

**Hampton Bishop Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – July 2018**

**Table 1 Herefordshire Council Comments**

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Council Comments</b>	<b>Amendments to NP</b>
HC Planning	4	1.13 & 1.16			Details not completed re public consultation.	An earlier version of the Draft NDP was placed on the PC website in error but this was replaced with the final version at the earliest opportunity. (The earlier version did not include the finalised advice about the consultation process.)	No change.
		5.2.6			(Insert figure) still in text	Figure inserted.	No further change.
			HB9		Useful if appropriate names for these LGS could be considered.	The proposed Local Spaces will be deleted from the Submission NDP following objections from local landowners and residents.	No change.
			HB1	Support	Development in Areas of Flood Risk - In general conformity with SS7; SD3.	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
			HB2	Support	Design for Flood Resilience & Resistance – in general conformity with SS7 & SD3.	Noted.	No change.
			HB3	Support	Design to Reduce Surface Water Run-Off – in general conformity with SS7; SD3 & SD4.	Noted.	No change.
			HB4	Support	Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology – in general conformity with SS6 & LD4.  The policy could be given greater localised effect if some of the Parish’s heritage assets were to be defined for protection and listed within it. At present, the policy doesn’t expand much upon the criteria of its Core Strategy equivalent, LD4.	Noted.  The Parish Council may wish to consider identifying local heritage assets for protection at some point in the future but there is no intention at the current time to undertake this activity as part of the NDP process.	No change.
			HB5	Support	Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary – in general conformity with SS2, RA2, RA5, MT1, LD1-LD4 & SD3.	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
			HB6	Support	Building Design Principles for New Development – in general conformity with SS1, SS6, LD1 & SD1.	Noted.	No change.
HC Planning			HB7	Support	Landscape Design Principles - in general conformity with SS6 & LD1	Noted.	No change.
			HB8	Support	Green Infrastructure – in general conformity with SS6 & LD3.  As with HB4, also identifying existing green infrastructure corridors and linkages for protection in accordance with LD3 would enhance the policy.	Noted.  The Parish Council does not intend to undertake further work on the NDP at this stage or to introduce substantial new detail to policies which have been consulted upon at Reg 14.	No change.
			HB9	Support	Local Green Spaces – in general conformity with SS6 & OS3.	Noted.	No change.
			HB10	Support	Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford – in general conformity with SS6 & LD1.	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
			HB11	Support	Improving Traffic Management & Accessibility in Hampton Bishop – in general conformity with SS4 & MT1.	Noted.	No change.
HC Transport ation & Highways	Objective 2				Suggest rewording the objective. How this objective is achieved through traffic management & promoting walking and cycling doesn't seem to tie in with the contents of the objective.	Accepted.  Insert new Objective 3.  Amend Objective 2 to refer improving traffic and accessibility.	Amend NDP.  <b>Insert new Objective 3 and amend 4.2 to refer to <u>three</u> overarching objectives.</b>  <b><u>"Objective 3</u></b>  <b><u>To improve traffic management and accessibility for all in the Parish."</u></b>  <b><u>Delete 3rd and 4th bullet points under Objective 2 and insert both under new Objective 3.</u></b>
		5	HB11		The developments should also include provisions for cycle storage.	Accepted.  Insert new bullet point as suggested.	Amend NDP.  <b>Amend Policy HB11:</b> <b>Insert 3rd bullet point at end of policy:</b> <b><u>"including provisions for cycle storage."</u></b>
HC Environm					No site specifics have been identified, therefore unable	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
ental Health					to provide comment with regards to potential contamination.		
Ecology					<p>One of the most environmentally sensitive parishes in Herefordshire for development due to the River Wye SAC &amp; flood plain with the Lugg Meadows.</p> <p>The NDP correctly identifies this as a significant consideration. However, housing requirement is already met, and applications are within regulatory framework of planning for the parish.</p>	Noted.	No change.
Archaeology					Good plan regarding archaeology and draft Policy HB4 is particularly welcomed. There are some archaeological issues relating the Holywell Gutter Lane development but they are not of an over-riding nature.	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
HC Development Management					<p>For understandable reasons managing flood risk takes centre stage. I'd note that whilst mentioned in the text, I could only find one mention of preventing the loss of community facilities &amp; that is in HB5. I don't know how other NDPs have tackled this &amp; whether they've relied on the CS Policy SC1?</p> <p>There is also nothing on employment or communications infrastructure. There are some businesses in the parish and I'd presume that if anything became available the NDP would like some influence on what might go on in there instead? I'm thinking of the reclamation yard for instance. Do they</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to leave such matters as protection of community facilities and employment to the strategic policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Also Policy HB5 requires that proposals should not lead to the loss of existing community facilities.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
					need/want to identify employment land?		
		1.7			Cites evidence on bus use that is from 2006 & thus 12 years old.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>However, the NDP draws on the Parish Plan in terms of evidence from public consultation and issues to be addressed.</p> <p>The Parish Council has investigated whether there is more up to date information but was advised by Herefordshire Council that bus usage is collated on a route basis rather than parish basis. This was not thought to provide enough detail to the NDP area.</p>	No change.
		H5			Should this not reference policies HB1-3 in the bullet point that talks about not exacerbating flood risk elsewhere?	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Policy HB5 criterion 4 as suggested.</p>	<p><b>Amend Plan.</b></p> <p><b>Revise Policy HB5 criterion 4 to:</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
							<b><u>"Development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and meets the requirements set out in Policies HB1, HB2 and HB3";</u></b>
		HB5 (2)			<p>This talks about development having to be within or adjoining the main built up area, but surely this is unnecessary? Anything within the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle, so this wording could be struck out.</p> <p>I also wonder whether they need a rider to guard against every available plot coming forward within the settlement boundary, which might ruin the existing settlement pattern to which they attribute significant value.</p> <p>We've seen what settlement boundaries can do historically (in a bad</p>	<p>1. Accepted. Delete HB5(2) wording related to adjoining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>2. Accepted. Add further criterion to HB5 to refer to existing settlement pattern and density.</p>	<p><b>Amend Plan.</b></p> <p><b>Revise Policy HB5(2) to:</b> <b><u>"Development is well related to the existing village in terms of accessibility and location;</u></b></p> <p><b>Add further criterion and renumber others:</b> <b>HB5(3):</b> <b><u>"Development reflects the existing settlement pattern and density of the village which predominantly comprises single dwellings set in large garden plots. Residential development in rear gardens will be resisted where there would be an unacceptable impact on the character of the local area in terms of loss of openness, mature trees, and a substantial increase in the density of built form."</u></b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
					way) so are they content that every available building plot sized area should be accepted in principle or are there some areas that they might seek to protect/explicitly rule out?		
			5.2.6		The outline for the Rugby Club is not still live! The RMs were refused before Christmas.	Accepted. This was a drafting error. Delete first bullet point.	<b>Amend Plan.</b>  <b>Delete 5.2.6 first bullet point.</b>
		HB6			I think this can be more prescriptive & say that bad design will not be permitted.  It's OK to say that certain things will be "encouraged" but you really need to say what will not be acceptable. Such an approach i.e. saying bad design should not be permitted, is entirely consistent with the NPPF & CS.	Accepted.  Insert further text to criterion 1 as suggested.	<b>Amend Plan.</b>  <b>Revise HB6 (1): Insert new sentence at start of paragraph:</b> <b><u>"Poor quality design in new development will not be accepted."</u></b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
		HB11			<p>We don't have CIL. What contributions are they referring to without the Rugby Club? Can only be the Barratt site off Hampton Dene Road and I think the money from that is being spent on Hampton Dene Road; so this needs review; particularly if they're expecting more developer contributions.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>When Policy HB11 was drafted there was an expectation that a CIL charging schedule would be adopted by Herefordshire Council in the near future. However, the preliminary draft charging schedule 2016 has not been progressed and the proposed development at the Rugby Club has expired.</p> <p>It is hoped that as the NDP moves forward and gathers weight in decision making, there is unlikely to be major development in the parish over the plan period. Therefore, references to CIL could be deleted from the policy.</p>	<p><b>Amend Plan.</b></p> <p><b>Revise Policy HB11:</b> <b>Delete "<u>such as Community Infrastructure Levy</u>".</b></p>