Dinedor NDP examination – suggested response to examiner's questions

1.   Firstly, I am not sure what the following sentence in the first paragraph means, if you could offer further explanation that would be appreciated:

"providing that it is proportionate to the existing number and form of housing in the immediate area of the village."

This paragraph seeks to ensure that new housing development is proportionate to that amount of housing already existing in the immediate vicinity of the proposal. For example, if there are, say, 3 or 4 houses in large gardens in the immediate area a small proposal of 1 or 2 dwellings would be acceptable; a development proposal, of say, more than 2 would not. The smaller proposal being considered proportionate, the larger proposal not. This principle could then be used in other circumstances. For example areas of the village where there are larger groups of homes a larger proposal, may be acceptable. This will ensure development will be in keeping with the scale and form of the village.

2.   Secondly, I cannot see the criteria used for determining the settlement boundary in the justification for the policy, and so I am assuming you are following the guidance produced by Herefordshire Council (attached for your information). This states that sites with planning permission will normally be included within the boundary if they are within the settlement. In this regard I am concerned that several sites with permission have been left out, in the vicinity of The Oaks, and P174094/F at Offas Dene, the other end of the village. Can you please explain the thinking here, and what criteria justify the exclusion of these permissions? I would also suggest that with the extra land included along the road leading to the B4399 (already with permissions), it is hard to justify excluding the homes further along this lane (which include The Oaks). They are an extension of what is a small village strung out on three lanes.

The Herefordshire Settlement Boundary guidance was used as the basis for drawing up the boundary. Planning consent has overtaken the original NDP identified area for development. Therefore we should include the sites with planning permission inside the village boundary and identify these as commitment sites.

3.   Proposed Rights of Way extensions (Policy D): Figure 3 in your Plan shows several places where the Rights of Way network could be enhanced. One such route is making use of Watery Lane, and while this looks a good proposal, the problem is that some of it would appear to be outside of Dinedor Parish. If this is the case, I'm afraid this section will either need deleting, or showing differently, and a key explaining that that section could link but is in an adjoining parish. Can you please confirm or not that a section of this path is outside of the Parish, and if so how you would like to show it on Figure 3. You can designate Watery Lane where it is the boundary of the Parish. I have copied a section of the OS map 1:25,000 series to show why I have come to this conclusion. The parish boundary is shown as a series of dots here. You will be aware that your Plan can only deal with land within the designated neighbourhood area – the Parish of Dinedor.

It is accepted that the some of the footpath is located outside the parish and should be deleted. A map detailing the neighbourhood area boundary has been attached, a red circle highlights the area that falls within the neighbourhood area.

I have some supplementary questions concerning the Consultation Statement:

1. The response table for Reg14 comments lists residents only as a number. This is acceptable as long as you retain the information as to who each number represents. Planning responses cannot be anonymous, so please confirm that you could identify the person if called upon to do so.

    Records were anonymised by the Parish Council, but the originals are retained and individual respondents could be identified if called upon to do so.

2. There are a couple of rows in the same table that are blank for the 'Respondent' column. I have assumed they are Resident 20 and Resident 27, please confirm that this is so.

3. Yes, these should read "resident".

Resr

137

125

Watery Lane

Rough Hill

116

Camp Farm

Dinedor Hill

Spr

Dinedor

Well Cottage

W

Glebe Farm

68

W

W

Earthworks

Spr

Dinedor Common

Dinedor Camp

175

The Hollow Farm

182

DINEDOR CP

150

135

120

Resr

89

Spr

100

85

75

99

Dinedor Cross Farm

102