

## Progression to Examination Decision Document

### Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

Name of neighbourhood area	Burghill Neighbourhood Plan
Parish Council	Burghill Parish Council
Draft Consultation period (Reg14)	20 January to 11 March 2016
Submission consultation period (Reg16)	13 July to 24 August 2016
2 <sup>nd</sup> Submission consultation period (Reg16)	10 May to 21 June 2018

#### Determination

Is the organisation making the area application the relevant body under section 61G (2) of the 1990 Act		Yes
Are all the relevant documentation included within the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map showing the area</li> <li>• The Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Consultation Statement</li> <li>• SEA/HRA</li> <li>• Basic Condition statement</li> </ul>	Reg15	Yes
Does the plan meet the definition of a NDP - 'a plan which sets out policies in relation to the development use of land in the whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the plan'	Localism Act 38A (2)	Yes
Does the plan specify the period for which it is to have effect?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes

<p>Are any 'excluded development' included?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County matter</li> <li>• Any operation relating to waste development</li> <li>• National infrastructure project</li> </ul>	1990 61K / Schedule 1	No
Does it relation to only one neighbourhood area?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
Have the parish council undertaken the correct procedures in relation to consultation under Reg14?		Yes
<p>Is this a repeat proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has an proposal been refused in the last 2 years or</li> <li>• Has a referendum relating to a similar proposal had been held and</li> <li>• No significant change in national or local strategic policies since the refusal or referendum.</li> </ul>	Schedule 4B para 5	No

### Summary of comments received during submission consultation

Herefordshire Council – Strategic Planning	Confirmed general conformity with the Core Strategy.
Herefordshire Council - Environmental Health (contamination)	<p>Site 10 and Site 21 – historic orchards which could be subject to agricultural spraying practices which lead to a legacy of contamination.</p> <p>Solar Farm site – located on a known closed landfill sites (Winstow Pit). The site's potential contaminative use would require consideration prior to any development.</p>
Herefordshire Council – Environmental Health	Have some reservations about the proposals for the settlement boundary for Tillington and housing site 10 and 25 are close proximity to the employment site. This could impact on residential occupants on the proposed sites depending on the planning restriction,
Herefordshire Council - Conservation	<p>Policy B14</p> <p>Notwithstanding section C and D of the policy, query the location of the site due to the proximity and potential to affect those aspects of the setting</p>

	<p>of listed buildings 650m south which contribute to their significance.</p> <p>Given the former use as a landfill pit, it is lower than the surrounding landscape. More evidence is required to demonstrate that this site is suitable for solar panels.</p>
Herefordshire Council – Transportation	<p>Policy B8 (f) – need to mention adequate cycle parking and storage</p> <p>Pg 24 Infrastructure – 6<sup>th</sup> bullet – Herefordshire Design Guide for new developments recommended 3.5metres for shared pedestrian and cycle facilities. It may be the case this is not feasible in every locations. 2 metres is acceptable for footway widths.</p> <p>Pg 75 Transport – 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet – the parking provision is designated by the Highway design guide and dependent on number of bedrooms for dwellings.</p>
Historic England	<p>Overall the plan read as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment</p> <p>No further substantive comments to make.</p>
Natural England	Not specific comments on this NDP
Environment Agency	In the absence of specific site allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment at this time
Welsh Water	Consulted at Reg14 stage in 2016 and pleased to notes that the parish council has incorporated our comments into Policy B13.
National Grid	No records of apparatus within the neighbourhood plan area
Sport England	Policy B10 identifies The Copse leisure area as a Local Green Space and proposes to oppose development except in 'very special circumstances'. However, these circumstances are not defined within the plan. Development of The Copse should be consistent with para 74 of the NPPF.
Herefordshire CPRE	Forwarded to volunteer for comment. No further

	comment received
Holmer and Shelwick Parish Council	Unanimous support for Burghill Parish Council's proposed NDP
<p>Joanna Helme</p> <p>Resident</p> <p>Suupport</p>	<p>Wish to express support for the Burghill Neighbourhood Plan. Great deal of work and a long consultation process with the local community.</p> <p>A number of misleading comments relating to development propels which were not even in the plan and should be excluded as irrelevant.</p> <p>Comments from people who do not live in the parish (apart from statutory consultees and business owners) should not be allowed.</p>
<p>Alison Fenton</p> <p>Resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Para 1.8 – Tillington sites, Lower Burlton and the solar farm site could have been removed and the 50 dwellings development on the Roman Road counted within the numbers to replace them.</p> <p>Sites were not removed due to not wishing to return to Reg14 and potential legal action.</p> <p>6.1.13 – tried to persuade the parish council to advise parishioners than the target number had been reached. Sites in Tillington could be removed from the NDP. Parish Council adamant would not accept the idea.</p> <p>6.1.21 – many site submissions which were not included within the plan that could come forward over the next 12 years including single storey bungalows and converted farm buildings. Those sites were never considered.</p> <p>6.1.20 and 6.1.32 – identification of Tillington which should have a boundary is an arbitrary decision. It has always been classed as open countryside as was Tillington Common. The shop, pub garage and industrial buildings where all there for years without a boundary. No consultation with local residents whether they wanted a boundary.</p> <p>6.1.28 – do not believe the infrastructure problems can be overcome by developers. Costs would make the sites non-viable. Main sewer is too far away. Don't believe developer would consider factoring in the costs of highway</p>

	<p>improvements for 14 dwellings.</p> <p>Consider that the consultation has been poor. In the early stages of the plan there was no publicity, no opportunities for parishioners to become involved.</p> <p>Not all sites submitted were those answering the 'call for sites'. Two were identified by the steering group.</p> <p>Does not appear to be any attempt to check with neighbours who could have highlighted constraints. We have not been informed if Kirkwells visited all the sites.</p> <p>Updates in the parish magazine have contained little detailed information and impossible for parishioners views to be taken into account.</p> <p>No open meetings held to allow parishioners a chance to engage. Suggest that it would have been more in keeping with wishes for smaller groups of dwellings if discussions about parts of sites being included rather than the whole.</p>
<p>Martin Roberts</p> <p>Resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>2016 version of the plan was rejected because of lack of community consultation and possibility some sites would not be deliverable. Same issues not been addressed this time around.</p> <p>Consultation is woefully inadequate. Lack of proper consultation and engagement within the community. Local knowledge ignored</p> <p>The Core Strategy states 'local evidence and environmental factors will determine the appropriate scale of development' has not happened.</p> <p>Settlement boundary drawn for Tillington was never consulted upon.</p> <p>Is was Tillington Comment which was originally recognised as a possible area for growth rather than Tillington. Unfortunately 'common' was left off by mistake in the Core Strategy, an error HC still refuse to acknowledge.</p> <p>We were promised that all sites would be reassessed. This has not happened. Two sites in the original have been put back in as favoured sites. Site 25 has a withdrawn planning permission because of major constraints.</p>

	<p>Site10 fails to mention the fact that a large part of it is actually greenfield with a section 52 agreement. Site may not be available.</p> <p>Maps and plans reproduce are dreadful. Very difficult to get an accurate picture</p> <p>Growth target is 18% which equates to 124 houses by 2031, have already had 122 granted planning permissions. Do not need the excessive numbers proposed especially as there are 20 recognisable and allowed windfalls.</p> <p>There are so many inaccuracies and anomalies in this NDP submission.</p> <p>Produced an alternative B1 policy. Suggests the deletions of map 4 – Tillington and suggests Tillington and Tillington Common are considered as open countryside under Policy RA3 of the Core Strategy with the exception of the list of potential developable sites within the appendix.</p>
<p>Clare Fenton (member of public)</p> <p>David King (member of public)</p> <p>Martin Roberts (resident)</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Have all served on steering group at various times. Some have moved but feel that we feel strongly to speak for the silent majority.</p> <p>Total disgust with the autocratic manner it has been conducted.</p> <p>There has been a lack of consultation. Concerns about Steering Group members being ignored and opinions brushed aside. Failure to publish minutes/notes. Register of Interests have never been published.</p> <p>Comments to Site Assessment Report have been ignored or rebuffed.</p> <p>Settlement boundary have been drawn by the steering group in a top-down, arbitrary manner without consultation with the community.</p> <p>Reminder of housing can be found via windfalls rather than the proposed housing estates containing 24 houses.</p> <p>Plan cannot conceivably meet the basic conditions.</p>
<p>Marion Burns</p> <p>Resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>It is no longer relevant. A number of planning applications have been submitted and development underway. Considerable plot of land adjacent to Tillington Road and Roman Road</p>

	<p>junction for 50 dwellings.</p> <p>If all developed there would be an additional 130 dwellings within the parish.</p> <p>No meaningful consultation has been undertaken. No investigation of the objections raised. In spite of genuine concerns raised, the parish council made no attempt to revise their proposals and spend money validating their original plan.</p> <p>Now propose to impose settlement boundaries without the knowledge or consent of the vast majority of the parish.</p> <p>Ground water pollution from the proposed developments at Tillington. No provision for mains sewerage at Tillington and it is unlikely even if the proposed housing developments go ahead that Welsh Water would consider it viable. All the houses would need to have borehole drainage. No local watercourse to discharge additional water into. Ditch contains very fast flowing stream in winter but dry during summer months. Concerned about this and removal of several acres of the trees would add to the ground water levels. Water would accumulate at the Bell Inn crossroads and The Bird crossroads.</p> <p>Concerned about freezing hazard in the winter.</p> <p>Proposed development at Tillington is unsafe on road safety grounds. NDP proposes 24 large dwelling houses in a small area. Could require 60/90 vehicles requiring access to this stretch of Tillington Road. The ancient hedge bordering the Tillington Road has a retention order on it, the required splay for visibility cannot be achieved.</p> <p>30mph speed limit is frequently ignored especially at peak times as Burghill school is just a few yards along the road. Have been several accidents on this stretch of road. Frequently used by tractors, cyclists and horse riders.</p>
<p>Russell Hoddell</p> <p>Resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Proper democratic procedures have been ignored, lack of consultation, transparency and engagement with the community.</p> <p>NPPF has not been compiled with.</p> <p>Extensive and detailed objections at Reg14 have not been listened to or taken on board. People have not been kept informed, unable to make their views known, process not open and</p>

	<p>inclusive and local knowledge not been taken into account.</p> <p>No steering group minutes or agenda published, parishioners not invited.</p> <p>Personally printed information to alert parishioners to the inclusion of Tillington.</p> <p>We not informed of options days.</p> <p>Tillington has been targeted for disproportionate development not characteristic of it. Never consulted on the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Inadequate consultation with the community – only 100 out of 1600 parishioners attended a public meeting in Burghill. No attempt to meet in Tillington or Lower Burlton. Consultation obviously bias toward Burghill. No consultation for a year then a draft plan, housing allocations and a settlement boundary. None of the information gathered on Options Day has been published. No criteria for site selection, assessment or scoring.</p> <p>Steering group made up of residents from Burghill and Portway.</p> <p>Second Reg16 has not material changed except for a reduction in site. Sites were presented in a misleading way – site 10 at Tillington presented as brownfield and commercial but in fact site is 80% greenfield. All sites have not been screened for constraints so many are not deliverable. Site 10 is heavily constrained yet included within the NDP as the most favourable site.</p> <p>The Updated site assessment report was completely inadequate and never addressed this issue. Local knowledge was never sought, comments ignored.</p> <p>Regulation 14 – not distributed to every household when they should have been. Inadequate advertising with only one notice within the parish magazine. A leaflet was delivered to each household announcing the start of reg14. Site assessment work was added to the website towards the end of the period. Objections were selectively published. No one who objected has ever been notified, their opinion sought or questions answered. Objections were simply ignored. Comment forms only available within</p>
--	---



	<p>Burghill village hall and Burghill golf course not in Lower Burlton and Tillington. Online comment form overcomplicated.</p> <p>Reg16/1 – no publicity by Burghill PC and one one notice by HC</p> <p>Reg16/2 – no change in approach to inform, engage or publicise. We produced a document ‘from concerned parishioners’ to inform parish. Final plan was completed by a consultant from outside the parish.</p> <p>Transparency – lack of transparency during the process.</p> <p>Solar Farm Site – never been consulted on properly or assessed. Site is prominent effect the character of the landscape, significant detriment to the built and historic environment, on a former landfill sites. Close to telephone and communications mast.</p> <p>Tillington / Tillington Common – no consultation with the local community</p> <p>Settlement boundary – never been consulted on within Tillington and Tillington Common. Lower Bulton was extended following a consultation where only 100 people participated.</p> <p>Failure to consider the possible housing development at Hospital Farm and the bypass – this could result in several hundred houses in the parish. Only appears as a single sentence in the resubmission.</p> <p>Excessive developments – housing numbers are excessive and allocated sites have remained little change in light of planning permissions. Windfalls have not been reassessed.</p> <p>Site 10 and 25 – indicated as brownfield but actually greenfield. This claim had an unjustified planning advantage over other sites. No constraints taken into account. .</p> <p>Human rights – causing harm to the least number of people is manifestly unfair and in breach of the convention.</p> <p>Alternative policy B1 – any alternative policy wording is proposed. Removes settlement boundary from Tillington and acknowledges</p>
--	---

	constraints within the area.
<p>David King</p> <p>Member of the public</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Dismayed by the manner in which the preparation of the BNDP has been conducted.</p> <p>Lack of proper consultation and engagement – huge flaw in the process. Lack of compliance with the NPPF and the NPPG; inadequate public engagement, not informed by public debate, product of individual not the community. Consultation restricted to the questionnaire, options day.</p> <p>Steering Group terms of reference not made public until August 2016.</p> <p>No adequate dialogue with submitters of sites. Alternative options have not been adequately explored.</p> <p>Failure to keep records – correspondence and information which the community has a right to see has not been maintained by the parish council.</p> <p>Fact have changed and evidence out of date – plan omits planning applications after January 2018. There are approximately 20 dwellings which have been defined as windfalls which were actually submitted to the NDP. The 24 dwellings included on the NDPs proposed three mini-housing estates are unnecessary and do not recognise this wishes of parishioners.</p> <p>Failure to consider sustainable development adjacent to proper infrastructure – Sewage mains are in Burghill and Lower Burlton and they run between those settlements. Large sites adjacent to Burghill and the sewage network have been ignored.</p> <p>Failure adequately to consider sustainable development on conversions and smaller sites – numerous sites utilising the reuse of old farm buildings or housing on smaller sites have been designated as windfalls.</p> <p>Failure to consider the implications of the intent to develop in the south of the parish – NDP fails to mention the Smallholding disposal plan to development Hospital Farm. NDP surely must consider these factor. Hospital Farm is a large site. Community has not been adequately consulted. Site was classified as open</p>

	<p>countryside and inappropriate development despite being adjacent to the northern extension of Hereford.</p> <p>Settlement boundary for Tillington – Guidance has been ignored. Boundary for Tillington drawn with no consultation.</p> <p>Site Assessment Report dates September 2015 was not published until part way through Reg14. Site assessments were based on the settlement boundaries, this is predetermination.</p> <p>Updated site assessment reports – preliminary analysis is simplistic because the scoring system is unweighted and key constraints buried within services score. Did not reassess the solar farm.</p> <p>18 months delay during which time there was no proper consultation and genuinely active engagement with the community as defined in the NPPG.</p> <p>Quality of the plan is poor – resolution of all graphics is worse than June 2016. Designed Local Green Spaces map is truly awful.</p> <p>Object to LGS on Map 3 as appears to be designed to block access to site 35 for housing. Site 35 is sustainable development site adjacent to the main settlement of Burghill village.</p> <p>Mistake by Herefordshire Council in including Tillington as a main growth settlement – this was not corrected during the Core Strategy examination.</p> <p>Failure to consult on settlement boundary for Tillington Common as well as Tillington – settlement boundary historically drawn for Tillington Common and comprises of the large group of houses. Boundary drawn without consultation with the community.</p> <p>Inclusion of a solar farm – top of hill, north of conservation area containing a number of listed buildings, Not included within the updated site assessment report. Not properly consulted upon. Should be removed from the NDP.</p> <p>No consultation, explanation on why sites with removed - site 22, 2D, 2b and ‘within curtilage of White Roses’. No rationale, not reasoning and no consultation.</p>
--	---

	<p>No mention of the implications of PPP.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory parish council responses to Reg14 – many 'no change' excessive redaction.</p> <p>Suggested modifications to Policy B1 - removal of Tillington, take account of environmental and other constraints in the area, respects housing targets</p> <p>Includes list of potential alternative sites.</p>
<p>Sandie King</p> <p>Member of the public</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>For about 4 years the parish council have failed to reach out to the residents in a way that would have involved them in its production and failed properly to inform them about the plan.</p> <p>Made comments to the questionnaire, option days, parish council meetings and made lengthy written comments to Reg14 and Reg16 plans. Comments were rebuffed.</p> <p>PC re-employed the same consultants to re-asses the same sites. Consultants did not make use of local knowledge, consider vehicular access, pedestrian safety, sewage or surface water drainage.</p> <p>NPPG appears to have been ignored. Community could express views in a limited way.</p> <p>Meetings were not publicised until September 2016. People were not properly informed.</p> <p>No mention in the NDP of Herefordshire Council's declared intention to develop its own property at Hospital Farm for housing.</p> <p>Planning application for 50 dwellings should have been included within the target and other sites removed.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council rejected the first Reg16, alterations to the rejected plan are few. There has been no involvement by the community in the removal of sites or the retention of others.</p> <p>2018 still included mini housing estates which will provide many more houses than HC required. PC rejected discussions about housing numbers.</p> <p>2.12 and 2.13 – description of Tillington and Tillington Comment are incorrect</p> <p>3.5 – failed to consider the offer of assistance</p>

	<p>and land from a 'significant landowner'</p> <p>4.0 – Objective 5 is beyond the remit of the NDP</p> <p>Objective 7 does not take into account the strategic land intent of HC</p> <p>Objective 8 - within the remit of Highways not PC</p> <p>Objective 11 – cannot lessen reliance on the car in a rural parish</p> <p>6.1.11 – out of date. The housing numbers are already achieved. No longer need the mini estates</p> <p>6.1.13 – proportional target is already achieved if you include a few windfalls.</p> <p>6.1.20 – PC arbitrarily decided to draw a settlement boundary without consultation around Tillington but not around Tillington Common.</p> <p>6.1.21 – out of date. Plan does not have to rely on windfalls</p> <p>Policy B9 – PC objected to RA5 conversions contrary to their own policy B9</p> <p>Policy B14 – if it does not satisfy criteria a) to h) it should not be in the plan at all.</p> <p>Appendix 1 / Map 2 – settlement boundary altered and sites which were previously assessed have been omitted without explanation.</p> <p>Appendix 1 / Map 4 – never been any consultation about a settlement boundary for Tillington. One site removed and one site relabelled.</p> <p>Appendix 3 – much of this guidance is only appropriate for a cite zone not a rural zone</p> <p>Appendix 7 – commented on the Updated site assessment report but comments ignored. Did not adequately rate/score or weight key criteria</p> <p>Tillington – dangerous stretch of road, no main sewage and drainage, totally alter the rural nature of this hamlet.</p> <p>Tillington site does not meet the criteria of Policy B1</p>
Neil Christie	Fails on the same basis as its predecessor,

<p>Resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>proposing inappropriate, unnecessary and unwanted development at the same undeliverable locations.</p> <p>To date there have been 123 planning approvals in the parish, 1 short of the target. Yet the parish persist in advocating the development of mini-estates.</p> <p>NDP repeats it focus on sites in the vicinity of Whitmore Cross site 25 and 10)</p> <p>Failed to engage with residents or respect their expressed preferences.</p> <p>Appears to have drawn an arbitrary settlement boundary around Whitmore Cross designated as Tillington. Significant drainage problem and road safety. Clearly noise, smell from the pub and business parish.</p> <p>Followed a blinkered course of development of mini estates in very specific rural areas contrary to site constraints, and local preferences.</p>
<p>Clare Fenton</p> <p>Member of the public</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Support the principle of the NDP but support alternative proposal.</p> <p>Believe that the planning permissions and windfalls are incorrect. Believed that it is fine to have undeliverable sites in the plan as long as exceed the target.</p> <p>Parish council have continually chosen to ignore the feelings of the community.</p> <p>Parish Council website not up to date or clear following first Reg16 consultation</p> <p>Landowners were not contacted.</p> <p>Concerns about how the steering group and Kirtwells undertook the site assessment work.</p> <p>Consultation over settlement boundaries, particularly Tillington and Tillington Comment is a major issue.</p> <p>Community frustrations as not properly informed. Articles were ambiguous and misleading. Therefore produced a flyer to inform residents.</p> <p>By the 20 June 2018, Burghill has achieved 123 planning permissions, their growth target being</p>

	<p>124. There are 19 windfalls submitted in the draft plan.</p>
<p>Robert Yeomans Local resident</p>	<p>Latest plan is virtually the same as the previous one which was rejected.</p> <p>The infrastructure and public services of the plan will not support the increased planned.</p> <p>Tillington the road system is inadequate and there are not the required main services available. Already a flooding issues.</p>
<p>Michael White Local resident Objection</p>	<p>Plan is little more than a rehash of the previous rejected plan. The direction of the plan has changed little from the very days more than four years ago.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council listed guidelines were given scant regard in Burghill. Settlement boundary drawn within residents.</p> <p>Opposition to windfall. Sites considered undeliverable are still in the plan.</p> <p>Tiollington Comment was not considered for development.</p> <p>Keeping track of the process has been difficult. Many questions unanswered.</p> <p>Tillington - is without question countryside, roads are inappropriate for development being suggested.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council must take on board the wrong classification of Tillington.</p> <p>Alternative Policy B1 suggested.</p>
<p>Beryl White Local resident Objection</p>	<p>Steering group has been inaccessible to the wider community. Opinion expressed at Reg14 would totally ignored.</p> <p>The failure of the first submission has had no effect on this unacceptable approach to produce a plan. The second is little more than a repeat of the first. Never told which of the sites from the first submission were undeliverable.</p> <p>Need to prepare a plan in keeping with the guidelines and one which is fair and proportionate, reflects the character of the areas and the public are a part of.</p>

<p>Geraldine Robert</p> <p>Local resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Proposed sites in Tillington are not suitable for development, major problems of sewage disposal, surface water run-off and access. Site 25 near a dangerous bend.</p> <p>Sites do not conform to initial consultation with residents. No certainty that developers would contribute to extra classroom. Selection of site has taken place within no proper consultation with the community.</p>
<p>Desiree Parish</p> <p>Member of the public</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Inadequate public and community consultation</p> <p>Minimal community engagement on the settlement boundary drawn for Tillington.</p> <p>Proposed sites for development in Tillington are unfair, grossly disproportionate and undeliverable. Would result in overdevelopment.</p> <p>Plan is out of date as several planning applications have been granted.</p> <p>Tillington is characterised by roadside dwellings not mini housing estate. Serious highway safety issues on the C1095, no public footpath.</p> <p>Concerns about surface Water drainage, Tillington is not connected to the main sewerage facilities.</p> <p>Nearest GP surgery is at capacity, School is full and public transport is limited.</p> <p>Included an alternative to Policy B1</p>
<p>Oliver and Lisa Kamester</p> <p>Local resident</p> <p>Objection</p>	<p>Inadequate public and community consultation</p> <p>Minimal community engagement on the settlement boundary drawn for Tillington.</p> <p>Proposed sites for development in Tillington are unfair, grossly disproportionate and undeliverable. Would result in overdevelopment.</p> <p>Plan is out of date as several planning applications have been granted.</p> <p>Tillington is characterised by roadside dwellings not mini housing estate. Serious highway safety issues on the C1095, no public footpath.</p> <p>Concerns about surface Water drainage, Tillington is not connected to the main sewerage facilities.</p>



	<p>Nearest GP surgery is at capacity, School is full and public transport is limited.</p> <p>Included an alternative to Policy B1</p>
--	---

**Please note the above are summaries of the response received during the submission consultation. Full copies of the representations will be sent to the examiner in due course.**

### **Officer appraisal**

This plan has met the requirements of the regulations as set out in the table above.

The previous submission plan was not recommended to progress to examination as the supporting housing site search information was not readily available during the consultation period. This has been rectified.

Burghill and Tillington are highlighted within the Core Strategy as proportional growth settlements. The NDP does take account of this and provide the ability for proportional growth to occur. There has been some debate of the inclusion of Tillington and Tillington Common. However, Herefordshire Council have left this to the discretion of the parish council in line with para 4.8.21 of the Core Strategy.

Settlement boundaries have been drawn for Burghill and Tillington. The proportional growth in the parish is 124, this has been reached and exceed by the currently planning permissions and the site allocations within the plan.

29 representations were received; 5 from Herefordshire Council internal consultees, 8 from statutory consultees and 16 from members of the public which included 12 local residents.

The Strategic Planning team have confirmed general conformity with the Herefordshire Core Strategy, although the need for additional references to the Hereford bypass have been highlighted. No fundamental objections have been raised by any of the statutory consultees.

15 members of the public (including local residents) have highlighted a number of issues including the process undertaken when producing the plan, issues with the steering group, the identification of Tillington /Tillington Common and the proportional growth targets which have been reached. There are also concerns regarding the site allocations within Tillington.

An alternatively worded Policy B1 has been suggested by a number of residents which removed Tillington and takes account of the housing targets. This will be submitted to the examiner.

1 support from a local resident was also received.

It is considered that there are no fundamental issues regarding the Basic Conditions which would prevents this plans progress to examination.

### **Assistant Director's comments**

**Decision under Regulation 17 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.**

The decision to progress to appoint an examiner for the above neighbourhood plan has been  
Approved.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Richard Gabb', with a large, sweeping flourish above the name.

**Richard Gabb**

**Programme Director – Housing and Growth**

Date: 02/07/2018

## Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) – Core Strategy Conformity Assessment

Herefordshire Council Strategic Planning Team

Name of NDP: Burghill- Regulation 16 Submission version

Date: 18/06/18

<b>Draft Neighbourhood plan policy</b>	<b>Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)</b>	<b>In general conformity (Y/N/)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
B1- Scale and type of new housing in Burghill and Tillington and Lower Burlton.	SS2; RA2; H3	Y	
B2- Supporting existing small-scale local employment.	SS5; RA6; E2	Y	
B3- Supporting new small-scale local employment.	SS5; RA6; E1	Y	
B4- Rural enterprise and farm diversification.	RA5, RA6, E3	Y	
B5- Supporting development of communications infrastructure.	N/A	Y	
B6- Education	SS1; SC1	Y	
B7- Traffic management and transport improvements.	SS4; MT1	Y	
B8- Design of development in Burghill Parish.	SS6; LD1-LD4; SD1-SD4	Y	
B9- Protecting and where possible enhancing landscape	SS6; LD1-LD4	Y	"All development will be expected to retain the green areas between Burghill and

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N/)	Comments
character.			<p>Hereford and to maintain the distinct and separate identity of the Parish.”</p> <p>The plan should perhaps make some reference to the Hereford Relief Road corridor that will run through the southern extremity of the Parish between Hereford and Burghill. This could provide an opportunity to influence aspects of the road’s design and screening/landscaping on the section in the NDP area.</p>
B10- Protection of green spaces.	N/A	Y	
B11- Protection of and where possible enhancement of local community facilities.	SS1; SC1	Y	Listing some particular existing community facilities in the Parish which should be given protection could supplement this policy and afford it greater strength.
B12- Community facilities and Community Infrastructure Levy.	SS1; SC1	Y	
B13- Flood risk, water management and surface water run-off.	SS6; SS7; SD3	Y	
B14- Development of renewable energy facilities in Burghill Parish.	SS6; SS7; SD2	Y	