

To: 'Rosemary Kidd'

Subject: RE: Garway NDP Examination

Dear Rosemary,

Thank you for your further questions.

To address your queries:

I will contact the QB to establish the whereabouts of this document. I only have had sight of the original table as detailed in the site assessment report and the table (appendix 1) of appendix 2 of the consultation statement, this is post the community's consultation and revision of the scoring.

You are correct. Please accept my apologies for not having double checked the report regarding the B2 assessment. This however shows that the sites were assessed on that basis that they were the highest scoring sites and the others were not deemed as reasonable alternatives. The justification of the two sites availability from the assessment was based on the notes from the QB relating to the previous and pending planning permissions on site 16 and 17. However I will ask the QB about the reasoning and justification on this point.

Looking into the issue regarding the mapping of site 18 in the SAR, you are correct, the map does not show the area that should be highlighted as site 18 and shows a repeat of the site map showing site 5 and 16. As only site 16 and 17 were mapped in the final policies map this was not fully identified at the time. As mentioned above, I will ask the QB for any documentation they have prepared in terms of a summary and reasons for selecting/rejecting the sites.

Thank you for your patience regarding this.

Kind regards

Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Rosemary Kidd
Sent: 06 August 2020 12:05
To: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Garway NDP Examination

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Stephanie

Thank you for your response.

I have been sent a copy of the draft Sites Assessment Report dated 29/3/2018 where site 17 (Newlands) scored 9.25. This has evidently been revised downwards to 7 in the table (headed Appendix 1) you referred me to in Appendix 2 of the Consultation Statement dated June 2018. I should be grateful if you supply me with a copy of the final version of the Sites Assessment Report.

The Environmental Report in paragraph 5.2 assessed the two options of preparing the plan or not preparing it. Sites 16, 17 and 18 were assessed in section B2 of the Environmental Report. I note your comments that only sites 16 and 17 were considered to be reasonable alternatives that were both available or deliverable. However no reasons are given in the Plan to justify the selection of these 2 sites.

I await the final version of this Sites Assessment Report to see the final recommendations. (It is noted that the location plan for site 18 is incorrect in the draft SAR). Has the QB prepared a summary of their reasons for selecting / rejecting the various sites?

I will review my position on site 17 Newlands, once I have had the opportunity to consider the final sites assessment report and summary of reasons for site selection.

Kind regards

Rosemary Kidd MRTPI

Independent Examiner

From: [Kitto, Stephanie](#)
Sent: 04 August 2020 14:40
To: [Rosemary Kidd](#)
Subject: RE: Garway NDP Examination

Dear Rosemary,

Thank you for your queries, I will respond to each on in turn:

Environmental Assessment of alternative sites:

The Environmental Assessments undertaken are assessments of reasonable alternatives. In this case, the result of the scoring tables in Appendix 1 of the Consultation Statement indicated that there were only three reasonable alternatives to become allocations. The other site scored significantly higher and therefore were not considered to be reasonable options to take forward into the Environmental Assessment as they had been discounted within the site assessment work.

Therefore, in terms of a consistent approach, I am confident that the approach that a sound approach has been taken and that the two sites that were assessed in the environmental report were justified.

It could be argued that site 18 could have been included based on the scoring table, as shown in Appendix 1 of the consultation statement, however

- Site 16 (scoring 1.25 with capacity of 2 dwellings) had previously had planning permission that had expired and
- Site 17 (scoring 7 with a capacity of 5 dwellings) had a planning permission pending.

Therefore, these two sites were deemed as both available and deliverable sites with confirmed land owner interest and had the capacity towards delivering the number of housing required in the 2018 figures.

Even though site 18 (scoring 5) was scored lower than site 17, the capacity was lower (capacity of 2 dwellings) and also was not deemed as available or deliverable as the other 2 sites. If required an assessment against the SEA objectives can be made and supplied for site 18.

Newland:

With regards to you potential proposal to delete Newlands from the allocations, Herefordshire Council would not have any issues with this.

This would not impact on the potential for the plan to meet its required growth figures. There would also be one site allocation within the plan to ensure compliance with para 14, and therefore Herefordshire Council would be content with this modification.

The April 2020 housing figures show that the number of built (12) and commitments (23) have risen to 35 , this is above the minimal proportional growth target.

If we are planning to delete Newlands would this negate the need to assess site 18?

We would also be happy to raise this with the parish council if required, we are aware the clerk is on leave but we could speak to the Chairman in his absence.

I hope this helps regarding clarification of process of assessment and a way forward

Best wishes
Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

Stay Safe  **Keep Healthy**  **Support Local** 

SAFE  **HEREFORDSHIRE**

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Rosemary Kidd
Sent: 03 August 2020 17:11
To: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Garway NDP Examination

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Stephanie

Thank you for the responses to my questions.

I have a major concern about the Garway Neighbourhood Plan after reading the Site Assessment Report. The proposed allocation at Newlands scores very poorly in the Assessment. The site is detached from the village and effectively is a site in the countryside. No overriding evidence has been provided to justify its allocation as exceptional development.

The Environmental Report has not included consideration of the site options as reasonable alternatives which has been carried out in other plans I have examined in Herefordshire. I would appreciate your comments on this omission so that I can ensure that a consistent approach is adopted.

In the circumstances I am minded to recommend that the site at Newlands should be deleted. However I would like to afford you and the Parish Council the opportunity to comment on this before finalising my report.

If this were acceptable, this would leave the site adjacent to the Old School as the only allocation. This site lies within the settlement boundary and would be suitable for development under the policy.

I am aware that the PC clerk is on leave until 17 August. However, your initial feedback would be appreciated.

Kind regards

Rosemary Kidd MRTPI
Independent Examiner

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Kitto, Stephanie](#)
Sent: 31 July 2020 14:22
To: [Rosemary Kidd](#)
Cc: [Banks, Samantha](#)
Subject: Examiners Questions - Garway - Responses

Dear Rosemary,

Please find responses to your questions regarding the Garway NDP in this email. These include responses from the LPA and QB.

(original Examiner questions in grey, QB responses in red, LPA responses in blue)

1. I have concerns that the Plan lacks any introductory description of the plan area, the landscape character, environmental assets or the issues facing the area. These are set out in background documents but it would be helpful to plan users to include a brief description in the introduction or in the justification to relevant policies such as GAR4.

Garway is a hill parish rising from 42 to 366 metres, with 2 significant areas of common land. There are 2 main areas of population. Broad Oak clustered around a crossroads, with a garage and shop. Garway is a linear village with a pub. The population is around 450

2. The plan uses the phrase "all development" a number of times. The word "all" is considered unnecessary; in any case there may be other matters that have to be taken in to consideration that would mean that the policy could not be applied to a particular development proposal.

Agree to remove the word “all” where relevant.

3. **Objectives** – I am concerned that these are worded as statements or policies and not as objectives. The objectives will need to be reviewed to reflect the final wording and order of the policies of the Plan. Would the QB comment on the following proposed revisions:

Revise Objective 1 to read: “*To seek to locate most development within the settlements of Garway and Broad Oak.*”

Revise Objective 2 and combine with 3 and 4 to read: “*To promote high quality design in development to conserve and enhance the historic and natural environment and local landscape.*”

Revise Objective 5 to read: “*To ensure that development is sited and designed to take account of the character of the village and its rural setting.*”

Revise Objective 6 to read: “*To ensure that development has adequate access and parking and does not unacceptably impact on road safety.*”

Revise Objective 7 to read: “*To ensure that development makes adequate provision for rainwater and sewage drainage to reduce the risk of flooding.*”

Revise Objective 8 to read: “*To seek to preserve dark skies, tranquillity and residential amenity.*”

Garway Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examiner’s Questions Rosemary Kidd MRTPI
Planning Consultant Page 3

Combine Objectives 9 and 10 to read: “To support the needs of the local community *and safeguard community facilities.*”

It is noted that there is no objective on the economy to provide the framework for Policies GAR8 and 9 – New objective “*To support the development of new and expanded businesses appropriate to the rural area.*”

Agree with all revisions to objectives and addition of further objective in relation to the economy.

4. The final part of **paragraph 3.5** does not accord with national policy. Would the QB confirm that the following revision is acceptable:

“...and therefore, everywhere outside the two settlements is considered to be countryside where proposals for new housing development will have to demonstrate that they satisfy the exceptional circumstances set out in the NPPF paragraph 79.”

Agree with the revision to paragraph 3.5 to accord with National Policy.

5. **Paragraph 3.12** refers to a Site Assessment Report. I am unable to locate this; would you please send me an electronic copy. It is noted that the Environmental Report has not included an assessment of the site options. Has this been undertaken against the SEA objectives?

This has been addressed prior to this email. Site Assessment report has been sent.

6. **Policy GAR1 – Site Assessment** – The site allocations should be included in the policy wording and the settlement boundaries should be defined. As the plan does not make provision for any development that would be above the threshold for affordable housing, criterion k) is unnecessary and should be deleted. Would the QB confirm acceptance of the following wording:

Add the following at the beginning of the policy: “*The following sites are allocated for housing development:*

A) Land at Little Newlands for 5-6 dwellings;

B) Land adjacent to the Old School, Garway for 2 dwellings.”

Revise the policy as follows: “*Settlement boundaries are defined for Garway Village on Policies Map 1 and for Broad Oak on Policies Map 2. Within the settlement boundaries, new housing development will be supported where they:*”

Agree with the revisions to GAR1.

7. **Policy GAR2 f)** encourages that use of natural slate tiles (I am not sure which is meant) and local stone walling. From Google street view photographs it is evident that many properties are white painted or have red brick walls and dark grey roofing tiles. Would the QB consider whether this criterion on the choice of materials is applicable and deliverable. Would the QB discuss the choice of appropriate materials with the LPA suggest a suitable choice of materials that reflects the local built character.

DM response I would not wish to be so prescriptive in relation to materials as there is a mix within the village. Perhaps a preference for natural slate but otherwise a choice that reflects local character would provide sufficient flexibility?

This has been discussed with HCC and the Parish Council is content with the approach suggested by the DM

8. **Policy GAR2h)** In view of the scale of development being proposed in the plan most of the requirements set out in criterion h) are excessive and undeliverable. I am proposing to delete from “**permissive pedestrian ...feasible.**” Would the QB confirm this is acceptable.

Agree to the deletion suggested by the examiner

9. **Policy GAR3** - the third paragraph requires that development of existing properties should make provision for the diversion of surface water away from sewers. Would the LPA confirm that this is appropriate in this area and can be required through a planning condition on development in this area?

DM response the separation of foul discharges from surface water is broadly supported and we will often require a drainage strategy and or condition as such on development –The officer has asked to draw your attention to the SUDS Handbook.

10. **Policy GAR4** – I am proposing to re-order the criteria to elevate the safeguarding of designated areas and to explain the requirements more clearly. As noted above, this policy would benefit from a description of the assets in the justification. Criterion d) refers to non designated assets. Have any of the examples listed been identified as such in the parish? Are the wildlife sites different from those in criterion c) and h)? Would the QB/LPA comment on the proposed wording:

“Development proposals should protect and enhance the local landscape character and should demonstrate that:

- a) Designated buildings or areas are protected, *conserved* and enhanced;
- b) Priority habitats and ancient woodlands are safeguarded;
- c) Non-designated assets are conserved and enhanced;
- d) Watercourses and riverside habitats are conserved. Where necessary, this should include management and mitigation measures for the improvement and enhancement of water quality and habitats;
- e) The design, scale, form and siting of the development has taken account of the local landscape character and the setting of the village; and
- f) An appropriate landscaping scheme is incorporated into the scheme which helps to integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. The landscaping scheme should incorporate native tree species, existing trees and hedgerows and make provision for the on-going management of the scheme.”

Agree with the revisions to GAR4. The wildlife sites in criterion (c) are designated local wildlife sites, criterion (h) relates more to priority habitats and the wider green infrastructure.

11. **Policy GAR5** – criterion a) refers to an “appropriate assessment”. Would the QB explain what this entails?

This was a policy to reflect other Dark Skies policies that have been approved by Examiners. Suggest criterion (a) and (b) are revised to reflect the Eardisland NDP Dark Skies policy which has been through examination

- (a) They have undertaken an assessment of the need for lighting and can demonstrate need; and
- (b) The nature of the proposed lighting is appropriate for its use and location. The Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) has provided guidance on acceptable levels of illumination for specific

areas. Applicants will be required to assess the need for lighting, whether the benefits of the lighting outweigh any harm caused and any alternative measures available.

12. **Policy GAR6** – It is not clear what is meant by the term “integrity of the rural environment”. As the policy criteria are concerned with the prevention and control of noise pollution and disturbance to residential amenity, I am proposing that the term should be deleted and the policy should be entitled Tranquillity. Criterion b) is very wide ranging; it is not clear what types of developments would be required to submit such assessments and is therefore considered to be unclear and potentially unduly onerous. Would the LPA confirm the type of development proposals that are normally required to submit Noise Impact Assessments.

Would the QB and LPA confirm that the following revisions to the policy wording are acceptable:

“Development proposals will be supported when they do not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts on the tranquillity of the rural environment of the plan area or residential amenity. Where a development proposal is likely to give rise to an impact on tranquillity or residential amenity, a Noise Impact Assessment will be required as part of the planning application. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be included in planning conditions to reduce any adverse impacts.”

Add the following to the justification: **“Mitigation measures may include control of the nature, scale, type of activity and the opening hours**

DM response The DM officer is happier with the re-wording which provides greater clarity but there is still a concern that there is a lack of definition – is the QB looking at new residential development and commercial development or smaller scale development? Danger of imposing too onerous a requirement on smaller scale development in my view

Agree to the wording proposed by the examiner.

13. **Policy GAR7** – Would the QB provide me with the names of the churches to be covered by the policy. The properties should be identified on the Policies Maps. Is it reasonable to require any alternative provision to be accessible by public transport in this parish?

**Churches are Garway Methodist Church and St Michael’s Church
I consider it reasonable that alternative provision should be accessible by public transport
as the current facilities are accessible by public transport**

14. **Policies GAR8 and 9** – The criteria for these two policies are very similar and it is suggested that they could be combined under the heading of Rural Employment and Tourism. The only differences are the inclusion of “views” in Policy GAR8b) and the “Green Infrastructure Network” in Policy GAR9b). Neither of these matters are addressed elsewhere in the NDP and there is no explanation in the justification of how these matters are to be considered or why they are considered differently under each policy. Would the QB and LPA confirm that the following combined policy would be acceptable:

*“Proposals for new or expanded rural businesses, new or expanded tourism development and homeworking will be supported when:
a. They are appropriate within the local landscape setting;
b. They would not have a significant adverse impact on tranquillity or residential amenity;
c. They would not result in a detrimental impact on road safety or traffic congestion and include suitable access and on site vehicle parking.”*

LPA – Happy with the proposed changes, summarises and combines, avoiding repetition.

Agree to the amendments suggested by the examiner

15. **GAR10 – Highways** – Would the QB explain what is meant in criterion c) by “materials more appropriate to urban locations”. Would the QB and LPA comment on the suggested revision to criterion c) as follows:

“Car and vehicle parking should be appropriately sited and screened within the landscape and should be surfaced with materials appropriate to the rural location.”

DM response I am happy with the suggested wording but would be helpful is the QB could clarify what is being promoted in a rural location – concrete, tarmac, gravel – all of which will be found in the Parish.

Criterion c) is to prevent the use of tarmac and other such urban materials. Agree with the revisions to Policy GAR10

Would the QB confirm which parts of the parish are served by public transport and confirm the types of development that would be required to implement criterion d).

The public transport map is attached. Garway and Broad Oak is shown in 6c and 7c along the main roads in the parish. This criterion is aimed at providing footways/footpaths through the villages to the bus stops to improve pedestrian facilities between the residential properties and the bus stops.

I hope that the questions have been addressed fully and if you have any further queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards
Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning



 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

To: 'Rosemary Kidd'

Subject: RE: FW: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

Dear Rosemary,

Thank you for your response. We will contact the QB to confirm this.

Kind regards
Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

Stay Safe  **Keep Healthy**  **Support Local** 

SAFE  **HEREFORDSHIRE**

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Rosemary Kidd
Sent: 13 August 2020 16:08

To: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: FW: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Stephanie

Thank you for sending me this information.

My reading of the Steering Group Minutes referred to is that when the SG reviewed Kirkwells Sites Assessment Report they decided that they wanted to give greater weight to the scoring on PDL, access and deliverability and revised the scoring of all the sites on these factors. They considered that site 17 was PDL and revised the scoring under this factor. The revised table (prepared by the SG) shows the best scoring sites as 16, 18 and 17 and was subject to consultation at Reg 14. The three best scoring sites were assessed in the Environmental Report. The boundary of site 17 was revised to include the buildings.

Sites 16 and 17 are allocated under Policy GAR1 and included in the Settlement Boundary. Site 18 is not allocated but is included in the Settlement Boundary.

I shall be grateful if you would confirm with the QB that my understanding is correct.

Kind regards

Rosemary Kidd MRTPI
Independent Examiner

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Kitto, Stephanie](#)

Sent: 13 August 2020 10:53

To: [Rosemary Kidd](#)

Cc: [Banks, Samantha](#)

Subject: FW: FW: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

Dear Rosemary,

We have been in touch with the QB to obtain a response to your further questions regarding the site selection justification.

Please see the email trail below, which includes a response from the Consultant, as instructed by the QB, and approval of the response of this from the QB. Included is a copy of the email response in full from the Consultant in the attachments, however the site assessments are also attached directly to this email.

Kind regards
Stephanie

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

Stay Safe  **Keep Healthy**  **Support Local** 
SAFE  **HEREFORDSHIRE**

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Mark Hearne <clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk>
Sent: 13 August 2020 09:50
To: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Chris Strange
Subject: Re: FW: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Morning Steph

Cllr Strange has canvassed the views of the Parish Councillors and they have confirmed that they are content to approve the recent response from Kirkwells to the Examiner's supplementary questions.

Regards

Mark

Stay Safe  **Keep Healthy**  **Support Local** 

SAFE  **HEREFORDSHIRE**

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Claire
Sent: 11 August 2020 14:10
To: Mark Hearne <clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk>
Cc: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>; Banks, Samantha <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi all

In response to the examiners questions, I have attached the final Site Assessment report which was amended after comments at Regulation 14. I have also attached the same report as V1 with the amended site plan for Site 18

With regards to the selection of sites 16 and 17 as follows:

The Steering Group decided they wanted a local weighting and considered that there were errors in the scoring. These resulted in the changes to the scoring for the consultation. This is partly documented in the Steering group notes on the PC website dated 3 April 2018, 25 April 2018 and 9th May 2018. I was not at any of these meetings, although I was sent the information following the meeting.

One of the disputes in relation to site 17 was brownfield or greenfield. I was of the opinion it was greenfield, however, the Steering group considered it to be brownfield as it had been a lorry park in the past. The PC consider the site at Little Newlands to be a previously developed land site appropriate for future development on the entrance to the village. The site had previously been used as a commercial bus depot around 1981 to 1989. Since that time, the site has also been sublet to Bull transport as a satellite lorry park since 2008. This information was provided by the PC following the publication of the site Assessment report (see response to Comment 7 at regulation 14).

With regard to site 16, the site adjacent to the old school had previously been granted planning permission for the erection of new dwellings and this had expired. The Steering Group thought it appropriate to allocate the site as it scored well and was well located in the centre of the village

Regards

Claire

Claire Bradley Dip TP

Director

Kirkwells Planning Consultants

Lancashire Digital Technology Centre

Bancroft Road

Burnley

Lancashire

BB10 2TP

Telephone: 01282 872570

Mobile: 07977853397

www.kirkwells.co.uk

On Tue, 11 Aug 2020 at 09:40, Mark Hearne <clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Claire

You will note from the e-mail below that the Examiner has sought clarification on a couple of issues connected with various sites in the Sites Assessment Report.

There is a degree of urgency in responding to the Examiner so it would be very much appreciated if you could let us have your comments by the end of this week.

I am currently on leave so could you direct your response to Stephanie Kitto and Sam Banks copied to me.

Thank you

Mark Hearne

From: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 August 2020 15:22
To: Chris Strange
Cc: Fagan, Toni (Cllr) <Toni.Fagan@herefordshire.gov.uk>; Banks, Samantha <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Garway NDP - Examiners further questions

Dear Chris,

Thank you for returning my call earlier. Following on from our conversation, please see a summary of what the Examiner is asking for regarding the Garway NDP.

The Examiner has been sent a copy of the draft Sites Assessment Report dated 29/3/2018 where site 17 (Newlands) scored 9.25. This has evidently been revised downwards to 7 in the table (headed Appendix 1) in Appendix 2 of the Consultation Statement dated June 2018. The Examiner would be grateful if you supply her with a copy of the final version of the Sites Assessment Report and a summary of the reasons for selecting / rejecting the various sites?

The Examiner would also like to see the justification specifically for the selection of sites 16 and 17 which were put forward as allocations in the NDP.

It was also picked up that the location plan for site 18 is incorrect in the draft Site Assessment Report.

Kind regards

Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI

Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Neighbourhood Planning Team

Herefordshire Council

Plough Lane

Hereford

HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk

www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

To: 'Rosemary Kidd'

Subject: FW: Further clarification from the Examiner

Dear Rosemary,

Please find an email trail below relating to your request for clarification. The QB and Consultant have confirmed that your understanding of the situation is correct.

Kind regards

Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI
Neighbourhood Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Tel: 01432 260411

email: stephanie.kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk
www.herefordshire.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

Stay Safe  **Keep Healthy**  **Support Local** 

SAFE  **HEREFORDSHIRE**

 Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this e-mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council.

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

From: Banks, Samantha <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Sent: 14 August 2020 09:29

To: Kitto, Stephanie <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Further clarification from the Examiner

FYI

From: Claire

Sent: 14 August 2020 09:18

To: Mark Hearne <clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk>

Cc: Chris Strange Banks, Samantha <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Further clarification from the Examiner

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mark

The Examiner's understanding of the situation is correct.

Regards

Claire

Claire Bradley Dip TP
Director
Kirkwells Planning Consultants
Lancashire Digital Technology Centre
Bancroft Road
Burnley
Lancashire
BB10 2TP
Telephone: 01282 872570
Mobile: 07977853397
www.kirkwells.co.uk

On Fri, 14 Aug 2020 at 09:08, Mark Hearne <clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Claire

May I trouble you further and ask you to offer a response to another request for clarification from the Examiner as you will see from below.

Regards

Mark

----- Original Message -----

From: "Kitto, Stephanie" <Stephanie.Kitto@herefordshire.gov.uk>

To: ""(clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk)""

<clerk@garwayparishcouncil.co.uk>, Chris Strange "[Fagan, Toni \(Cllr\)](mailto:Fagan, Toni (Cllr)@herefordshire.gov.uk)"

<Toni.Fagan@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Cc: "Banks, Samantha" <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>

Date: 13 August 2020 at 16:57

Subject: Further clarification from the Examiner

Dear all,

The Examiner has come back with the following:

My reading of the Steering Group Minutes referred to is that when the SG reviewed Kirkwells Sites Assessment Report they decided that they wanted to give greater weight to the scoring on PDL, access and deliverability and revised the scoring of all the sites on these factors. They considered that site 17 was PDL and revised the scoring under this factor. The revised table (prepared by the SG) shows the best scoring sites as 16, 18 and 17 and was subject to consultation at Reg 14. The three best scoring sites were assessed in the Environmental Report. The boundary of site 17 was revised to include the buildings.

Sites 16 and 17 are allocated under Policy GARI and included in the Settlement Boundary. Site 18 is not allocated but is included in the Settlement Boundary.

She has asked if I could confirm with the Parish Council that her understanding of the situation is correct.

Kind regards

Stephanie

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Stephanie Kitto AssocRTPI

Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Neighbourhood Planning Team