their close penetration of the village. Likewise, views from the church of Lingen Vallet Wood. I don't pretend to know how best to express this or to accomplish it in planning terms, but I'm happy to explore if this will help the Steering committee?</p> <p><b>Policy BG18 (3) describes the important views associated with Lingen Conservation Area. These could be made clearer.</b></p>	Changes made



	Policy BG18	Suggest change	Strongly supportive but can we add to point 3: to protect, as a unique defining feature of the Lingen Conservation Area, the wide 90 degree views of the church from the surrounding hill, and the views from the church of the hills.  Can we strengthen point 5 (in the bold text) to emphasise the close proximity of woodland to the village, and the visibility of that woodland within the village (from the main street), as essential to the character of the settlement?	Change made
			<b>Useful suggestion</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Para 7.2	Comment	<p>The plan is insufficiently explicit on the nature of the constraints effecting the delivery of the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The major local landowner, who owns all but a handful of plots in and around Brampton Bryan, and also owns the bulk of two other parishes, does not propose to develop in Brampton Bryan – perhaps the only location in the Border Group parishes that has public transport, an A-road, access to public facilities in both Knighton and Leintwardine which make it suitable for younger families, and is not subject to flooding, nor constrained by a conservation area. You can't say this of anywhere else and yet the plan is unable to allocate new build to Brampton Bryan – due to the landowner's decision.</li> <li>2. Adforton – which is also on an A-road, is also close to public facilities in Leintwardine and Wigmore, and also enjoys a limited public transport connection, is constrained by its topography. The lack of level sites is acute. Again, a village that might suit new build to meet Herefordshire allocations is unavailable for reasons outside the control of the parish council</li> <li>3. Walford – within walking distance of facilities in Leintwardine, on an A-road and with access to public transport, might also make a feasible new build development site. Here flood risk severely constrains options, whilst development beyond a very modest scale risks run-off difficulties.</li> <li>4. Lingen is acknowledged in the plan as the least sustainable development location in North Herefordshire (see Meeting Housing Need paras 4.10-4.12), is constrained by flood risk in the area roughly south of the Royal George, has no public transport, is not on an A-road and is either a six-mile roundtrip by a singletrack road, or an 11-mile round trip by a mostly two-way road, from a pint of milk. It is a conservation area, with special environmental features to the south and linked to the river Lugg (again, see Meeting Housing Need). Whilst there is scope for development on a handful of mostly infill sites, these are limited in capacity.</li> <li>5. Housing need – as identified in the 2011 study – is real. Despite the constraints identified above, the BG NDP manages not only to meet the (quantum) needs identified in the 2011, but the exceed them, indicating a willingness and a determination to meet, with a relatively wide margin, established and demonstrable local need.</li> <li>6. An area as isolated as the Border Group parishes, and as particularly isolated as Lingen is, being without public transport, not on an A-road, no facilities, and no jobs, cannot be regarded as an area for the encouragement of inward migration if sustainable development is to be the objective. The plan already identifies housing for local needs as a priority, and long-distance commuting is undesirable for social as well as environmental reasons and not supported by the Herefordshire Plan. Recent evidence of house sales suggests demand is, in any case, thin as potential inward relocators opt (increasingly) for urban or semi-urban life offering the health, education and leisure facilities – and urban vibe – which has been an increasing feature of popular housing tastes in the last ten years. Retiring to the country is no longer the popular or desired options it once was.</li> </ol>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			The conclusion is that it is almost impossible to deliver the quota of housing allocated under the Herefordshire	
			<p>Plan, and that delivery within the plan boundary is severely constrained and will always remain severely constrained. The 36 dwellings identified in Meeting House Need para 5.2 (Table 2) are – after a canvas of sites, evidence for which will need to be provided, and analysis of the results made available - the extent of deliverable capacity, given these constraints of what can be provided. In these circumstances, it is possible to argue that an additional housing allocation beyond 36 new dwellings can and must be met during the first five-year period by those neighbouring parishes with capacity (Parishes in Shropshire have moved in this direction, I believe). I am happy to research and explore this issue if it helps the Steering committee. Evidence of site canvas and selection, and the criteria used, is vital if this is to survive inspection.</p> <p><b>1 – 4 . The constraints are acknowledged and para 3.2 of the NDP refers to the fact that all four settlements have particular constraints.</b></p> <p><b>5 – The NDP is required to provide for at least the level of proportional growth set out in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>6 – The NDP must plan over the period 2011-2031. The economic cycle will affect demand, which is currently low. The Core Strategy has set a level of growth that has been examined in order to meet Government expectations of needs.</b></p> <p><b>The NDP has put forward sufficient sites to meet the required level of proportional growth. Shropshire Core Strategy and its SAMDev Plan were adopted based on requirements before Government introduced neighbourhood planning. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has been adopted since those measures were brought forward and neighbourhood plans must comply with this in order to meet its Basic Conditions.</b></p>	
	Appendix 1	Support	<p>Generally, very supportive.</p> <p><b>Noted with thanks</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

	General Comment	Comment	<p>The NDP process is complex: one wonders whether the idea of NDPs is feasible for small communities – or perhaps any community. The scope for meaningful public engagement on matters of some complexity is limited – few of us have any planning knowledge, even fewer have the time or capacity to devote to reading and comprehending complex and lengthy documents. – leaving the process in the hands of well-resourced developers or those with a direct personal or financial interest in sites to be developed. Volunteers involved deserve applause and thanks. If I have misunderstood anything, I’m happy to be corrected; if the plan already answers my concerns, I would be delighted to hear it.</p> <p>I recognise that the plan is walking a fine line in attempting to clear the way for appropriate development but recognising the constraints. However, I fear that without detailed site assessments based on rational and clearly stated criteria – assessments of those sites selected, and those rejected which this plan lacks, and are not provided as part of the supporting evidence base – an inspector will judge it harshly.</p> <p>I fear that without an improved evidence base, settlement and development boundaries stand small chance of</p>	Change made
--	-----------------	---------	--	-------------

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>surviving inspection. And without more detail, those landscape, building design, conservation zone and character protections it does offer will turn out to be relatively worthless.</p> <p>In other words, if the plan is to adopt its current balancing strategy, it needs more evidence to survive inspection. The alternatives are to abandon settlement boundaries etc. on the one hand (which I would not support), or to make a more thoroughly evidence-based claim for their significance (which I would support, and have suggested some ways of honestly addressing the constraints).</p> <p><b>A significant number of communities across the County have decided to prepare NDPs and many have progressed to adoption. The level of public engagement has varied but the efforts have generally been in excess of what would have taken place had the communities not prepare an NDP. To date all those that have gone to referendum have been approved. The approach to consultation taken for Border Group NDP has not varied significantly from many others. Many communities have found that they have gained a greater knowledge of the planning system through preparing the plan. Herefordshire Council’s SHLAA process did not reveal any suitable sites and consequently, in order to identify land that could be developed which reflected the community’s aspirations for small sites, the Steering Group approached landowners directly. Despite formal publicity through two Regulation consultations very limited further sites have come forward and these have been considered. Herefordshire Council has recommended further explanation about how settlements boundaries have been defined is provided and it is proposed to do this.</b></p>	
C2.15 J Walker	Para 1.4	Question	<p>Where and when was discounting alternatives decided?</p> <p><b>The options were considered by the Steering Group as part of the process in drafting and considering the plan.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

	Para 1.5	Comment	On a number of points the Draft NDP differs from the Residents' Needs Survey. <b>The residents' survey helped to inform decisions but it was not always possible to meet all the points made, especially if they would conflict with the Basic Conditions requirement. In addition, the tests of deliverable and developable (available, achievable and suitable) in relation to sites were not always consistent with residents' views.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 1.8	Suggest change	Change to: "four of six parishes" <b>Assume para 1.19 - The reference to four relates to those within the Group Parish that have 'named' settlements within them. The two other parishes - Buckton and Coxall and Willey – do not have named settlements. This could be made clearer</b>	
	Para 1.9	Comment	Adforton - no mention of the principal issue is that it sits on a steep hill surrounded by open countryside (other village have the A4110 pass through). Also, Letton Lane (one of the few areas for expansion) is very narrow with little space from pedestrians, parking and passing places. <b>Assume para 1.10 – There is reference to the village's topography and setting.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 1.10	Suggest change	Delete Civil war and Doomsday references and add: "rare example of a Commonwealth Church" and "the landscaped Deer Park" as notable features. <b>Assume para 1.11 - The information about the Civil War and Doomsday Book has been taken from published</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<b>sources. Reference should however be made to the deer park.</b>	
	Para 1.11	Question	What positive influences? <b>Assume para 1.12 - Relative isolation and small local communities can be attractive to some households.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 1.12	Comment	Secondary area is not separate but contiguous just accessed from a different road. <b>Assume refers to para 1.13. There is no reference to the two areas being separate.</b>	
	Para 1.15	Suggest change	Add "employment" to "services and facilities". Without analysis of employment patterns and opportunities hard to envisage sustainable development (it would imply long commutes, which the Herefordshire plan discourages).	

			<b>Assume relates to para 1.16. Although it may be true that employment opportunities are limited the emphasis in this paragraph relates to services and facilities. There may be other features that are also limited – such as housing opportunities – and additions would not serve any purpose. It can only be assumed that the issue of employment (and other) patterns in relation to sustainable development will have been fully considered in determining and examination of the locational strategies that led to the adoption of Herefordshire Local plan Core Strategy.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
Para 1.16	Question	What attendance and feedback was there from the consultations in Dec. 2014? How did this feed into the Plan? Don't understand the last sentence.	<b>Assume this also relates to paragraph 1.17 – see response below.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
Para 1.17	Question	What evidence is there that these consultations supported the general direction? How many responded? How many from landowners or developers? How many from ordinary residents? <b>This paragraph is a summary of early consultation arrangements and a specific Consultation Statement will need to be prepared to explain these in greater detail and what further consultations were undertaken, in particular the two formal consultations at the Regulation 14 stage. The subsequent paragraph represents the opinion of the Steering Group</b>		No change required in relation to this representation
Para 2.2	Question	Why is increasing the supply of houses the number one objective and maintaining the character the fifth? These all seem to be very specifically worded objectives which don't directly relate to the Survey results. <b>Although the objectives have been informed by the residents' questionnaire this is not the only consideration that was considered. The order of objectives does not reflect any level of priority. Any priority would need to be set through policies.</b>		No change required in relation to this representation
Policy BG1d)	Comment	It is not clear that development should not increase danger (resulting from traffic) where safety measures cannot be pursued. <b>Helpful advice</b>		Change made
Policy BG2 e)	Suggest change	Change "broadband" to "communication (broadband, telephone, mobile, etc.)" <b>Helpful advice</b>		Change made
Para 2.5	Suggest change	Change: "proposals are advanced in order to meet the "needs of....". Correct the punctuation in this paragraph. <b>Helpful advice</b>		Change made

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Para 2.6	Comment and question	No mention of the actual housing demand and what housing would be suitable to satisfy it? Where is the evidence base? <b>It is not the intention of this paragraph to present information about housing need or type but to set out the response to the issues stated from the residents' questionnaire.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.8	Question	What is the evidence? <b>The evidence comes from the Parish Plan and residents' questionnaire.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.10	Question	What relevance does this have for neighbourhood planning? <b>This paragraph explains concerns expressed by the community in relation to the infrastructure referred to and adds to the justification for the final bullet point in policy BG1.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.11	Question	What does this mean? <b>This is part of the justification for policy BG1. There may be proposals for development that is not covered in the plan but for which some principles may assist decisions about whether and how such development might take place. It complements Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SS1, adding detail that reflects local concerns.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG2	Suggest change	Add "Border" to "Group Parish" for consistency. <b>A useful suggestion</b>	Change made
	Policy BG2 bullet point 3	Suggest change	Add "(see Policy BG6)" to the end. <b>Examiners would delete such a reference as there is generally no need to cross-refer to policies within a plan. The Plan should be read as a whole.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.13	Question	How is brownfield to be defined in a rural context? Does it include agricultural land, working buildings or agricultural tenancies? How many identified sites are brownfield? <b>It is understood that buildings and surrounding land that are currently in use for agricultural or forestry purposes are excluded from the definition of brownfield land.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 2.14	Question	What protections are there against dense infilling and suburban estate form, such as a Close? How was the decision not to have any boundaries for Brampton Bryan agreed and how does this relate to the survey? Could the title for the webpage referred to in Footnote 3 be stated and is the web address permanent?	No change required in relation to this representation

			The approach to accommodating development in appropriate forms should be included within the relevant planning policies and attempts have been made to do this for all four settlements. The Steering Group agreed to the decision not to define a settlement boundary for Brampton Bryan. It was considered it would serve no purpose as there was only one landowner of any sites within or adjacent to the settlement who was very firm in indicating that there was no intention of developing any sites within the plan period. Consequently, even should a boundary be designated there would be no deliverable new sites. The only site considered likely to come forward was a barn conversion, albeit a significant one. The website is understood to be the Parish Council's website.	
	Para 3.2	Question and comment	Why is it best to share provision equally? This is to adopt an arbitrary criterion, rather than responding to the constraints and opportunities in each settlement, and therefore cannot be judged a sustainable approach to	No change required in relation to this

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			development The approach was pursued by the Steering Group based upon the proportional growth required, an assessment of developable and deliverable sites (available, suitable, achievable), and the fact that all four settlements had constraints in these regards. The identification of the four settlements as sustainable locations for development has been set by Herefordshire Council and accepted by a Government Inspector following an examination. It is felt there are limited opportunities for adopting alternative approaches and although representations have been received about the inability of each settlement to accommodate development, limited alternatives to provide additional sites elsewhere have been identified.	representation.
	Policy BG3b)	Question	Why three bedrooms in Adforton? This was based upon the limited number of dwellings upon the site where a number of properties might be built and the emphasis placed on three bedroomed accommodation within Table 2. However, having reviewed the issue following the representation and given the expected number of dwellings now expected on the site, the reference might be deleted.	Change made
	Policy BG3c)	Suggest change	As density and massing in Adforton is already very high (with little or no space for parking or views out into the countryside) would it be better to suggest new development should be less so to meet modern demand for parking and green space - especially for families? What does "adversely affect the amenity" mean in practical terms? There are areas of higher and lower density in Adforton as there are in many rural settlements. Parking requirements are covered by policy BG13. The reference to adversely affect amenity is one commonly used in planning policies and relates to development that might cause problems through overshadowing/loss of light, dominance, loss of privacy, undue noise, dust and other pollution. The extent to which potential problems may arise is usually dependent upon the separation distance, height, depth, mass and location of an extension and	Change made



			<p>window positions. Normally the effect has to be significant and it might be more appropriate to refer to residential amenity.</p>	
	Policy BG3d)	Suggest change	<p>Add: "work-live units"</p> <p><b>It is not certain why the suggestion should be to add this reference to criterion d). It might be more appropriate to refer to it in criterion g).</b></p>	Change made
	Policy BG3	Comment	<p>There isn't any protection for the heritage assets of the village including their setting or for green space or incorporating parking into overall design. (see BG5)</p> <p><b>No such assets have been identified that would not be covered by other policies e.g. BG16 and BG17.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 3.5	Question	<p>How do you get a mix of types and tenures by only building certain family homes?</p> <p><b>The paragraph accepts that the opportunity to provide a mix of dwelling types is limited through the defined settlement boundary within this settlement. The mix might otherwise be 2/3 bed family homes.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG5a)	Question	<p>How far is "unreasonably into the plot" - especially where neighbouring building are set back or where they run in different directions?</p> <p><b>This will differ for each site depending upon its location and adjacent properties. The reference does refer to comparison with adjacent premises and it is considered the test of reasonableness/unreasonableness is one that can be used within this planning context</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG5	Question	<p>Why no mention of the number of bedrooms unlike other Policies.</p> <p><b>With the exception of BG6, the sites advocated for Lingen are considered suitable for 1 or 2 dwellings and hence unlikely to accommodate a mix of dwelling types.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG6	Question	<p>Why two and three bedrooms? Should waste disposal be included? We should explore how live-work units could be created on this site.</p> <p><b>The reference is not just to 2/3 bedroomed properties but a mix, although with an emphasis upon 2/3 bedrooms to reflect the information set out in Table 2. The issue of waste disposal will be covered by Herefordshire Council within a separate Development Plan Document. However, if the response relates to ensuring provision for waste receptacles there is reference to the need for recycling storage in policy BG9. Reference might usefully be made to dwellings providing space for live/work and working from home provided that this does not affect residential amenity. It is suggested that the best place to refer to this is within Appendix 1</b></p>	Change made
	Para 3.11	Suggest change	<p>Delete ", as does Adforton,". Lingen is completely split by the Castle, Church and fields to Lingen Vallet Wood.</p> <p><b>Suggestion is helpful</b></p>	Change made


Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Para 3.11	Suggest change	<p>Change to: 'Lingen is the most remote of the Group Parish's villages. Only minor roads provide access to the village and these are particularly narrow. Much of the village is designated a conservation area characterised by small scale development which does not extend in depth away from the road frontage. It contains no modern suburban housing estate. A Scheduled Ancient Monument is located at its northern end. Its eastern edge comprises land at risk of flooding. To the south of the village land is shown as a Special Wildlife Site. The brook flowing through the village is similarly designated and this flows into the River Lugg which is an SSSI and later a Special Area of Conservation. There is no public sewer or sewage treatment works and consequently there remains concern that a precautionary approach should be taken to the level of any development in the village in order to protect the water environment and contribute towards the River Wye Nutrient Management Plan. The village is considered the least sustainable location for further housing of any settlement in north-west Herefordshire for the above reasons although would support some limited development that serves local needs, retains or enhances the conservation area and makes a contribution to the wider needs of the Group Parish.</p> <p><b>Appropriate parts of this might be included within para 3.11 and/or para 1.12</b></p>	Changes made
	Para 3.12	Suggest change	<p>Add protection to the small paddocks and parcels of land which allow villagers to earn income from smallholding close to their houses. This should be part of home working as many residents already do. It would also allow people to keep horses for leisure.</p> <p><b>An appropriate reference might be made</b></p>	Changes made
	Policy BG8	Question	<p>Where is this likely to happen? Do we need any further protections to make sure this housing does no undermine provisions elsewhere? Could we have large developments in open countryside or just outside village boundaries?</p>	Change made
			<p><b>The level of affordable housing provision would need to match 'need' identified by an appropriate up-to-date survey and in association with the Parish Council, this being the first criterion. No specific locations have been identified, although the policy gives a general indication – criterion ii). Currently it remains uncertain whether any such housing will come forward within the plan-period and if it does it is unlikely to affect provision elsewhere as the level of proportional growth is considered a minimum. It is noted that the old table references are indicated and should be amended.</b></p>	
	Policy BG11	Question	<p>Do we need make sure that other technologies which are as important as Broadband is now are included in development up to 2031?</p> <p><b>The reference is to broadband infrastructure in general and it is suggested that this ought to cover changes in such to take into account new technologies. Helpful suggestions about what further issues need to be addressed that might not be covered by the current wording were identified.</b></p>	Change made
	Policy BG12	Question	<p>What about solar farms which may have similar adverse effect as wind?</p>	Change made

			<b>All renewable energy proposals must comply with the proposed policy requirements. The reference to wind-energy relates to specific provisions set out in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SD2. However, previous attempts to insert a policy as proposed have been rejected at Examination and therefore a revision to better reflect that in the Core Strategy is suggested.</b>	
	Para 7.6	Comment	Any review should require BGPC to proactively consult with the community including the villages affected and insure the maximum amount of participation.  <b>The preparation of an NDP, including any review would need to comply, at a minimum, with the consultation requirements set out in the Regulations. Arrangements can go beyond this and is a matter to set out at the time of any review and it is suggested not at this time.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.16 D Driver	Policy BG18(4)	Comment	Lingen's strength is its architectural variety. It has virtually every style from 1400's to 1960's council houses. With the exception of conversions and the Old Nursery house we have no new architecture. Development has either been retrogressive timber frame or country pastiche. New development should embrace new technology and design to produce architecturally interesting and energy efficient homes. This can be delivered at affordable price points with careful planning and design. Existing materials are incredibly varied within the villages and new development should reflect this. It should also be noted that Lingen has only had 13 new homes created in the last 35 years so if we take on a quarter of the proposed 44 - 11 more in five years will be more than enough.  <b>The policy does not rule out modern design and specifically suggests it may be accommodated where this can be achieved sympathetically. The previous level of development reflected planning policy over that period and this has now changed through the adoption of Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Highway safety	Comment	Another major concern that is mentioned in the plan but contravened by some of the proposed sites in Lingen is that of road safety. The site on the corner opposite The Court House is blind to traffic and extremely dangerous. This would also apply to any consideration of a site near the Old Post Office.  <b>It is felt that a suitable access might be possible to this site, although if this is not the case then it would fail to</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>meet the provisions of Policy BG5 f). One of the reasons for identifying growth in excess of the minimum proportional requirement is to take into account the possibility that some of the small sites might not meet the criteria set out in the respective policies.</b>	
	General comment	Comment	Blocks of development should perhaps be limited to 6 dwellings to avoid mini estates. As Lingen is described as "one of the least appropriate villages for development" in the plan, any development proposal should be given great scrutiny.  <b>The approach adopted was to try to bring forward small sites, but it does depend upon those that are available. Currently the NDP includes small sites although if it is not possible to show that there is reasonable certainty in bringing these forward, further, potentially larger sites may have to be considered.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.17 B Sheppard	Page 17	Question and comment	<p>I don't understand where the target of 44 comes from. The target 2011-2031 is set at 36 dwellings. The paragraph 3.1 then goes on to say that once the rural windfall has been taken into account this leaves 28 dwellings. The point is that it is not very clear just how many houses need to be built. I would also point out that from what we have seen in Lingen over the last few years, houses have not exactly been selling fast. I would question what is the level of demand to live in this village? There could be a very real risk of building something that no-one wants, and we are left with an expensive (financially, environmentally and socially) white elephant.</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Council has advised that the level of proportional growth is a minimum. The NPPF requires that the NDP plans 'positively for growth'. Herefordshire Council requires a high degree of certainty in terms of delivering this growth. The approach taken, which aims to reflect the character of the Group Parish's settlements is for small scale and individual developments to take place. This carries a higher degree of uncertainty and consequently a small over-provision is considered necessary to indicate that there is a stronger likelihood of the target being achieved. If it is not possible to show that there is reasonable certainty in bringing these forward, further, potentially larger sites may have to be considered.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG6	Comment	<p>No mention is made here of environmental protection other than noting the flood risk. What about sewerage and the risk of getting into the local watercourse? The rivers here are in the Wye catchment and the water table is close to the surface, so ground water contamination is a real threat.</p> <p>Care should be taken to ensure that there is no detriment to local flora and fauna including amphibians, reptiles, mammals (inc. otters) or plant life and that steps are taken to ensure their protection.</p> <p>The local geology also demands that care should be taken when excavating any Silurian fossil deposits.</p> <p>Any development here must be of a sustainable nature, however it is difficult to see how what is proposed – ie several dwellings, is sustainable.</p> <p><b>The plan should be read in its entirety and other policies within this and Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy that cover such matters will be relevant</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation)
General comment		Comment and question	Reading through "Regulation Draft Plan v2 September 2016" in general I agree with what it says. As a whole, it seems to be a reasonable and sensitive plan – <u>if that is stuck too</u> . However there seems to be no specifics on pace	No change required in relation to this

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>of development other than for Brampton Bryan where it suggests that “potential for some 8 dwellings in Brampton Bryan.....although this is anticipated to be towards the end of the plan period”. If this is relating to barn conversions, why the need to wait for 15 years? As noted below a conversion is surely a preferred option anyway.</p> <p>This plan is until 2031, with a review in 5 years. I don’t understand how the target of house building has been arrived at in the first place, but with no sign of any demand for housing of the size and type proposed to build – there remains unsold examples in Lingen – why not wait until review or until there is demonstrable demand?</p> <p>People generally do not want to move to areas which are inconvenient, lacking in local jobs and services. Somewhere like Lingen is essentially quite remote – no shops, no services, no mains drainage. People need to be self reliant. Lingen is off the beaten track surrounded by roads that regularly flood – a 4x4 is all but essential. Any flooding in Walford or Brampton Bryan for example also cuts off Lingen along that route. Lingen is five miles from the nearest shop, and even further from the nearest Station or public transport and further again from the nearest emergency care – a 50 minute drive to Hereford with a sick/injured child is no fun I can tell you, which is why my wife completed an emergency paediatric first aid course. It makes more sense to build where there is demand and less local resistance. Nine extra dwellings in Leominster for example would barely register, but in any of these villages will make a huge difference. In Lingen it will put a huge and irreparable burden on the community and the environment.</p> <p>I would re-iterate the point I have made above – i.e. Lingen is singled out as the Village LEAST suitable for development due to lack of services (mentioned above), infrastructure (main roads, transport etc), environmental concerns (Lingen is on a very sensitive watercourse catchment area – the only village under consideration that is mentioned as such, with diverse and sensitive flora and fauna as well as being home to some fine Silurian fossil deposits), small size and having a conservation area. The conservation area must be respected as it is fundamental to the character and form of the village.</p> <p>As far as the village character goes – Lingen is fairly linear village – any development should be in keeping both in house form and style – i.e. BG5 and BG18 in the regulation draft plan v2.</p> <p>Looking purely objectively, and assuming a target of 7 houses per village is eventually agreed upon (based on the 28 figure) it should also be agreed that each village builds at the same rate to prevent any one village being disproportionately developed, thus evolves more naturally. This will also guard to some extent against any future changes in legislation. This would amount to about 1 dwelling per village per 24 months – a rate that should be adhered to, and one that I believe will not be overall detrimental, going some way of preserving the character of these villages.</p> <p>A slow steady approach is the only sensible, sustainable and fair way to achieve what has been thrust upon us. Additionally preference should also <u>always</u> be given to conversion of existing buildings over breaking new ground. Such reuse is clearly more sustainable, having a far reduced impact on the environment as well as the look, feel and dynamic of the villages in question.</p>	representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>There is no reason to phase development because of utility or other constraints. The reference to the barn conversion at Brampton Bryan is an indication of the landowner's intension. It could come forward earlier if this view changes. The level of proportional growth is set through Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policies RA1 and RA2. The NDP would not meet the Basic Conditions for a neighbourhood plan if it fails to include proposals to meet this level of growth. The level of growth now required is greater than that originally indicated as a consequence of changes made following the Examination of the plan by a Planning Inspector.</p>	
	HRA. Appendix2 pg4/5 opt 15/16/17	Comment	<p>Lingen is singled out as the Village LEAST suitable for development due to lack of services, infrastructure (main roads), environmental concerns, small size and having a conservation area. Why in that case do ALL the development options include Lingen? Where is the logic in that? Anyone looking at this objectively would see that to be the case. Clearly the only sensible, sustainable option is divide the development proportionately between the settlements.</p> <p>All the named settlements have constraints of one sort or another and Lingen has some services that others do not. Herefordshire Council has indicated Lingen is a location suitable for housing development. The approach advanced does seek to spread development around the four named settlements although it also depends upon the availability of sites.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	HRA. Appendix2 pg3/4 opt 10/11/13	Comment	<p>European sites potentially affected – as it is stated that these villages do not fall within Lugg or Clun catchment areas, development will NOT affect the Clun or Wye SAC, unlike Lingen which will. This must be changed.</p> <p>Lingen, like many settlements falls within the Wye catchment and it has not been shown that these other settlements will adversely affect the SAC provided appropriate safeguards are in place. Lingen is able to receive new housing without adversely affecting the River Wye SAC with the appropriate safeguards.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation

<p>C2.18 G Clark Planning Consultant, Berry's on behalf of client</p>	<p>Para 3.7</p>	<p>Suggest change</p>	<p><b>This paragraph refers to land at the western end of Adforton which client would propose for housing within the NDP</b></p> 	<p>Change made</p>
			<p>Currently this site contains a redundant rural building that sits outside of the proposed settlement boundary. However, paragraph 3.7 of the NDP makes reference to its potential although it would require some extension to enable it to be used as a dwelling. Sites of this size would not normally be allocated for housing but come forward through compliance one or more policies such as RA3 or within a settlement boundary. An extension to the current settlement boundary would to include land between the site and the current end of the village would add certainty. This would be a logical extension provided although currently the lane is narrow at this point and making it wider would result in the loss of part of the hedgerow.</p>	
<p>C2.19 C Moore</p>	<p>Housing general</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The overall housing figure for the parish itself is excessive</p> <p><b>The require minimum level of proportional housing growth is set by Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy and the NDP must comply with this in order to meet basic conditions.</b></p>	<p>No change required in relation to this representation</p>
	<p>Housing in Lingen</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Whilst every village has to grow through its quantity of houses, it seems excessive that Lingen is taking the majority of the allocation, especially as the plan itself states: Lingen is the <i>only village</i> to not be on a main road, the <i>only village</i> to have a <i>Designated Conservation Area</i> to its centre and compared with other villages is relatively <i>inaccessible</i>.</p> <p><b>It is not proposed that Lingen will take the majority of housing. The approach is based upon spreading development around the four named settlements. The availability of land for housing will lead to variations from this. Each settlement within the Group Parish has constraints of one sort or another.</b></p>	<p>No change required in relation to this representation</p>

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policy BG6	Comment	<p>The plot called in the plan 'The Nursery Site' which is within the <i>Lingen Designated Village Conservation Area</i> gives the greatest concern with the quantity of houses it is mooted to accommodate. This proposed housing development is earmarked for eight (<i>not</i> including the house already in situ) medium family houses of up to three bedrooms and whilst instantly unbalancing the overall population here in Lingen, this intense building on the nursery site would also be totally out of keeping with the village. At the same time its effects would immediately have grave consequences for those living adjacent to the proposed site plus it would seriously affect the outlook of the adjacent properties. Such proposed excessive building as this would also negate the development plans criteria for building, as the plan itself states: dwellings should complement the character of the village, especially being in scale with the general density of existing properties in the vicinity; and that: development important views, vistas and panoramas, in particular into and out of the <i>Lingen Conservation Area</i>.</p> <p><b>Although the site might take between 6 and 8 dwellings, the indicative level of growth suggested for the purposes of contributing to the proportional growth requirement is 5. The number of houses is considered less important than the design in terms of complying with relevant policies set out in the NDP, in particular that relating to the need to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. Some 8 dwellings on 0.46 hectares (1.15 acres) is a relatively low density.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Housing proposals generally	Support	I support and very much welcome the plans proposed outline of small building plots dispersed throughout Lingen village which will keep the feeling of space and is much more in keeping with its character therefore having the overall effect of enhancing the village's appearance. These plots will also have the advantage of giving smaller scale much needed housing for future parishioners and their families whilst hopefully, supplying new members of the community whom would take an active part in its Chapel, Church, Village Hall and in village life itself.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Note with thanks</b>	
	Housing proposals Lingen	Comment	<p>Lingen is a very small village full of character which has naturally transpired over hundreds of years along with its views and vistas and I sincerely hope the plan executes its statements of preserving those qualities at all costs, not only for those whom are already residents but also for those that wish to come to Lingen and call it "home".</p> <p><b>Comment noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation



Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.20 T and C Dixon C2.21 V and J Richards C2.22 C and P Brady C2.23 C and D Fraser C2.24 L Clothier and P Eades C2.25 J Maxwell C2.26 A and A Grimley C2.27 A and C Gloag C2.28 K Kennedy C2.29 S Vernon C2.30 D and H Hodgkinson C2.31 R J Price	Policy BG7	Objection	<p>Walford was correctly identified in the preamble to the plan as a hamlet, with no anticipated potential for further house building, particularly given its propensity to extensive and regular flooding. At some later stage in the process, Walford was 're-defined' as a village (which patently it is not, as it has no parish church- there is nowhere even to display the draft plan) and it was 'identified' as having development potential for housing. To support this contention, a completely arbitrary 'settlement boundary' was devised, which outlines the existing houses, except along the Lingen road, where it bears no relation to any physical characteristics in the vicinity. Specifically, there is no justification for placing the boundary to the west of the Lingen Road. No attempt was made to advise the Walford residents of these draconian changes to the plan, for reasons which remain unclear, so the suggestion in the text that the plan is based on consultation with local residents is, in the case of Walford, wholly incorrect.</p> <p><b>It is agreed that Walford is not a village and that the correct term for the purposes of the NDP should be 'settlement'. Herefordshire Council has determined it is a location for development within Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy and this has been approved by a Planning Inspector. It is not a matter that can be revisited through this NDP. Walford has not previously had a settlement boundary and consequently there was no starting point from which to consider any extensions. The boundary proposed was based upon the existing built form and land that was adjacent to this that was available for development. The options were limited, especially given large areas of the existing settlement and its surroundings are at risk of flooding. However, land that represents an acceptable extension has been identified in the NDP. This differs from that previously identified and is in a location where less impact will be had on the settlement. Significant efforts were made to ensure that residents of Walford were consulted when the NDP went through its Regulation 14 consultation for a second time.</b></p>	Change made
	Policy BG7	Comment	<p>As presently configured, the plan envisages a scheme of eight houses to the west of Lingen Road, and two to the east, a total of ten units <i>plus</i> any infill sites available. This represents twenty-five per cent plus of the entire housing requirement for Border Group, which is clearly grossly disproportionate given that Walford (having only twenty one dwellings) is half the size or less of the any of the three actual villages of Lingen, Brampton Bryan, and Adforton (which average over forty).</p> <p><b>Although Walford is smaller than the other three settlements, the number of properties in the parish of Walford Letton and Newton is roughly similar and not the smallest. The level of proportional growth is based upon the number of properties within the parishes having 'named settlements' within the Core Strategy not the number in each settlement, as was previously the case.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.32				

<p>S Wynne C2.33 A P Davies C2.34 M J Abbott C2.35 S and D Jones</p>	<p>Policy BG7</p>	<p>Objection</p>	<p>These proposals fail to achieve any of the stated principles of the Neighbourhood Plan, and represent exactly the type of inappropriate isolated discordant housing development which Neighbourhood Plans are supposed to prevent.</p> <p>a) Planning- the main site is isolated and on a ridge line surrounded by open agricultural land. It would therefore be visually intrusive in a landscape of significant natural beauty. It would be skylined on the approaches to Walford, particularly from the east, south, south west, and west, thus presenting a significant blot on the landscape, and one which is wholly unsympathetic to its locality. The density of the scheme, representing a fifty per cent increase in the number of dwellings in Walford, is grossly disproportionate. The scheme fails to comply with any of the five stated criteria of the Plan, being to: - provide accommodation for the elderly and young families (now accepted as non-deliverable); encourage industrial development; increase road safety; increase access to health and education facilities; and be sympathetic to the character of the local landscape. Indeed, it actively militates against them.</p> <p>b) Environment- Unlike Brampton Bryan Adforton or Lingen, Walford has no facilities whatsoever; no church, pub, shop, or hall; there is virtually no bus service. Whilst market demand for housing is not necessarily a planning criterion, a Neighbourhood Plan must seek to satisfy actual demand, not merely be construed to fulfill some arbitrary administrative target. The market evidence shows that there is little or no residential demand in Walford, which is unsurprising given its complete lack of facilities and propensity to flooding. There are currently two long term empty dwellings in the hamlet; two houses still on the market after several months and over a year respectively; and the last two houses to sell were both on the market for over three years before a purchaser could be found.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> The Plan acknowledges that almost the whole of Walford lies within Environment Agency flood risk zones 2 and 3; and flooding on both the A4113 road junctions is sufficiently severe to close the roads regularly, as it does in the Lingen direction at Stoneybridge. Thus, while the location of development on the ridgeline may avoid direct flooding, the area will be completely cut off from time to time. More seriously, such development will generate substantial hard surfacing which will significantly exacerbate the existing run off into the adjoining areas. This is particularly severe in the adjacent lane on the eastern side of the Lingen road, where some properties already have to run continuous pumps during even moderate rainfall. A recent High Court decision found a planning authority liable in damages for collateral flooding resulting from permitted development in a known flood risk area, and the Environment Agency has issued a severe caution on proposing or granting planning permission in these circumstances. Indeed, it seems to us bizarre and erroneous to seek to encourage any development in the worst location for flooding in the whole of the Border Group parish.</p> <p><u>Highways</u> Although the Lingen road is unclassified, it already carries significant volumes of both agricultural traffic and commercial vehicles cutting through to Presteigne from the A49 at Bromfield. At the Walford end, the carriageway</p>	<p>No change required in relation to this representation.</p>
--	-------------------	------------------	---	---

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>is too narrow for two large vehicles to pass each other, and there are no pavements for pedestrians either here or on the main road; nor any opportunity to create them due to existing hedge lines and the proximity of existing houses to the roads. The river bridge immediately on the A4113/Lingen road junction is single lane only, and already presents a dangerous conflict between vehicles turning off the A4113 and those approaching from the Lingen direction. The proposed development would significantly exacerbate this danger to an unacceptable degree, due to the number of additional vehicle movements which it would generate (see comments under Parking below).</p> <p><u>Parking and Deliveries</u></p> <p>The current parking standard appears to be two spaces per dwelling, but, as the Roman Close scheme in Leintwardine so painfully demonstrates, this is hopelessly inadequate in a rural area where there is little or no public transport (this situation is even worse in Walford than it is in Leintwardine). In reality, there can be five car owner/users per dwelling, requiring yet more hard covered areas. Traffic volumes are also increased by the number of van deliveries (currently ten to fifteen per day in Walford) generated by the complete lack of any local facilities and the journey of over twenty miles to the nearest main shopping centres (Hereford and Shrewsbury).</p> <p><u>Site Restrictions</u></p> <p>The proposal appears to ignore the fact that the Elan Valley to Birmingham trunk water aqueduct, which supplies up to three hundred and forty-five million litres per day, passes directly through the site. At this point it is at a relatively shallow depth as it prepares to cross the river Teme, so any development of the land above would pose threats of physical disruption and potential contamination. The relevant water authorities do not appear to have been consulted.</p>	
			<p><b>Planning – The area has no landscape designation, many sites proposed for development will be in similar circumstances and the requirement for good quality landscape proposals in association with developments should ensure that the development fits sensitively into the setting of the settlement. The range of factors, including those referred to and others have already been considered by Herefordshire Council and the Planning Inspector in determining Walford is a location for development. The NDP has to meet the Basic Conditions in terms of housing provision the factors referred to would apply across the whole Group Parish. Arguably Walford is better placed than Adforton or Lingen in terms of access to Knighton for many of these important facilities.</b></p> <p><b>Environment - There are constraints that apply to all four settlements that might affect housing market conditions. The provision of limited numbers of dwellings on available and suitable sites across the four settlements addresses the widest possible market in terms of offering a variety of locations.</b></p> <p><b>Highways – These conditions are not untypical and a distinction should be drawn between what might be a level of inconvenience and what is actually a potential highway danger. The latter will be determined by Herefordshire Council Highways Division. Herefordshire Council was consulted upon the draft plan and no relevant comments received. Furthermore, development will need to comply with NDP Policy BG13.</b></p> <p><b>Parking and Deliveries – Again this matter applies to any development wherever it is located. The standards for</b></p>	Change made

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>the provision of parking space for residents and visitors is a matter for Herefordshire Council to determine.</p> <p>Site Restrictions – Severn Trent Water Company has been consulted and provisions agreed to ensure the water trunk main will not be affected by development.</p>	
	Policy BG7	Comment	<p><u>Alternative Sites</u> Given the disabilities which apply to the whole of Walford, the conclusion should be that there is no significant capacity for further residential development in this location, which is certainly the least suitable of any within the Border Group parish (and was so recognised in the original proposals). There are already two proposed infill/conversion sites, at Stoneybridge Farm and Birtley which are not included in the 2016 Housing Needs report. The plan also envisages industrial development of the farm barns in Walford fronting on to the A4113. The rear set of buildings are on raised ground above the flood plain, so these could provide work to live units. Further afield there are much better sites, such as the field opposite the Aardvark scheme in Brampton Bryan which should be considered. Furthermore, the County Core Strategy plan requires only thirty-six dwellings in Borders Group parish, not the forty-four which the draft plan seeks to impose. Thus, the official target would still be achieved without the Walford proposals, which should be deleted in their entirety.</p> <p>It is understood that of the two sites referred to, one has been granted planning permission and the other withdrawn. That granted planning permission is outside of any settlement and would be counted in with the rural windfall allowance. Sites have to be available in order to meet the criteria for them to be considered and the landowners have advised that neither the barn complex nor the site opposite Aardvark books are available. The NPPF requires that the NDP plans 'positively for growth'. Herefordshire Council requires a high degree of certainty in terms of delivering this growth. The approach taken, which aims to reflect the character of the Group Parish's settlements is for small scale and individual developments to take place. This carries a higher degree of uncertainty and consequently a small over-provision is considered necessary to indicate that there is a stronger likelihood of the target being achieved. If it is not possible to show that there is reasonable certainty in bringing these forward, further, potentially larger sites may have to be considered.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG7	Objection	Appendix 1 of the Herefordshire Core Strategy Policy RA2 lists four specific criteria for promoting housing development in rural settlements (see attached document). The Walford proposals in the current draft plan fail in all four categories, and do so fundamentally. They are unacceptable to the residents of Walford (see below) and should be removed from the plan for it to retain any credibility as a competent and acceptable basis for future development within the Border Group Parish	No change required in relation to this representation.

			<p>Not sure what is meant by the reference to Appendix 1 to Policy RA2. This may be the first criterion within that policy referring to the need for development to ‘demonstrate particular attention to the form, layout, character and setting of the site and its location in that settlement and/or they result in development that contributes to or is essential to the social well-being of the settlement concerned’. It is considered these are matters that would be addressed through the design of any schemes on the sites suggested and there are sufficient policies in the NDP to cover this.</p>	
C2.21 V and J Richards (Additional comments)	General	Objection	<p>No demand. (Walford) not a village but a hamlet lacking facilities. Would lead to increased traffic from Lingen Road onto the increasingly busy A4113. Totally unsuitable site.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<p>It is agreed that Walford is not a village and that the correct term for the purposes of the NDP should be ‘settlement’. Herefordshire Council has determined it is a location for development within Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy and this has been approved by a Planning Inspector. It is not a matter that can be revisited through this NDP. The level of traffic that would be generated would not be excessive from the anticipated development and it is considered could be accommodated on the network in this location.</p>	
C2.22 C and P Brady (Additional comments)	Policy BNG7	Objection	<p>The whole of the village is in a flood plain and extremely sensitive to any changes in its environment. The building of new houses would create a significant increase in water run-off which would exacerbate the flooding of the low surrounding area, particularly in the small back lane where the houses of The Grange, The Motte, Walford Court, Fold Cottage are situated. Walford does not have a sewage system and then problems of pollution from then overflow of septic tanks is a significant health hazard. The hamlet does not have any amenities to support further housing development. There are no schools, regular bus service, food shops, community centre, parks, churches, pedestrian pavements for safe walking. It is not a suitable area for development.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation.
			<p>The sites suggested for development do not fall within the area indicated to be at risk of flooding. However, they would need to comply with Policy BG14. This is explicitly referred to in Policy BG7. It includes requiring any development not increasing flooding to other properties elsewhere.</p>	
C2.25 J Maxwell (Additional comments)	Paragraph 2.3, Policy BG1(c)	Comment	<p>The development is bound to detract from ‘features supporting tourism’. Tourists come for peace and countryside</p>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<p>The proposed level of development should not have any significant effect on this activity.</p>	
	Policy BG1 (d)	Objection	<p>The development will increase traffic on the lane to Lingen, which in part is single track, specifically by the bridge at the junction with the A4113.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<p>Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. The highway conditions referred to that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has not been accepted as a reason for restricting development. Herefordshire Council has been consulted upon the NDP and raised no objection to the areas proposed from a highways safety perspective.</p>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policies BG2 and BG7	Objection	Although the new properties will not be at risk of flooding, the risk to the rest of Walford would increase when fields, which now can absorb some water, would be covered with buildings. Some Walford properties have been badly flooded in recent years. All have trouble getting house insurance at reasonable rates.  <b>For sites to receive planning permission for development they will need to show that they comply with Policy BG14 and this includes an assessment of the effects that development might have on other properties should this add to the flooding of other properties then this is likely to be a reason for refusing planning permission.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation.
	Policy BG14	Objection	This clause says that 'No development will be permitted that will result in increased flood risk to properties elsewhere'. The proposed development is clearly at odds with this clause.  <b>For sites to receive planning permission for development they will need to show that they comply with this policy.</b>	
	General	Comment	Throughout the document, except at the beginning, Walford is referred to as a village. A village is defined as a settlement with a parish church, which Walford does not have. The only amenity in Walford is a post box, access to which, for most people, entails a dangerous walk along then A4113  <b>The correct term in relation to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy should be 'settlement';</b>	Change made
C2.27 A Cloag (Additional comments)	Policy BG1	Objection	Define sustainability. Point d) Roads do not meet current needs. Point e) has no meaning.  <b>The term used here is 'sustainable development' and para 2.5 and the related footnote gives the relevant reference.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG2	Comment	Walford said to be a village while in para 1.9 it is a hamlet and a village again in Policy BG7.  <b>The correct term in relation to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy should be 'settlement';</b>	
	Paragraph 2.14	Question	How can 43%-44% constitute 'most residents'. What does 'exceed to a limited extent' mean? Does it exceed or not?  <b>The reference is incorrect as suggested and should be to 'more' residents. On the basis of landowner indications, the sites anticipated as a consequence of the plan would exceed the required level of proportional growth. The reference to limited extent is an indication that this is not by many although the emphasis may be deleted if preferred.</b>	Changes made
Paragraph 3.2	Comment	Line 2 to line 5 is a complicated sentence. Four settlements are called four parishes. Sizes are compared in this paragraph. Walford it would seem is smaller than the other three and yet has a greater number of dwellings in its rural area. So, if the plan goes ahead the Parish of Walford would have even more dwellings than the other three, and yet fewer facilities, a greater flood threat and an inadequate bridge.	No change required in relation to this representation.	

			It is understood that the proportional growth is based upon the number of properties in those parishes with settlements and hence properties within the parishes of Buckton and Coxall and Willey have not been included. The remaining four parishes within the group each have a settlement and therefore in combination the sum of their properties form the basis for the calculation. It is therefore the parishes that are referred to. The number of properties in each parish is as follows: Adforton – 68; Brampton Bryan - 86; Lingen - 82; Walford , Letton and Newton - 79. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. The conditions referred to that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has not been accepted as a reason for restricting development.	
Policy BG3	Comment	There is no mention of ‘safe and convenient access to public roads by cyclists and pedestrians.’ <b>Correct</b>	No change required in relation to this representation	
Policy BG5	Comment	There is no mention of ‘safe and convenient access to public roads by cyclists and pedestrians.’ <b>Correct</b>	No change required in relation to this representation	
Paragraph 3.15	Question and comment	What is meant by ‘Main Road’? The A4113 or the Lingen Road? Neither have a pavement <b>The reference is one relating to design in that dwellings generally face onto the road. The reference to ‘ main’ is immaterial and can be removed if preferred.</b>	Change made	
Policy BG8(ii)	Comment	Note ‘Development within a hamlet’ Is this why Walford is a village? <b>The correct terminology is ‘settlement’ and this will need to be corrected</b>	Change made	
Policy BG13	Comment	Councils are struggling to provide public transport so that is an aspiration. Point c) – increased housing will increase road traffic. <b>The increased levels of traffic generated in the locations suggested are unlikely to be ‘significant’ in highway design/capacity terms.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation	
Paragraph 5.3	Comment	Weasel words <b>Unnecessary to respond</b>	No change required in relation to this representation	
General	Comment	Since the local council is strapped for cash our local roads. Lanes and bridges are poorly maintained and barely adequate for current usage by even larger farm and haulage vehicles. Walford farm lane is badly eroded by rivers of water flowing down it from the Lingen Road. This will increase with extra hard standing, rooves, etc. The recent increase in traffic along this lane has resulted in the junction between it and the Lingen Road becoming badly damaged. With no cash for repair.  Most of the principle objective and guidance targets can be met outside of the Border Group of Parishes by building in Leintwardine where young families can walk to the school, shops and medical centre. Old people can have easier access to the shops and age appropriate clubs for company.	No change required in relation to this representation	

			<p>Herefordshire Council has indicated a minimum level of proportional growth that must be accommodated within the Group Parish. It is understood this cannot be provided outside of the Group Parish even if other areas provide more than their minimum requirement. If the Group Parish Council does not prepare a plan to meet the proportional growth requirement then either or both Herefordshire Council will prepare a plan for this or developers will obtain planning permissions in or adjacent to the named settlements of Adforton, Brampton Bryan, Lingen and Walford where landowners are prepared to release their land. Herefordshire Council has emphasised that strong and compelling reasons would be needed to indicate that the required proportional growth cannot be accommodated.</p>	
	Environmental Report	Comment	<p>Para 1.2 – Only one site is proposed – Lingen.          Para 1.5 – an SEA required          Para 1.10(1) - This might be interpreted as no road development etc. lest the rural character be lost.          Para 1.10(2) – Local crops for energy is unrealistic          Para 1.10(3) – How can an increase in housing numbers achieve any of the aspirations of this paragraph?          Para 1.10(4) – As above          Para 1.13 – Has this plan been adopted yet?          Para 3.5 – Last bullet point. HRA Screening. There is no mains drainage.          Appendix Task B3 policy BG7. This seems to be blank</p> <p><b>The SEA of the NDP was undertaken by Herefordshire Council who found:</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<p><b>'On the whole, it is considered that the revised Border Group NDP is in general conformity with both national planning policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and strategic policies set within the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy). Nor does it propose any growth that would be over and above that prescribed by strategic policies. Therefore no changes to the NDP are recommended as a result of the SEA, however suggestions have been made where additional strengthen could be added to the existing safeguards.'</b></p>	
C2.29 S Vernon (Additional comments)	General	Objection	<p>Particularly concerned about highways with the build-up of traffic at the junction of the A41134/Lingen Road. Vehicles, often heavy in nature sometimes come to aa halt on the A4113 as they wait to exit onto the Lingen Road. This is caused either by the narrow river bridge, or occasionally flooding, or both. Stationary vehicles here are at risk from traffic that is often fast moving in a westerly direction, despite the recently installed 40mph speed restriction. Currently it is dangerous to walk along the A41134 near the junction with the Lingen Road, due to speeding and often heavy traffic and lack of pavements. The proposed development will not make the situation any easier.</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. The highway conditions referred to that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has not been accepted as a reason for restricting development. Herefordshire Council has been consulted upon the NDP and raised no objection to the areas proposed from a highways safety perspective.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation.



Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.34 M J Abbott (Additional comments)	Policy BG7	Objection	<p>Walford has no amenities or pavement except for a small stretch on the A4113. Any development in Walford would increase the impact on the two junctions on the A4113. No children are entitled to a free primary school bus with both Wigmore and Leintwardine being under 3-iles distance. Therefore, school runs would impact on both junctions. Walford has greater number of agricultural vehicles moving through it which increases the danger of these junctions. Recent developments in Leintwardine highlight the lack of sympathy to the local use of materials resulting in more intrusion on the landscape. Uniform developments increase this intrusion.</p> <p><b>Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. The conditions referred to that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has not been accepted as a reason for restricting development.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	General	Comment	<p>I do not object to building houses but understand what is required of a development, how local people would shape that development is paramount.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.36 S A Barnett	Housing	Suggest change	Asks for plot of land which is owned to be taken out of the NDP	Change made
			<b>Plot will not be shown as available within the table showing how the minimum level of proportional growth is to be met</b>	
C2.37 M Morris	Policies BG5 and BG6	Comment	In order to complement the character of Lingen village, the proposals for sympathetic development seem strong.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.38	General/Housing	Support	A good plan in general. 44 houses spread over the Border Group area sounds sustainable to me.	No change required
C Shurmer			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	in relation to this representation
C2.39 A Thomas	Housing	Suggest change	The plan should explain that affordable housing cannot be insisted upon, so that self-build is the only way of achieving affordable housing for local people, and therefore should be a priority in the plan.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>There are four references to self-build within the NDP. Policy BG8 relates to affordable housing and the approach considered most appropriate to the Group parish.</b>	
	Section 6	Suggest change	<p>There should be a distinct policy on noise pollution</p> <p><b>Development that might result in noise pollution is likely to arise from local businesses and it is considered this is covered appropriately through Policy BG10 iii) and referred to specifically in its supporting paragraph.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Whole plan	Support	<p>The policies on flooding, protection of the landscape/ecology/environment, design and the Conservation Area are strong, so it is a good plan.</p> <p><b>Noted with thanks</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.40 H, J and J Thomas	Housing	Suggest change	Self-build should be heavily prioritised as the only way to achieve affordable housing for local people, otherwise the strong community aspiration to provide housing for local people will be frustrated. <b>There are four references to self-build within the NDP. Policy BG8 relates to affordable housing and the approach considered most appropriate to the Group parish.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Whole plan	Support	We support the allocation of the Core Strategy 44 houses roughly equally between the four villages and would oppose any change <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Live/work units	Suggest change	It should be explained that three sites for live/work housing units have been identified in Lingen, on the edge of the Conservation Area, so as to reduce visual and other impacts on the Conservation Area. <b>It would be excellent to see live-work- units in the suggested location although it is also uncertain whether they can be insisted upon.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Section 6	Suggest change	There should be a separate policy on noise pollution, given the strong value placed on tranquillity by the community. <b>Development that might result in noise pollution is likely to arise from local businesses and it is considered this is covered appropriately through Policy BG10 iii) and referred to specifically in its supporting paragraph.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	General	Support and suggest changes	With clear, strong and effective policies on flooding, the environment and Lingen Conservation Area, this is a good plan. A list of spelling, grammar and other corrections was provide. <b>Grateful for pointing out the various spelling, grammar and other minor corrections that might be addressed.</b>	Changes made
C2.41 R Parry	General	Support	We support this plan. Lingen needs more houses <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.42 B D and M H Kitchen	General	Support	The draft NDP appears to be sustainable but I would suggest an emphasis on local family need before builder's development sites. <b>The NDP is not generally able to differentiate between particular needs, with the exception of providing affordable housing. This can only be achieved through allocating a site or sites for 11 or more houses or seeking a site for affordable housing in accordance with Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy H2.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.43 M Bedford	General	Support	A good plan <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C2.44 B Thomas	General	Support	The plan will allow the building of a fair number of houses for people and young people in the local area in an environmentally sustainable way.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.45 M Rowley	Section 6	Support	We are in favour of a policy safeguard against noise pollution	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Development that might result in noise pollution is likely to arise from local businesses and it is considered this is covered appropriately through Policy BG10 iii) and referred to specifically in its supporting paragraph.</b>	
	General	Support	Wholeheartedly in favour of this plan. Local families need provision for housing and within these parameters village character can be preserved and enhanced.	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.46 J Robinson and L Wright	Section 6	Suggest change	We would like there to be a specific policy on noise pollution	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Development that might result in noise pollution is likely to arise from local businesses and it is considered this is covered appropriately through Policy BG10 iii) and referred to specifically in its supporting paragraph.</b>	
C2.47 S Rogers	General	Support	We are both in strong support of this plan.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.48 Mr and Mrs G Rowlands	General	Comment	A good plan	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.49 G Bengree & D Lambert	General	Comment	A sound, fair and balance plan	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	
C2.50 L Singer	Para 2.17	Comment	My preference would be for only sites of up to 34 buildings. I do not believe Lingen nursery site should be allowed to be much bigger than this.	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>The NDP is required to plan' positively' for development. Herefordshire Council emphasises that the proportional growth requirement is a minimum. The NDP has to show that there is a high degree of certainty in being able to deliver at least this number. Furthermore, it is difficult to be precise about the number of dwellings any site might accommodate.</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policy BG18	Suggest change	In addition to that which is stated I believe the avoidance of noise pollution should be considered to retain the tranquil nature of the village.	No change required in relation to this
			<b>Development that might result in noise pollution is likely to arise from local businesses and it is considered this is covered appropriately through Policy BG10 iii) and referred to specifically in its supporting paragraph.</b>	representation
	General	Support	I agree with the general policies on environmental protection, flood prevention and the need to provide greater housing for local families. I also believe buildings should be in keeping with the local vernacular and where possible self-build. <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.51 S King	General	Support	I support the Plan <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.52 Mr and Mrs W A Simpson	General	Support	In agreement with the proposals <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.53 K Jackson	General	Support	I support self-build by local young people. <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.54 D Coleman	Policy BG1(a)	Support	I strongly support the high priority to be given to promoting new homes to meet the needs of local people. <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Paragraph 2.6	Support	Comments in this paragraph all very sensible <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Paragraph 2.13	Comment	New development should be on 'brownfield' where possible. <b>This is a positive aim that should be pursued but depends upon its availability in the appropriate locations.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Paragraph 2.17	Comment	Sites for 3-5 dwellings more sensible, but plots big enough for just one OK <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG1(e)	Comment	Improved broadband very desirable. Mine is really slow. <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policy BG5	Support and comment	All sensible. Sympathetic consideration shall be given to a new dwelling for a family member (e.g. an adult child) on the same plot if it is big enough.  <b>Any new housing would need to be within development boundaries defined for Lingen unless there are exceptional reasons which are defined in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy RA3. Within the development boundaries certain criteria have to be complied with. The planning system does not generally provide exemptions for specific family members.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG6	Support	All sensible	
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	in relation to this representation
	General	Support	Sensitive and sensible proposals <b>Noted with thanks</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.55 S and R George	General	Objection	Agree with Walford residents concerning the proposed building. We have a holding tank within 10 meters of our back door and any extra surface water will counteract our efforts to contain the flood problem over the past 4 years. We have no village hall, no pavement, no bus route and no mains sewerage.	No change required in relation to this representation.
			<b>Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. Any new properties would need to comply with Policy BG14 which addresses flood risk. The other conditions that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has neither been accepted as a reason for restricting development nor been found to affect demand.</b>	
C2.56 Mr and Mrs G Jones	Policy BG1	Objection	Support the objections already submitted by Walford and Lingen residents. New houses need to meet the needs of local people. Properties in Walford have stayed on the market for longer than average, a number of years in some cases, probably due to Walford's flood zone position. Most of the properties in Walford are owned/lived in by outsiders, not locals. Walford has no amenities for either young or old, no bus service or even pavements, no community hall, as we are a hamlet, or even a decent notice board. Any significant properties would have a significant impact on the landscape, particularly from the main road to Knighton looking east. There is very poor infrastructure regarding mobile connectivity and broadband. Accessibility to services would have to be significantly improved.	No change required in relation to this representation.
			<b>Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy has identified Walford as a location for new residential development and this has been accepted by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination. Any new properties would need to comply with Policy BG14 which addresses flood risk. The other conditions that apply to Walford are reflected in many other settlements throughout the County and this has neither been accepted as a reason for restricting development nor been found to affect demand.</b>	

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Representation and response - Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
	Policy BG2	Objection	<p>Although the sites are only just outside the flood zone, the extra run-off and waste water, there being no mains sewerage system, will find its way to the lowest point in Walford where there are Listed Buildings at the high risk of flooding. The water table is consistently high and ground water rises at a frightening rate within just one day of rain. Although some work has been done to the weir there is still a bottle-neck at both bridges. And flood insurance is very expensive if it can be found. This would apply to new properties in the post code area regardless of their relationship to the flood zone. Development would exacerbate the flood issue. There is already a large barn complex on the Knighton Road undergoing some renovation (understand workshops). There are enough workshops in Brampton Bryan and Leintwardine. These barns would best be flats or live/work. They could accommodate 16 flats or 10 live/work plus two cottages to the rear solving the housing issue in Walford. Flood impact is the highest concern.</p> <p><b>Any development within or close to Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 would need to comply with Policy BG14. The</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation.
			<b>Environment Agency has been consulted upon this policy and the whole NDP and its comments can be found under representation S2.5 below. Comments were specifically requested from Herefordshire Council in relation to storm water but none have been received. It is understood the owner of the barn complex at Walford has chosen to convert the barns referred to workshops. This is another suitable use for such buildings that is supported by both the NPPF and Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy.</b>	
	Policy BG12	Comment	<p>Renewable energy should be a priority on any new buildings and this should be extended to other local residents who would benefit from solar panels, ground/air source heating etc. which up to now has been refused, particularly for Listed Buildings which the Council/Government want preserving, but cost too much for people to take on due to many restrictions, often unreasonable.</p> <p><b>This policy is considered appropriate for the location in that there is a need to refer to scale. It would not necessarily restrict measures for individual properties where they can be introduced without conflicting with the criteria listed, all of which are considered appropriate and relevant. A NDP nor any Local Plan can include policies covering decisions in relation to Listed Building Consent.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
C2.57 B Williamson	Whole Plan	Comment	<p>There was nothing wrong with the original plan. Perhaps this proposal will succeed without people who don't even live in Lingen, making objections about houses in Lingen. All the villages in the Border Group should have their fair share of houses. If certain villages object to every proposal for new houses, I assume Herefordshire Council will overrule this decision and give potential developers the green light. Under no circumstances should additional houses be 'off-loaded' to Lingen because other villages have objected to any development.</p> <p><b>The Plan seeks to spread development across the four settlements in the best way possible in order to meet the required level of proportional growth.</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation

## Section 3b.

### Schedules of Representations in response to Revised Draft Plan (Regulation 14 Stage),

April 2017

## Schedule 2: Stakeholder Representations and Response

Stakeholder	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Comment Parish Council Consideration (in blue)	Amendment Number
S2.1 Herefordshire Council (Statutory Consultee)	General	Suggest change	<p>Developments such as hospitals, homes and schools may be considered 'sensitive' and as such consideration should be given to risk from contamination notwithstanding any comments. Please note that the above does not constitute a detailed investigation or desk study to consider risk from contamination. Should any information about the former uses of the proposed development areas be available I would recommend they be submitted for consideration as they may change the comments provided.</p> <p>It should be recognised that contamination is a material planning consideration and is referred to within the NPPF. I would recommend applicants and those involved in the parish plan refer to the pertinent parts of the NPPF and be familiar with the requirements and meanings given when considering risk from contamination during development.</p> <p>These comments are provided on the basis that any other developments would be subject to application through the normal planning process.</p> <p><b>This advice is helpful and appropriate provision will be made in the policy on sustainable design.</b></p>	Change made
	Policy BG1	Comment	<p>In general conformity (with Local Plan)</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG2	Comment	<p>In general conformity (with Local Plan)</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Para 3.1	Recommend change	<p>Figures should be referred to as 'indicative growth' not 'targets' and add 'approximately' to any figures</p> <p><b>This advice is helpful and noted although it is understood that the level of proportional growth is a minimum requirement.</b></p>	Change made

	Policy BG3	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan); Potential opportunities for conversion and new development are identified which it is presumed are available and deliverable and, if delivered, would exceed the housing target. Formally allocating these sites in the policy would provide a greater level of assurance and certainty that sites are deliverable and will come forward for development.  <b>Only sites that are currently available have been counted towards the proportional growth requirement. It is possible to allocate one site within Adforton although the Steering Group is aware of Planning Practice Guidance advice in relation to size of sites for allocations. The remaining available sites would not be close enough to the figure of 5 or</b>	Change made
<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Section/ Policy Number</b>	<b>Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.</b>	<b>Comment Parish Council Consideration (in blue)</b>	<b>Amendment Number</b>
			<b>more dwellings to be considered within any assessment of sites.</b>	
		Suggest change	Amend point e) to read that 'the amenity and privacy of existing and new residential premises should be protected' <b>This is helpful advice although might be accommodated in a different way</b>	Change made
	Policy BG4	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan); Potential opportunities for conversion and new development are identified which it is presumed are available and deliverable and, if delivered, would exceed the housing. Formally allocating these sites in the policy would provide a greater level of assurance and certainty that sites are deliverable and will come forward for development.  <b>Only sites that are currently available have been counted towards the proportional growth requirement. The site in Brampton Bryan is for the conversion of a major range of rural buildings which should be retained and not a site that should be redeveloped. As such it is considered that to make this an allocation would be inappropriate and potentially lead to the loss of important buildings.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
		Suggest change	After i) insert 'new residential premises shall not be adversely affected by adjacent commercial or agricultural activities.' <b>This is helpful advice although might be accommodated in a different way</b>	Change made
	Policy BG5	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan); Potential opportunities for conversion and new development are identified which it is presumed are available and deliverable and, if delivered, would exceed the housing target (? – our emphasis given the above). Formally allocating these sites in the policy would provide a greater level of assurance and certainty that sites are deliverable and will come forward for development.  <b>Only sites that are currently available have been counted towards the proportional growth requirement. It is possible to allocate some sites within Lingen although the Steering Group is aware of Planning Practice Guidance advice in relation to size of sites for allocations. The remaining available sites would not be close enough to the figure of 5 or more dwellings to be considered within any assessment of sites.</b>	Change made
		Suggest change	Insert criterion - 'new residential premises shall not be adversely affected by adjacent commercial or agricultural activities.' <b>This is helpful advice although might be accommodated in a different way</b>	Change made



	Policy BG6	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG7	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan); Potential opportunities for conversion and new development are identified which it is presumed are available and deliverable and, if delivered, would exceed the housing target (? – our emphasis given the above). Formally allocating these sites in the policy would provide a greater level of assurance and certainty that sites are deliverable and will come forward for development. <b>Only sites that are currently available have been counted towards the proportional growth requirement. It is possible to allocate one site within Walford although the Steering Group is aware of Planning Practice Guidance advice in relation to size of sites for allocations. The remaining available sites would not be close enough to the figure of 5 or more dwellings to be considered within any assessment of sites.</b>	Change made
		Suggest change	Insert - 'new residential premises shall not be adversely affected by adjacent commercial or agricultural activities.'	Change made

Stakeholder	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Comment Parish Council Consideration (in blue)	Amendment Number
			<b>This is helpful advice although might be accommodated in a different way</b>	
	Policy BG8	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
		Suggest change	In point 3 note registered providers do not provide funding for self-build projects. <b>This advice is helpful and noted</b>	Change made
	Policy BG9	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG10	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy PG11	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG12	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

	Policy BG13	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG14	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan); Development must also have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Herefordshire (SFRA) 2009. <b>Reference to the SFRA can usefully be included</b>	Change made
	Policy BG15	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG16	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG17	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG18	Comment	In general conformity (with Local Plan) <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Section/ Policy Number</b>	<b>Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.</b>	<b>Comment</b> <b>Parish Council Consideration (in blue)</b>	<b>Amendment Number</b>
	Appendix 2 - Vartious	Comment	There's a section on Sustainable Transport Initiatives (2.1) which refers to active travel routes, then nothing about active travel under section 3. Transport and Highways. Finally, 6 is headed Tourism, Footpaths and Cycle Routes, but talks solely about PROW and footpaths. There seems to be a bit of a disconnect between the three sections which ideally would tie in together. <b>Whether there is 1, 2 or three sections is considered immaterial so long as the issues are covered. The references in the NDP appendix reflect the approach taken in the Parish Plan.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Appendix 2 Para 3.2	Seeks clarification	We would like to ask for clarification of the wording in section 3.2? Maintenance is undertaken in line with the Highways Maintenance Plan. For issues surrounding this we suggest you contact Balfour Beatty Living Places who oversee highway maintenance on behalf of the council. <b>The PC will be happy to liaise with Herefordshire Council's agents, as advised, on this matter should relevant issues arise.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

	Appendix 2 para 6.1	Suggest change	<p>Suggest the following:</p> <p>6.1 Seek a high standard of maintenance and greater promotion of public rights of way footpaths and cycle routes within the group of parishes, developing linked routes associated with Offa's Dyke and Hereford Trail Footpaths, including working with adjacent parishes.</p> <p>Rationale: cycle routes aren't always restricted to PROW and often can necessarily include highway sections as well. There are a few examples on their neighbourhood already, eg. National Byway, Radnor Loop. Should you wish to cater for equestrians we would suggest expanding further to footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes?</p> <p><b>This advice is helpful.</b></p>	Change made
	SEA and HRA	Comment	<p>Please also note any recommendations within the SEA and HRA reports.</p> <p><b>The conclusion within the SEA is:</b></p> <p><b>'On the whole, it is considered that the Border Group NDP is in general conformity with both national planning policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and strategic policies set within the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy). Nor does it propose any growth that would be over and above that prescribed by strategic policies. Therefore, no changes to the NDP are recommended as a result of the SEA, however suggestions have been made where additional strengthening could be added to the existing safeguards.'</b></p> <p><b>Changes are proposed as a consequence of advice from HC and other agencies that would be expected to cover the suggestions to strengthen the plan.</b></p>	No specific change required in relation to this representation
S2.2 Welsh Water Dwr Cymru (Statutory Consultee)	Whole plan	Support	<p>DCWW are supportive of the aims, objectives and policies set out.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Section 3	Comment	<p>We do not envisage any issues in providing a supply of clean water for the circa 44 new housing units proposed up to 2031, other than the potential provision of off-site main laying.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG14	Comment	<p>It is our understanding that any public sewerage that exists within the Group Parish area is within the Sever Trent Water (STW) operational area for public sewerage. As such, we would advise that STW are contacted for comment on the impact of development on their assets. Where no public sewerage exists, alternative foul drainage options will be required in line with the criteria set out under Policy SD4 of the CS.</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p>	No change required in relation to this representation
S2.3 Historic England (Statutory)	Whole Plan	Support	<p>Supportive of the Vision and objectives set out in the Plan and the content of the document, particularly its' emphasis on local distinctiveness including undesignated heritage assets and the maintenance of historic rural character. Overall the plan reads as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the Parish.</p>	No change required in relation to this representation

Consultee)			<b>Noted</b>	
	Policy BG17	Comment	Specific references in Policy to the protection of historic farmsteads and archaeological remains are particularly welcome. <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
S2.4 Natural England (Statutory Consultee)	Policy BG1	Suggest change	We previously advised the policy should be strengthened, with additional criteria that development which would have an adverse impact on European sites will not be permitted and note that specific policy wording has not been altered. Suggest this policy is altered to avoid ambiguity; specifically stating that housing numbers should not exceed those set out in the Local Plan to avoid impacts on designated sites.  <b>The previous response was that although parts of the Group Parish fall within the catchments for the River Wye (SAC) the settlements are somewhat remote from them and consequently this issue, although important at a county scale, is not seen as a local priority. This is not to say that it should not be a material consideration when determining the effects of development on the natural environment. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SD4 combined with this plan's policy BG16 was considered appropriate to address the protection issue with the latter more particularly promoting a positive approach to biodiversity enhancement. Reference was, however, made in para 5.6 to the River Lugg and its relationship with the River Wye SAC.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG9	Support	Support the inclusion of wording requesting the retention of features such as ponds and hedgerows in response to previous representations. <b>Noted</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG14	Suggest change	We previously advised that an additional criterion should be added to the policy that "where non-mains drainage is proposed for example package treatment plant or a septic tank, then these should discharge to a soakaway and that these are sited 30m from any water courses and outside the flood plain". Policy commitment to the use of soakaway (which removes phosphate), where practical, for development with no mains sewerage would help to reduce impacts on river habitats.  <b>The previous response is still considered appropriate which was that the plan makes reference to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policy SD4 being that which covers the issue of foul/waste water disposal more appropriately and</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
			<b>need not be duplicated. It may not be possible to achieve 30 meters' distance in every instance. It is understood details for such drainage is a matter for Building Regulations.</b>	
	Policy BG16	Support	Support the inclusion of your revised policy wording. It would also be appropriate to include a commitment to the creation of habitat, such as community orchards, in keeping with the local landscape character, as part of new development.  <b>Support noted. A change to refer to the creation of habitats can easily be accommodated.</b>	Change made
	Further Issues	Advice	An annex was provided setting out sources of environmental information and some natural environment issues to consider in developing the neighbourhood plan.  <b>The amount of development proposed is small and offers little potential for enabling such measures. Nevertheless, changes were made to the previous draft to take into account earlier advice.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

	HRA Addendum	Comment	The findings of the additional information provided in support of the HRA addendum are noted.	No change required in relation to this representation
			No change required in relation to this representation	

Stakeholder	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Comment Parish Council Consideration (in blue)	Amendment Number
S2.5 Environment Agency (Statutory Consultee)	Policy BG6	Comment	Note that the Nursery Site in Lingen lies adjacent to the Lime Brook (Ordinary Watercourse) and that there is an area of Flood Zone 2/3 associated with this watercourse. However, as the site is proposed to accommodate a maximum of 5 dwellings we would accept that all built development can be located within Flood Zone 1. Any forthcoming planning application will need to be accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which confirms that the development will be safe without increasing flood risk to third parties. The Lime Brook (Lime Bk – Source to Confluence of R Lugg) is currently at ‘good status’. In line with the above we would expect development in the area to have no detrimental impact on the watercourse and, where possible, aid in it maintaining ‘good status’ by 2027.  <b>Noted. The first criterion in the policy specifically refers to the requirement for a flood risk assessment.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
	Policy BG14	Comment	We welcome reference to flood risk in (this policy) in the plan and also in consideration of future development throughout the Parish. As confirmed on the submitted Pro Forma all development will be located within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone. Development of the Nursery site, and all windfall development within the Parish, should adhere to your Policy BG14 along with Policy SD3 of Herefordshire Council’s Core Strategy. It should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of ‘fluvial’ flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with Herefordshire Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).  <b>Sites indicated to meet the proposed housing target are available outside of areas that flood. However, some areas within settlement boundaries do fall within areas identified as Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. Potential sites within these zones have not been counted against the target and will need to comply with this policy. Herefordshire Council, as LLFA, was approached as a consequence of this representation but no comments have been received.</b>	
S2.6 Highways Agency (Statutory Consultee)	Whole Plan	No comments received	NO RESPONSE RECEIVED  <b>No response suggests happy with plan or no adverse comments to make</b>	No change required in relation to this representation
S2.7	Whole plan	No comments	The Town Council thanks you for consulting it. It has no comment to make.	No change required in

Presteigne and Norton Town Council		<b>Noted</b>	relation to this representation
------------------------------------	--	--------------	---------------------------------

Stakeholder	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Comment Parish Council Consideration (in blue)	Amendment Number
S2.8 Network rail	Whole plan	Advice	Refers to requirements in terms of publicity for planning applications within 10 m of railway land; assessing the impact of development on level crossings; requesting the opportunity to comment on planning applications on sites adjoining the railway  <b>Only a small length of railway line passes through the Group Parish and this is not affected by any proposals included within this plan. The line does not fall close to any of its settlements. There is no level crossing within the Group Parish. The procedures relating to planning applications will be undertaken by Herefordshire Council. This NDP does not affect these.</b>	No change required in relation to this representation

**End of Section 3b**

## Section 4. Border Group Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Summary of Representations in response to Further Consultation on Sites at Adforton, Lingen and Walford - July 2017

#### Community Representations and Response

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C3.1 R and T Swainson	Adforton	Objection	<p>Extending the Settlement Boundary on the north side of Letton Lane to include the brownfield site to the west of Adforton is excessive and unwise. The boundary extension could result in extensive development with a significant increase in traffic on a narrow lane which is already dangerous and with poor visibility. The same applies to the adjoining Gullet Lane which is also narrow and in very poor condition. Removing the ancient hedges for access or excavate the bank to a depth of over 3 metres at its eastern end to meet the road level would seriously affect the character of the sunken lane.</p> <p><b>Letton Lane is a single lane road that relies upon a limited number of passing places, many comprising private drives, and any works along its frontage at the point of the boundary extension will change the nature of the lane. However, in relation to the latter point it may be possible to provide an access to the development through a private drive leading off the lane to Lower House Farm. The access onto the A4110 is not ideal. There is a question about whether it is possible to provide the level of certainty required by Herefordshire Council for the extension to count towards the proportional growth necessary within the Group Parish. The decision to include this area may also depend upon whether there are better alternatives.</b></p>	Change proposed
C3.2 J Maxwell	Walford	Objection	<p>There has been serious flooding in Walford, most notably to Fold Cottage, and to other properties to a lesser extent. Although the designated area itself has not flooded, water, which is now absorbed by the fields, would run off built-up sites and exacerbate the problems lower down. Have found it impossible to leave home because of the depth of water at the junction of the A4113 and the Lingen Road. Building will be near to the line of the Birmingham water supply and construction could rupture pipe or contaminate water. Only facility in Walford is a post-box, access via an unpleasant walk along the busy A4113. Bus service. The Lingen Road is narrow, with no pavement, and no room to put one. Car traffic would increase, making walking and cycling even more dangerous than at present.</p> <p><b>The development of this site should be possible with provision to ensure current rates of greenfield flows are not increased. The alignment of the water trunk main is being checked and advice is awaited from Severn Trent Water. It is understood that a site can be defined that need not impinge upon that water main.</b></p>	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria
C3.3 B P Lewis	Lingen	Objection and comment	<p>Revising the settlement boundary surrounding Turn Farm will increase traffic accessing the N – S road through the village at this point. This road has limited sightlines, in particular, the approach to Turn Farm from the Leintwardine direction. Alternative access/egress between Turn Farm and the Wigmore road will be problematical. The development of more dwellings on this site should be limited. Development must take</p>	Cover relevant elements


Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>account of the existing farmhouse and the conversion of the timber barn into a dwelling, maybe allowing for an additional maximum of 2 dwellings, perhaps using the redundant farmyard buildings. The existing hedges and historic landscape structure should be retained to reduce the visual impact of any proposed further development on the village environment. Buildings should be in keeping with the overall nature of the village specifying materials and designs that complement the nearby existing ancient and traditional buildings. Serious consideration should be given to better sited alternatives. For example, the field that lies between Rose and Ivy Cottage and the Nursery and/or perhaps, Birds Meadow. Either of these sites have better access.</p> <p><b>The Turn Farm site is located on the outside of a right-angled bend in the road where it should be possible to provide safe access through a comprehensive scheme involving one access point. A smaller site was presented in the Regulation 14 draft and no observations were received from Herefordshire in relation to vehicular access for that. Turn farm is a Listed Building and hence needs to be retained and its setting preserved or enhanced. Similarly, the older barns form part of its curtilage and comprise part of the site's character. Although outside of the Conservation Area, it is on its boundary and clearly visible from within it. It forms part of its setting. The Herefordshire Historic Farmstead Characterisation Project includes this farm. The removal of the steel framed barns might contribute the enhancement of both the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. The historic form of the farmstead might inform any proposals for further development and hence a heritage assessment and statement should accompany any proposal. These matters can be covered by criteria included in any policy for the site.</b></p>	through policy criteria
C3.4 L Clothier	Walford	Objection	<p>The map provided is not a true representation of the area, nor is it to scale. The loop road shown is a single-track lane with virtually no passing places and is not in the same category as the much larger Lingen Road. Many of the buildings in the hamlet do not feature on your plan at all.</p> <p>Objections include inappropriate extension of the existing hamlet, lack of facilities, non-compliance with the core strategy, proximity to the Birmingham water pipeline, the effect on the existing drainage and flooding issues in the locality, and traffic and road safety issues.</p> <p>Gravely concerned that development proposed, all presumably with multiple bath rooms and domestic appliances discharging water, will only exacerbate an already precarious personal situation relating to Fold Cottage, a Grade 2 listed property situated at the lowest point in Walford and already at significant risk of flooding. The property is the natural collection point for water draining off the surrounding higher ground as well as being liable to flooding from the brook which runs through the land and which acts as a drainage channel for the whole valley. It is impossible to contain or divert the water elsewhere. The only way to manage the situation is to run electric pumps at times of high rainfall to circulate the water and keep it away from the house until the rainfall eases or the water table drops. At such times, we are unable to flush our only WC, have a bath or shower, run the washing machine or anything which involves discharging water into the already flooded system. In addition, our lane floods at both ends, and the run-off water, particularly from the Lingen end, comes down our drive and floods our property giving us even more water to deal with and adding to the problems already mentioned.</p> <p>Other properties have concerns about drainage and ground water levels. I am not confident that a consultant who is not intimately familiar with the situation will realise the severity of the problem. I am aware that systems such as these have been tried elsewhere and have failed to solve the problem.</p> <p><b>The Plan is based upon the current OS map provided by Herefordshire Council's technical support consultants. Access to the site would be expected at the southern end of the 'loop' and close to the Lingen Road, avoiding the need to use Walford Farm Lane. The site is located adjacent to the current built-up area of the settlement in compliance with Core Strategy Policy RA2. The settlement is listed in table 4.15</b></p>	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria



Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			which includes settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate. The level of housing on this site and for the settlement is not excessive in this regard. Walford has been assessed as a potential location for new housing development. The availability of facilities is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy. The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. The level of additional traffic generated by the proposal along the Lingen Road is considered minimal. Examples exist elsewhere of areas in similar locations that have been accepted as suitable for development. The exact location of the trunk water and any safeguarding zone is being ascertained but it is unlikely to restrict the identification of a site suitable for a housing allocation. The inclusion of appropriate criteria to cover relevant matters can be included in any policy for the allocation and it is considered unlikely that these are such as to restrict development in principle, given previous comments from statutory consultees.	
C3.5 I and J Urry	Walford	Objection	<p>The proposal ignores all the objections previously raised to development in this location on objective grounds of planning, environmental, highways, drainage and run-off flooding to adjacent houses issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The proposal is an inappropriate extension of the existing hamlet, which has no infrastructure or facilities</li> <li>2) The proposal does not comply with the Herefordshire Core Strategy Plan, which lists Walford as a secondary location for minor development only, typically not to exceed sites of two to three dwellings (para 4.8.12 and fig.4.15) and then only where appropriate and sympathetic to the locality (which this proposal is not)</li> <li>3) The proposed site sits astride the Birmingham Trunk Water Main</li> <li>4) The development would hard cover a substantial area, severely exacerbating the existing major drainage problems to houses in the adjacent lane. A water balancing tank would not solve this issue.</li> <li>5) Lingen Road carries heavy traffic, is very narrow at this point, and has no pedestrian pavements or the opportunity to install them.</li> <li>6) The proposal would significantly increase the traffic volumes at the Lingen Road/ Knighton Road Junction, which is already dangerous due to the narrow bridge at the turning.</li> </ol> <p>The site is located adjacent to the current built-up area of the settlement in compliance with Core Strategy Policy RA2. The settlement is listed in table 4.15 which includes settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate and there is no reference in the Core Strategy to any size. The level of housing on this site and for the settlement is not excessive in this regard. As such it has been assessed as a potential location for new housing development. The such availability of facilities is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy. The exact location of the trunk water and any safeguarding zone is being ascertained but it is unlikely to restrict the identification of a site suitable for a housing allocation. The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. The level of additional traffic generated by the proposal along the Lingen Road is considered minimal. Examples exist elsewhere of areas in similar locations that have been accepted as suitable for development. The inclusion of appropriate criteria to cover relevant matters can be included in any policy for the allocation and it is considered unlikely that these are such as to restrict development in principle, given previous comments from statutory consultees.</p>	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria
C3.6 C and A Cloag	Walford	Objection	<p>- Poor communications: Mobile and broadband. Public transport</p> <p>- Narrow and twisting roads, no pavements: Vehicles have all increased in size and number making these narrow roads without pavements more hazardous for drivers, cyclists and walkers. Roads have not kept pace with vehicle size or density. The junction of Lingen lane and the A4113 is an increasing hazard as traffic from the A4113 has to stop almost immediately if it faces oncoming vehicles on the very narrow bridge. There are no warning signs advertising the narrowness of the bridge.</p>	Cover relevant elements through

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>- The flood lines: Development is too close to a known flood risk. The lane is being steadily eroded by the impromptu streams that flow down the edges in heavy rain.</p> <p>- Plan is not to scale - Walford Farm Lane is a single-track lane and not the same size as the narrow Lingen Road. The map does not include the route of the Birmingham water pipe, nor land either side of the pipe that has building restrictions.</p> <p>- Two land owners have not been consulted upon the land where development has been proposed.</p> <p>- There are 8 houses on Walford Farm Lane. An additional 5 is stretching the proportionality aspect of any planning concept beyond breaking point.</p> <p>The idea that planning restrictions would include some temporary flood water storage scheme shows that the committee recognise that planning to build there is risky re flooding. However, is not backed up with details of how this would work and where the stored water would be pumped when the flooding subsided. It is quite a distance to a brook, one route goes over the Birmingham water pipe, the other through existing buildings and gardens. There are no mains drains.</p> <p>Plan should not include plots that the committee do not expect anyone to use because of the difficulties.</p> <p>The environment of our small settlement will suffer if, as is likely, there is any increased flooding caused by an increase in dwellings. There seems to be space on the B4530 in Walford.</p> <p><b>The problems of the communication network apply to many areas where development is to be located and that relating to superfast broadband is being addressed. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy identifies Walford has been identified as a potential location for new housing development. The availability of facilities such as public transport is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy and there are many settlements defined for development that have similar conditions. Many parts of the County have a similar road network that has been able to accommodate such levels of growth. The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. The Plan is based upon the current OS map provided by Herefordshire Council's technical support consultants. It is acknowledged that the plan extends incorrectly to cover areas that should not have been shown within the allocation and this can be corrected for the next formal stage of consultation. The level of development and its location close to the Lingen Road will not adversely affect the character of Walford farm Lane. The exact location of the trunk water and any safeguarding zone is being ascertained but it is unlikely to restrict the identification of a site suitable for a housing allocation. The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development and there is no reason to believe it is unlikely to be attractive to a developer. Land along the B4350 adjacent to Walford falls within the area at risk of flooding.</b></p>	policy criteria
C3.7 T S Vernon	Walford	Objection	<p>Conditions in Walford for growing rice are almost perfect given the necessary requirement to flood fields. The labour-intensive production cycle could give a boost to local gig economy while excellent fertile alluvial soils would contribute to high yields. The only main ingredient missing would be hot temperatures during the growing season. However, with emergence of global warming, we may be nearer to those perfect growing conditions than we might think. Rice production would surely preferable to planting 5 concrete pads with adjacent tarmac areas given the inherent challenges of run off and consequences that would result.</p> <p>A neighbour who lives in the affected area and near to the proposed development parks her car in my yard over night when flooding is bad. She wades to and from home in order to ensure that she gets to work on time</p> <p>The junction of the A 4113 with the Lingen road can be dangerous. Flood waters by the narrow bridge can cause traffic build up onto the main road with potentially serious consequences. Heavy lorries can exacerbate the problem especially during the week. At weekends, the atmosphere can be more akin to the Le Mans 24 hours or an Isle of Man TT race. Motorists and motorcyclists travelling westwards are often in</p>	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>their impressive stages of acceleration, perhaps overtaking other vehicles when passing the junction and reaching speeds nearer to 100mph than the speed limit by the time they pass the old Methodist chapel, once the only public facility in Walford other than the telephone kiosk. Severe flooding has been taking place not only in the area South of the A4113 which has been well documented, but also in the area around the crossroads in Walford.</p> <p><b>The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. Any development on the site will need to undertake will need to undertake a flood risk assessment so that any dwellings are built to appropriate floor levels and storm water run-off is collected to meet greenfield flows taking into account climate change. This is a requirement of the NPPF. The level of additional traffic generated by the proposal along the Lingen Road and its junctions is considered minimal. Examples exist elsewhere of areas in similar locations that have been accepted as suitable for development. A similar site was presented in the Regulation 14 draft and no observations were received from Herefordshire in relation to vehicular access and implications for the network for that.</b></p>	
C3.7 T Dixon	Walford	Objection	<p>The proposed five house development on the eastern side of the Lingen Road is situated predominantly on arable land of a classification that precludes it from any alternative use for development, in accordance with the Government's maintenance of agricultural productivity policy.</p> <p><b>The Government's policy in relation to agricultural land is that land of lower quality should be used where there is a choice between sites. It is only one of a number of criteria that should be used to determine the location of development. The Agricultural Land Classification for land in this location shows it to be category 4 (poor). Other land in the vicinity is grade 3 (good to moderate). Given this grading, the issue is not considered one to be given any significant weight.</b></p>	No change
C3.8 C and D Fraser	Walford	Objection	<p>Agree with objections concerning poor road access and visibility, lack of public services, and no school places. Walford floods without warning, and irrespective of seasons. We have spent close to £10,000 on various flood prevention and minimization schemes, including stream dredging, bund building and rebuilding, the construction of a spillway, and so on, all without council advice or assistance. When the rain comes the water flows down the lane, and right down our drive, turning it into a river. The septic tank fills and overflows and roads are impassable. This proposition will subject others to this misery and further exacerbate the problem for existing residents.</p> <p><b>Walford has been assessed as a potential location for new housing development. The availability of facilities is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy. The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. The level of additional traffic generated by the proposal along the Lingen Road is considered minimal. Examples exist elsewhere of areas in similar locations that have been accepted as suitable for development. The inclusion of appropriate criteria to cover relevant matters can be included in any policy for the allocation and it is considered unlikely that these are such as to restrict development in principle, given previous comments from statutory consultees.</b></p>	Cover matter through policy criterion
C3.9 C and P Brady	Walford	Objection	<p>Agree not confident "that a consultant who is not intimately familiar with the situation will realise the severity of the problem." Neighbours cottage has been flooded countless times and one winter, we know, her kitchen was flooded five times. We reinforce the point that Walford is highly susceptible to flooding when any changes are made in the environment. Putting a few drainage pipes in place is not going to solve the problem. Screenshot map from the Environment Agency provided where you can see the whole area is sitting on top of a series of active and long-standing aquifers. The flooding here is naturally occurring and any extra drainage can only re-enter this land and these aquifers increasing the risk of flood.</p>	Cover matter through policy criterion

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			 <p><b>The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. The Environment agency has been consulted on both occasions under Regulation 14 and raised no objections. It is noted that Walford does not fall within a ground water protection zone according to the map. In addition the proposed site does not fall within an area identified by any of the notations while much of Walford does.</b></p>	
C3.10 J Slater	Adforton	Objection	<p>This is a sizeable piece of ground and if the boundary were extended could take about six houses plus the barn conversion. Whilst we see the need for housing in the village and the other Border communities, extending the boundary could, in the hands of a clever Planning Consultant, make way for a larger development in what is now open countryside. Any new houses will rely on cars and deliveries by road vehicles. No one will walk to the centre of the village for an infrequent bus nor toil back up the hill with shopping and the same will apply to using a cycle as the lane is a long steep climb. An upgrade to an acceptable Highways standard will be uneconomic and massively intrusive. Both the Letton Lane and the Gullet are narrow and The Gullet is in very poor condition. At this point the Letton Lane runs in a deep cutting, through rock and on a</p>	Change proposed

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>bend with very poor visibility and without passing places. It is not suitable for increased traffic and the existing traffic. The Gullet also runs through a narrow twisting cutting, which runs with water in the winter and like the Letton Lane into Adforton has entrances and houses around it. The piece of land between the barn and the end of the village is up to 4m above the lane and is very prominent, so any new houses will be very obvious from the surrounding area and particularly from below, from Leintwardine and the valley beyond. They would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the area. On the other hand, the little barn could make dwelling; although it is not, in its present state fit for conversion, it could be rebuilt and the little yard to its east could take another small dwelling. That would make use of a piece of land that may never have an agricultural use, is effectively a brownfield site and if the houses are carefully designed would sit in the corner with much less visual impact. Prefer not to have houses beyond our garden with the potential loss of privacy and quiet, which we value greatly.</p> <p><b>The issue of level of development is a matter that should be covered by criteria within any policy covering the site/settlement to reflect current densities and access requirements. The conditions in terms of accessibility are similar for both existing and new development. Adforton has been assessed as a potential location for new housing development. Access to facilities is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy. Letton Lane is a single lane road that relies upon a limited number of passing places, many comprising private drives, and any works along its frontage at the point of the boundary extension will change the nature of the lane. However, in relation to the latter point it may be possible to provide an access to the development through a private drive leading off the lane to Lower House Farm. The access onto the A4110 is not ideal. There is a question about whether it is possible to provide the level of certainty required by Herefordshire Council for the extension to count towards the proportional growth necessary within the Group Parish. The decision to include this area may also depend upon whether there are better alternatives. Criteria are included in the policy to require development to reflect the scale and character of the area and to protect residential amenity.</b></p>	
C3.11 J and K Short	Lingen	Comments	<p>The proposed houses would need to be of a very specific nature - materials used would need to be in keeping with the listed buildings they would face in order to retain the integrity of the village. The hedges and trees around them should remain. Example of new houses around the corner from the Church indicated as acceptable design and fit the village character. Turn Farm is directly on a corner, with a blind bend to negotiate in which at times can be very busy with fast moving large agricultural vehicles passing through. Lingen is a village with no resources, Presteigne being the nearest source of village shops and so all planned future residents would have to be fully independent car drivers. Although not personally experienced major flooding as other residents have, we have been aware many times of pooled water not being drained away on the road directly outside our house which might adversely affect the proposed buildings. It would be detrimental to such a unique spot if the first glimpse of Lingen and the impression created on entering the village from the north, was blighted by a cluster of badly designed, cheaply erected dwellings.</p> <p><b>Current policies BG5, BG16, BG17 and BG 18 cover design matters relevant to this representation. They may be made more explicit in relation to any specific policy for the site. The Turn Farm site is located on the outside of a right-angled bend in the road where it should be possible to provide safe access through a comprehensive scheme involving one access point. A smaller site was presented in the Regulation 14 draft and no observations were received from Herefordshire in relation to vehicular access for that. Any storm water drainage requirements will need to be addressed in accordance with policy BG14.</b></p>	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria
C3.12 T and C Dixon C3.13 V and J Richards	Walford	Objection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is inappropriate with a 25%+ extension of the existing hamlet outside of the natural settlement boundary.</li> <li>2. Walford has no facilities, no natural centre, very sporadic bus service and the schools at Leintwardine and Wigmore are oversubscribed.</li> <li>3. Does not comply with Core Strategy policy RA2 which lists Walford as a secondary location for minor development only, not exceeding two/three dwellings and only where building would be sympathetic to the locality</li> </ol>	Cover relevant elements through

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C3.14 C and P Brady C3.15 C and D Fraser C3.16 S and G Jones C3.17 L Clothier and P Eades C3.18 J Maxwell C3.19 A and A Grimley C3.20 A and C Cloag C3.21 Karen C3.22 S Vernon C3.23 K Kennerley C3.24 R Price C3.25 D and H Hodgekinson C3.26 S Wynne C3.27 A P Davis C3.28 M Abbott			<p>4. Walford is the worse location in the parish in terms of flood risk and flooding. The development would create additional run-off particularly along the adjoining lane which acts as a sump even during normal rainfall. A balancing tank would not resolve the problem.</p> <p>5. Development would be visually intrusive and out of character.</p> <p>6. Although a minor road the Lingen Road carries heavy agricultural and commercial traffic as a link through from the A49 to Presteigne. It is narrow at this point, with embanked hedgerows, no possibility of a pavement with there being none existing elsewhere so dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>7. The proposal would generate significantly more traffic at the Lingen Road/Knighton road junction which is already hazardous due to the narrow single carriageway bridge immediately adjoining the turning.</p> <p>8. The proposed site sits astride the Elan valley Birmingham trunk water main.</p> <p><b>1/3. The site is located adjacent to the current built-up area of the settlement in compliance with Core Strategy Policy RA2. The settlement is listed in table 4.15 which includes settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate. The level of housing on this site and for the settlement is not excessive in this regard. There is no reference to any size of development for settlements listed in table 4.15.</b></p> <p><b>2. Walford has been assessed as a potential location for new housing development. The availability of facilities is not considered a critical issue within the Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>4. The site falls outside the area at risk of flooding and there is scope to utilise a range of measures to ensure greenfield storm water flows are maintained. Building and landscape design can ensure that any development in this location is no more intrusive and uncharacteristic than other properties in the settlement.</b></p> <p><b>5. Herefordshire Council has not made any highways representations about the level of development along Lingen Road included in the first draft plan which provided for an even higher level of development. It is considered that the level of development will have minimal effect on the current network and the road is similar to many throughout the County that will be required to accommodate additional residential development. This issue will be similar to the other settlements within the Group parish that will be accepting new development.</b></p> <p><b>6. The exact location of the trunk water and any safeguarding zone is being ascertained but it is unlikely to restrict the identification of a site suitable for a housing allocation.</b></p> <p><b>The inclusion of appropriate criteria to cover relevant matters can be included in any policy for the allocation and it is considered unlikely that these are such as to restrict development in principle, given previous comments from statutory consultees.</b></p>	policy criteria
C3.29	Lingen	Comments	Support the proposed extension as long as the following points above are considered	Cover in NDP

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
H, J, J, B and A Thomas			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prefer to see more development at the Turn Farm, rather than run the risk of damage to important views in and around the village. Most of the proposed site is 'brownfield', except for the small paddock on the eastern edge which should this be excluded.</li> <li>2. Development would lead to the construction of at least one new farmhouse and buildings elsewhere on the holding siting and landscaping should be controlled to avoid undue damage to the landscape and environment elsewhere.</li> <li>3. It should be made clear that restoration of the farmhouse and conversion of the two Listed barns are an integral part of the package.</li> <li>4. The two barn conversions would mean that only three new units are required and these could easily be accommodated within the current boundary. However, I think it is possible that, under the latest rules, the two buildings within the proposed southward extension - the silage clamp and livestock/storage unit - would not need formal planning permission for conversion? If they are included in the development boundary, I assume that their conversion would be subject to any design guidelines for the site and that only two units would result and if so the extension is accepted.</li> <li>5. The hedges should be retained and strengthened to protect the amenity of neighbours, retain the existing landscape structure and character, and minimise the visibility of new development from the adjacent footpath and the surrounding area generally.</li> <li>6. Suggest that the existing site entrance may not be suitable for increased traffic levels because of the poor visibility for those entering the site from the north. Channelling all new traffic through this entrance would adversely affect the setting of the Listed farmhouse and barn and the amenity of their future residents. Suggest that a new entrance could be formed, taking traffic to Webb's Stile, where visibility is better and where it could link up with the new entrance to the Old Combine Patch. If this new drive was routed along the existing hedge-line and double hedged, it would not unduly affect neighbours, views or the historic landscape.</li> </ol> <p><b>These matters can be covered through criteria in the policy for the site's development. The last point will, however, require to be explored further, especially to ensure that the view to the south-west from the church is not adversely affected.</b></p>	
C3.30 S Brown	Adforton, Walford, Lingen	Objection	<p>Why are we proposing green field sites in order to accommodate targets imposed upon us by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and, ultimately, central government? This does not conform to the concept of local planning being of the people, for the people and by the people: in fact it is the reverse. There is nothing "local" about this NDP other than, as a matter of convenience and in order to pre-empt future objections, getting "locals" to identify potential sites and also to satisfy the LPA's need to show a five-year land supply for its own adopted Core Strategy for the whole county. When "locals" do identify sites they are told they have not identified enough sites and must identify more. That has resulted in the proposed extension to Development Boundaries and the inevitable invasion of adjoining open countryside with all the negative effect that will have on the nature and essence of this locale, something we should be aiming to preserve and not wreck by building upon it.</p> <p>Where are the jobs to accompany this proposed housing? Where is the real, genuine evidence that housing in these small villages, offering virtually no services, is either needed here or is sensible? How will the existing infrastructure cope with the inevitable increased pressure from an ever-increasing local population?</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed extension to the Turn Farm site in Lingen for the same reasons, except the Turn Farm site is not a green field site and so there may be a little greater logic to its extension, but, again, where are the jobs and how will services and infrastructure cope?</p>	No Change

Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
			<p>It should be noted that various local houses have taken inordinately long times to sell, sometimes years! Various desirable local residences of all sizes are just not selling which demonstrates, to me at least, that the case for more housing is not established. There may be a demand for small, low cost housing or Affordable Housing (owned by Housing Trusts) but again, where are the jobs to go with that type of housing?</p> <p>A recent planning application made at Sunnybank Farm was refused because it was deemed to be an isolated development within the open countryside contrary to RA3 of the Core Strategy and Sec 55 of the NPPF, sensitivity of the site outweighing the benefits etc.. The decision can be found at</p> <p><a href="https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=152734&amp;search=sunnybank%20farm">https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=152734&amp;search=sunnybank%20farm</a></p> <p>If that proposal was not deemed suitable why should extension of Development Boundaries into open countryside with accompanying proposals for housing thereon be deemed suitable, and why should such proposals to build in open countryside, albeit adjoining small hamlets or villages, not be seen to be contrary to policy RA3 of the Core Strategy?</p> <p>What is the point, value or meaning of defined Development Boundaries if they are to be extended at the drop of a hat to facilitate building in open countryside to satisfy seemingly random housing targets imposed by the LPA? Why not just abandon the whole concept of Development Boundaries and build anywhere? (That was sarcasm, not a genuine proposal.)</p> <p>Why initiate a policy of greater local involvement in planning while dictating what plans and numbers of houses the locals must come up with? As a concept NDPs are a sop to the electorate and should be treated with the contempt they deserve.</p> <p>The imposition of targets by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is against the concept of Neighbourhood Planning. This was supposed to be bottom up planning, not top down. I suggest, therefore, that the whole NDP be abandoned and the matter left to the LPA which can draw up its own plan for the area which will have to comply with its own Core Strategy in the same way the NDP must comply.</p> <p><b>NDPs are required by Government Regulations to meet basic conditions and this includes complying with the Core Strategy. The alternative to the local community using the NDP approach is for Herefordshire Council to decide where the housing goes or to leave it to the ad-hoc process of developers bringing forward sites. It will be for the community to decide whether it wishes to adopt the first of these or not. The approach to both housing and employment set out in the Core Strategy has been through a public examination and found to be sound by a Government Inspector. The NDP must identify sites within or adjacent to the built-up areas of the settlements identified in the Core Strategy. Many of the issues raised are not for the NDP to address.</b></p>	
C3.31 R Nisbett	Lingen	Support and comment	<p>To exclude certain landlocked and modern farm buildings would leave an anomaly. Furthermore, sensitive redevelopment of this brownfield site would have no material impact on village views. For farmstead sites like this, there should be a presumption in favour of retention/conversion of old buildings wherever possible, even if (as here) they are outside the Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Support welcome. The intention is to retain the historic buildings and enhance their setting through removing the modern ones and allowing new sensitive development.</b></p>	No Change



Respondent Identification Number	Section/ Policy Number	Support/ Object/ Comment/Recommend change/etc.	Suggested Changes Parish Council Consideration (In blue)	Propose Change or Not
C3.32 J Roberts	Lingen	Objection/comments	Access to the Turn site will need sufficient splay allowing for wide access onto the roadside. The road is unlit and narrow carries heavy commercial and farm machinery vehicles and clear visibility of any oncoming traffic is difficult especially from the north. After heavy rain, and the drain-off from the fields, the road floods (there are no road drains to take the deluge. Choice of sympathetic and compatible building materials more be rigorous. Lingen lacks a public transport network and residents have to travel a distance for amenities such as shops, medical facilities and schools. Whilst I do not oppose development in principle, the type and number of dwellings should not compromise the village. It is important to preserve the integrity of the village in maintaining the historic element and landscape and consideration should be made to the retention of the existing hedgerows and trees.	Cover relevant elements through policy criteria
			<b>The NDP contains policies seeking to address concerns about access, drainage, conservation of buildings and the Conservation Area, materials and design. Many similar roads within the County accommodate agricultural and commercial traffic and the level of development proposed will have a marginal effect in terms of increased traffic. Similarly, the issue of poor or unavailable public transport is one that affects many areas where new development is to be located.</b>	
C3.33 B Sheppard	Lingen	Support	The Turn Farm proposal seems like a sensible compromise if it gives us more confidence that we will have more control over development, and in the process protects the stated aim to ensure any development fits the village character, and is contained within the proposed settlement boundaries.	No Change
			<b>Noted with thanks</b>	

## End of Section 5

## Appendix A Neighbourhood Plan – Border Group Feedback from Public Meeting 29.10.13

41 written responses recorded at the event

### **Housing Development**

Local housing for young people with provision for self build and individuality of design

Villagers who live within area for housing should determine plans and NOT those who live miles away but serve on the PC

Local housing for local youngsters particularly those with family history in area and who work here – not being restrictive/prescriptive about materials and styles.

Council Housing – takes those that supposedly cannot afford a property under their own steam to an area that requires a car to get about

Priority should be given to local people wanting to downsize

Priority should be given to local people wanting to build their own homes

Local housing for local people is a first priority

Local housing for local people- opportunities for self-build

Local housing for local youngsters working in the area

Local housing for local people who have jobs in/around village A local user ‘restriction’ on housing (new) which lasts e.g exists beyond the first buyer ( like a covenant)

Dispersed housing development rather than a whole field concreted over

Farmstead conversions

Rejuvenate existing housing to meet ‘needs’ rather than build new

What about the Chapel in Adforton – a good family home

Enforce empty houses back into occupation

We must build more houses or the villages will die

It should not just be affordable housing – there are elderly people forced to move from village in order to downsize

Affordable housing with lowish incomes would have difficulty running 2 cars for shopping and work. No Plan is preferred –individual applications are better option

Don’t do a Plan – there is no issue it can resolve better than the Core Strategy

Is a Plan the best way to go?

Before any development in the village of Lingen is ratified, it should be noted there is an absence of services to sustain the community i.e. transport, health, commercial etc

I feel a Plan is the best way forward for Lingen – there will be criticism if we don’t and criticism if we do. People will have their opinions

The whole area has a new chance to develop with the arrival of the Internet. The Plan should concentrate on this first- then it should move into other areas

### **Environment**

Ensure all green lanes, footpaths and bridleways are kept open

Open the Roman road from Paytoe to Wigmore to foot traffic

Eco-compost system

Encouraging micro-generation of power

Drainage, public transport, mobile phone signal, BB – all necessary for satisfactory development and happy residents

Micro- generation –not wind farms

Off – road parking for at least 2 cars

### **Sports related**

Sports teams – getting everyone involved

Have a football or sports pitch for Lingen and Willey as more houses will bring more people and they will need something to entertain them

Provide some sort of sports facilities for Youth and Older people

### **Other**

Lingen bypass

Village Panto

Art Club

Village meeting – fun!

A public toilet in Lingen

A music festival in Willey, Lingen or Birtley to liven things up

A shop in Lingen – and a park

Fast BB to encourage success of local business

## Appendix B Notes of sub-group discussions following Village Walks of October 2014

Notes following discussion on Saturday, November 8<sup>th</sup> 2014

Present: Harley Thomas, Philip Barnett, John Walker, Robert Nisbet, Moira Williamson

**Land to East of Lingen, beyond the new bridge: Owners Ian Morris and Mr Nicholas**

- this was judged by the group to be outside the boundary of the village
- the area is wet
- there are views which should be protected

**Land owned by J Stock**

- the land owner is interested in building up the smallholding
- there are considerable views from both the orchard and field near to the brook
- avoid further development along minor roads

**Birdmeadow**

- this land is wet
- there are views both to Copse Hill, Old Castle Woods and across to the Monument lands from the road and other housing
- avoid further development along minor roads

**Mill Field**

- archaeological site of old mill
- access
- on the Lingen Loop and has footpath running through

**Nursery Site (5)**

- not to develop beyond South of bisecting footpath
- would need the agricultural tie to be lifted
- 2 small houses and up to 3 detached
- retain and enhance hedge/tree screening
- set back from road to protect amenity of neighbours as exception to general pattern of frontage development in Lingen
- this back land would be acceptable as it is screened, it was previously developed and provides good access
- look into sewage/soak away
- leave land from footpath to Well Cottage - views
- arboretum gives space for community facilities

- design brief would be essential for this site

**Woolley's Field (1)**

- build house near to road
- consideration should be given to lowering the footprint of the building
- good work/live site as at edge of village
- house for local person
- substantial screening would be required

**Field behind the Chapel**

- not suitable
- access difficult up Chapel Lane this includes a footpath/right of way
- considerable views
- back land development

**Garden between Nutwood and Eastwood House**

- a small plot
- access is difficult via Chapel Lane this includes a footpath/right of way
- over development of backland

**Chapel**

- community building, tea/coffee for walkers
- place to meet and have exhibitions
- toilet, useful for walkers

**Plot by Brook Cottage - the arboretum belonging to house**

- back land development
- difficult access
- inconveniences other residents (The Barn, The Council Houses)
- greenfield site

**The Turn Farm (corner plot)**

- opposite Court House Farm/adjoining The Granary
- the landowner is not wanting development
- access would be needed from near existing stile
- building to be on rough patch not in field

**Horseradish Field**

- no - views of church from Chapel Lane and from Church across the fields
- height of house may cause problems
- need to re-check by visiting site

**The Turn Farm Fields**

- not suitable for development
- characteristic 'green windows', central to views into and out of village
- landowner wants to retain agricultural use

**Sally's Chickens/Orchard (1)**

- possible English Heritage objection
- if any building could be lowered it would be a better site
- access from the car park (The Pound) via existing gate

**The Turn Farm**

- 17<sup>th</sup> Century barn is a listed building remaining attached to the farm
- no development at present as landowner not interested

**Land opposite the Village Hall**

- owned by Turn farm
- substantial views to the countryside
- views from the Old School House, Village Hall, Morlingcourt
- access to the field difficult
- access via Willey lane outside the 30mph

**Joe Thomas' Site (1)**

- a live/work site
- self build
- house for local person
- landowner willing

**Amy Thomas Site (1)**

- live/work site
- self build
- local person
- landowner willing

## Appendix C Feedback results for Adforton Drop-in Event, 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014

**Adforton Consultation Evening 6-8 pm Dec. 2 2014.**

Residents' demographics.

	Male	Female
12 & under	1	
13-16		
17-20		
21-25		
26-36		
37-47	1	1
48-58	1	1
59-69	3	1
70 & over	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>

**Residents' names**

<b>E. Adams</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>D. Watson</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>R. Swainson</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>A. Boulton</b>	<b>SY7 ONB</b>
<b>G. Place</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>D. Place</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>C. Gurney</b>	<b>HR6 9UF</b>
<b>J. Denyar</b>	<b>SY7 ONJ</b>
<b>A. Voysey</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>J. Voysey</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>R. Edwards</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>C. Dyer</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>R. Dyer</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>G. Dyer</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>A. Thomas</b>	<b>SY7 OND</b>
<b>D. Stevens</b>	<b>SY7 ONF</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>

*Geoff Williams was there, but he did not sign in.*

*Dick Hughes and Christine Newman did not sign in either taking the total up to 19*

**Comments**

Any development should take into account the infrastructure within the village. There is a real need for cheaper housing for younger people to buy/rent.

If the empty properties in the village were brought into use, less housing would be required.

*Alison Thomas*  
Stanway Bank

John Miles's barns are already under consideration. The meadow behind them running towards the main road would be a logical, compact extension of such a development with safer access to the main road.

*Dick Hughes*  
Laburnum Cottage

Personally, I would put the whole plan, probably listed under objectives, under the development of businesses. This will be provided by the development of the

internet which needs to be exploited. An Example is Aardvark Books.

*David Watson*  
Brick House Farm

It seems that the old Methodist Chapel is a No 1 development site, or could be – The present lack of use is a disgrace.

*Anne Voysey*  
The White House  
Adforton

Still need more.

*Geoff Williams*  
Penny Close  
Adforton

Gordon Place said that something needed to be done about the Methodist Chapel.

Dick Hughes asked who had identified the possible development sites.

Christine Newman was concerned that if the derelict barn was developed then infilling could occur towards Christmas Cottage.

## Appendix D: Future Housing Needs in the Border Group of Parishes (Survey)

(Adforton; Brampton Bryan; Buckton & Coxall; Lingen; Walford Letton & Newton; Willey)

Please complete and return this short questionnaire if you think you or members of your household are likely to need separate, local accommodation now or in 4-5 years.

Please complete only one questionnaire per household to cover the needs of everyone currently living at your address.

The results will help the Border Group Parish Neighbourhood Planning Team to build local need into their proposals for future housing development in the six parishes.

Your responses will remain completely confidential. If you wish to talk to someone about this questionnaire please contact your Parish Clerk, Maureen Robinson, on 01568 770547

**Q1. Are there any people living in this household needing their own home in the Border Group of Parishes, which they are currently unable to obtain?**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

(If you have answered 'No' please go to question 6)

**Q2. If you have answered 'yes' to Q1 please indicate how many additional homes are currently required?**

1	2	3
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q3. If additional homes are currently required please indicate how many bedrooms are required in each.**

First extra home	Second extra home	Third extra home

<b>Write number of bedrooms in box</b> <input type="text"/>	<b>Write number of bedrooms in box</b> <input type="text"/>	<b>Write number of bedrooms in box</b> <input type="text"/>
--	--	--

**Q4. Are those requiring extra homes currently registered with Herefordshire Homepoint?**

Yes, All	<input type="text"/>	Yes, some	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
-------------	----------------------	--------------	----------------------	----	----------------------	---------------	----------------------

**Q5. What type of home are they ideally seeking? (Tick all that could apply)**

Owner occupied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rented from Housing Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low cost purchase	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shared ownership (part rent, part buy)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private rented	<input type="checkbox"/>	Accommodation connected with employment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adapted for older person or person with special needs	<input type="checkbox"/>		

**Q6. Is there anyone in the house, who is not currently in need of their own home but is likely to want one in the Border Group of Parishes in the next five years?**

Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
-----	----------------------	----	----------------------

**Q7. If you have answered 'yes' to Q6 please indicate how many additional homes may be required?**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**Q8. If additional homes may be required please indicate how many bedrooms are likely to be required in each.**

First extra home	Second extra home	Third extra home
Write number of bedrooms in box <input type="text"/>	Write number of bedrooms in box <input type="text"/>	Write number of bedrooms in box <input type="text"/>

**Q7. What type of home are they likely to be seeking? (Tick all that could apply)**

Owner occupied	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rented from Housing Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low cost purchase	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shared ownership (part rent, part buy)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private rented	<input type="checkbox"/>	Accommodation connected with employment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adapted for older person or person with special needs	<input type="checkbox"/>		

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire.**

**Please seal your completed questionnaire in the small envelope and return to the volunteer who delivered it.**



## Appendix E: Have you any land suitable for future development? (Survey)

If you own land in the Border Group of Parishes (Adforton; Brampton Bryan; Buckton & Coxall; Lingen; Walford Letton & Newton; Willey), the Border Group Neighbourhood Planning Team would appreciate it if you could complete this short questionnaire

Over the next 20 years, land will be needed for small developments of houses, and possibly for business premises, plots of land for self-build dwellings, public facilities, play areas, parking, and perhaps many other things.

You might be prepared make land available for specific uses at some time in this period. At this point in time, we only need to have some idea of land that might become available, and the uses that would be acceptable to you, in order to outline possible options for the future. We are aware that there are constraints on some land which make it unsuitable for some uses. Any responses we receive will not be binding.

Your completed questionnaire will be passed securely to our independent, external planner who will treat the information in confidence, but may need to contact you. For this purpose, please leave your name and contact details on the back page.

**PLEASE COMPLETE ONLY ONE "LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT" QUESTIONNAIRE PER HOUSEHOLD**

**Q1. Would you be prepared make available some land at a future date, for specific purposes stated by you?**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------	--------	--------------------------

**Q2. If you can identify specific pieces of land you might be prepared to make available in future, please describe each plot in the spaces below:**

<b>Plot 1</b>	
Location	
Size of Plot	
Access to the plot	
Uses of the plot acceptable to you	

<b>Plot 2</b>	
Location	
Size of Plot	
Access to the plot	
Uses of the plot	

acceptable to you	
-------------------	--

<b>Plot 3</b>	
Location	
Size of Plot	
Access to the plot	
Uses of the plot acceptable to you	

<b>Your name</b>	
<b>Phone Number</b>	
<b>Email Address (optional)</b>	

**If you want to tell us about more plots, or if you have said 'no' but decide later that you would consider selling land, please contact the Parish Clerk on 01568 770547 or email [clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com](mailto:clerkbordergroup@btinternet.com)**

# Appendix F: Draft Border Group Neighbourhood Plan Response Sheet

Public consultation - 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016

## Response sheet

**You may use this sheet to submit comments.**

Please give your name and address. As this is a formal statutory consultation all comments submitted will be available publicly.

If you wish to be kept updated on future progress with the Neighbourhood Plan, please also give an email address (which will not be published).

**Please make comments as specific as possible, relating to specific Policies or paragraph numbers, and quote the relevant policy or paragraph number(s).**

Send your comments to Border Group NP Steering Group:

✉ by post or 🖐 by hand to:

- Tony Swainson, Autumn House, Adforton, Leintwardine, Craven Arms, SY7 0NF
- Steve Chilman, Upper House, Willey, Presteigne, Powis, LD8 2NA
- Moira Williamson, Birdmeadow Cottage, Lingen, SY7 0DY

💻 or by email to:

[swainsons@autumnhouse.eclipse.co.uk](mailto:swainsons@autumnhouse.eclipse.co.uk).

**All comments must be received by 5pm on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016.**

---

### Your details

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Address</b>	

Email address (if you wish to be kept updated)	
Please tick one:	<input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Local business <input type="checkbox"/> Local organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Statutory consultee <input type="checkbox"/> Agent

**Please give your comments overleaf. If you need to continue on an additional sheet, please write your name at the top of each sheet and staple sheets together.**

---

### Comments on specific policies

---

**Please indicate the specific policy, please state the policy or paragraph number.**

Policy and/or Paragraph No	Comments and/or suggested changes

--	--

---

**General comments**

---

---

**Thank you**