

**HOLMER AND SHELWICK
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
Submission Draft Version**

**Holmer and Shelwick Neighbourhood Plan
Examiner's Questions
by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd**

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
18 October 2019

Holmer and Shelwick Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions

Following my initial assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations, I would appreciate clarification and further evidence on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

1. Would you provide me with a correct version of the representation from David Baum of Hook Mason Consulting. The version in the pack is garbled. Would you confirm whether planning permission has been granted for the site at Shelwick referred to in this representation.
2. Policy HS1 states that housing development to meet local needs will be supported adjacent to the settlement boundaries. Paragraph 6.3 refers to small scale development being accepted in "certain circumstances" adjacent to the settlement boundaries. However, there is no explanation of the certain circumstances. Would the QB explain what this is intended to refer to. In other rural areas, usually only rural exceptions housing supported by an Affordable Housing Needs Survey is accepted adjacent to and outside settlement boundaries. If this is the case would the QB and LPA confirm that the following wording is satisfactory. Delete "adjacent to" from the first sentence of the paragraph and add the following after the first sentence: "*New housing development will be supported adjacent to the settlement boundaries of Munstone and Shelwick where it delivers rural exceptions housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H2.*" Explanatory text will be needed to explain how this is to be applied and should be added to paragraph 6.3.
3. Policy HS1 f) is considered to be unnecessary as the policy wording requires the site to be within or adjacent to the settlement boundary.
4. Policy HS1 Is it intended that all the criteria should be applied? If so the word "and" should be at the end of criterion h) instead of g).
5. Both Policy HS1 and HS2 refer to development "not adversely impact existing agricultural or commercial activity." Is this correct or should the wording of Policy HS3i) be used?
6. In their comments on Policy HS2, HC refers to other sites that may be considered through the HAP. As these have not been considered through the NP process it would not be appropriate to include them in the settlement boundary. If further sites will be required to deliver the strategic requirement of 500 homes plus the Park and Choose site these should be allocated in the HAP and the Settlement Boundary revised accordingly. It is suggested that an additional paragraph should be added to the justification to Policy HS2 to explain how much additional land will be required for housing and that any further sites required will be allocated in the HAP and the Settlement Boundary revised accordingly.

Add the following to the justification: "*The housing commitments included in the settlement boundary should deliver about XXX homes. Sites for the remaining XXX homes will be allocated in the Hereford Area Plan as well as*

a site for the Park and Choose location. The Settlement Boundary will be revised accordingly.”

7. Would the LPA confirm whether the parking requirement set out in Policy HS3 b) accord with the Council’s Parking Standards. If not, what evidence has the QB relied on to set their own parking standards?
8. Does HC have a process for assessing and designating local heritage assets? Would the QB explain the heritage significance of the two locations identified in Policy HS4 and the contribution they make to the local environment.
9. Figure 10 shows three of the four views. View iii) of Lyde Hill is not included. Would the QB provide me with a map to show the location of all the viewpoints. These should be from publicly accessible vantage points such as roads or footpaths within the plan area. Would the QB explain how it is intended that development proposals should enhance the views? Is there any reason for including the Furlongs Play area and the River Lugg on Fig 10?
10. Are the local wildlife sites listed in Policy HS5 designated as such? They do not appear to be shown on the Policies Map. Would you provide me with a map of the location of these sites.
11. Would the QB confirm whether the landowners of the sites proposed as Local Green Spaces have been consulted on their proposed designation in view of the comments in the representations.
12. Part of site 9 appears to be a landscaping belt on the western edge of the housing development. Is this safeguarded by a planning condition? Would the QB provide me with a map to show the location of LGS site 10 as it is not shown on Figure 12.
13. It is considered that Policy HS10 on CIL is a community aspiration and not a planning policy. It could be retained in the Plan if it were presented under the heading of a “Community Aspiration”.

Rosemary Kidd
Independent Examiner
18 October 2019