

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

Consultee	Comments	MMNDP Response	Action Required
Informal Pre-Regulation 16 Consultation			
Herefordshire Council Neighbourhood Planning, Strategic Policy & Development Management 26/9/17	<p>Meeting between planning officers, Working Group Chair and Foxley-Tagg Planning to discuss variance of views about policy treatment of Rushall and Kynaston, settlement boundaries and housing site allocations.</p> <p>In discussion we agreed to:</p> <p>Continue to treat Rushall & Kynaston as a single settlement within the meaning of CS Policy;</p> <p>Delete Land by The Steppes, and Land behind Bridge Cottage from the proposed 'Allocated sites' at Kynaston;</p> <p>Retain the Old Chapel site as a proposed 'Allocated site' for up to 5 new dwellings.</p> <p>The Constraints Map was deemed helpful in illustrating the difficulty of identifying sites for development in and around Much Marcle village centre.</p>	<p>Continue to treat Rushall & Kynaston as a single settlement within the meaning of CS Policy RA2.</p> <p>Delete infill sites (Land by The Steppes, and Land behind Bridge Cottage) from housing site allocations at Kynaston.</p> <p>Retain the Old Chapel site as a housing site allocation for up to 5 new dwellings at Kynaston.</p>	<p>Meeting held 26/9/17 – report on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p> <p>Infill sites (Land by The Steppes and land behind Bridge Cottage) withdrawn from housing site allocations.</p>
Herefordshire Council Neighbourhood Planning, Strategic Policy & Development Management 12-15/9/17	<p>Strategic Policy and Neighbourhood Planning have no objection in principle to considering Rushall and Kynaston as a single settlement based upon clear evidence. Development Management (14/9/17) do not consider this approach un-implementable and state “<i>a small number of dwellings here would be preferable to pressure in other less sustainable and potentially</i></p>	<p>Agreed with regard to treatment of Rushall and Kynaston as a single settlement, and accept concerns about potential impacts of infill sites on settings of listed buildings.</p>	<p>Infill sites (Land by The Steppes and land behind Bridge Cottage) withdrawn from housing site allocations.</p>

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

	<p><i>more impactful locations</i>”, but express concerns about two infill sites within curtilages of listed buildings.</p> <p>Expect to see housing supply divided into categories of allocated, windfall and exception sites (based on sound evidence). <i>“There were 33 houses completed in 1996 – 2011, [and] all of these were ‘windfall’ development”</i> (Strategic Planning 12/9/17).</p> <p>Development Management (15/9/17) subsequently state <i>“Kynaston is an unsustainable location”</i> when assessed against NPPF.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Further meeting requested with Council planning officers to discuss variance in their responses.</p>	<p>Table added to Plan, which shows proposed housing supply figures in each category.</p> <p>Meeting held 26/9/17 – report on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p>
<p>Herefordshire Council Neighbourhood Planning & Strategic Policy 24/1/17</p>	<p>Meeting between planning officers, Ward Councillor Barry Durkin (Old Gore), Working Group Chair and Foxley-Tagg Planning to discuss Regulation 14 consultation responses.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning confirmed that the MMNDP must pass all four tests of conformity with planning policy.</p> <p>Strategic Planning stated that if a detailed and well-evidenced written case is made to treat Kynaston and Rushall as a joint settlement within the meaning of Policy RA2, Herefordshire Council would consider it. This case should be published as a supporting document on the MMPC website.</p> <p>Strategic Planning advised that supporting text on settlement boundaries should ‘anchor’ the approach taken within the MMNDP to criteria in Herefordshire</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Meeting held 24/1/17 – report on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p> <p>Working Group produced an Exception Case for Kynaston and published it on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p> <p>Additional text added, settlement boundaries assessed against Guidance Note 20 criteria with minor</p>

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

	<p>Council Guidance Note 20 – guide to settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Planning officers advised that MMNDP Working Party should produce a composite constraints map of Much Marcle to illustrate the shortage of land suitable for development within the Plan Period.</p> <p>Overall approach to housing site allocation within the Regulation 14 consultation draft Plan and priority given to affordable housing were discussed.</p>	Agreed.	<p>revisions to boundaries made subsequently.</p> <p>Composite constraints map for Much Marcle produced and included in revised draft Plan.</p>
Regulation 14 Consultation Responses			
<p>Neighbourhood Planning 12/12/16</p>	<p>Detailed comments have been already made prior to regulation 14 Much Marcle draft NDP in September 2016. In response to the comments made, the NDP group have accepted the majority of the comments and have amended their plan.</p> <p>Policy MM12- Could include how your Local green spaces comply with paragraph 77 of the NPPF. This will help strengthen your justification.</p> <p>Please add the PSMA licence to all of the maps you intend to use in your consultations and publications.</p>	<p>Comments about specific housing site allocations considered and majority have been accepted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Housing site allocations amended.</p> <p>Text amended and text box added to show how green spaces comply with para 77 of NPPF.</p> <p>PSMA licence number added to maps.</p>
<p>Development Management 16/11/16</p>	<p>With regards Much Marcle, the [settlement] boundary seems sensible, but some of the allocations (next to single dwellings, or very modest groups) appear not to be so with regards connectivity etc. In particular the sites to the west of the A449 seemed to be at odds with all that the NPPF and CS promote.</p>	<p>Comments about specific housing site allocations considered and majority have been accepted.</p>	<p>Housing site allocations amended.</p>

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

	<p>The site to the east of Glebe Orchard is considered to have potential.</p> <p>Dobbins Pitch is an unsustainable location, in regards to highways and ecology.</p> <p>Rushall is a figure 4:15 settlement, but Kynaston is not. To allocate this number of allocated sites in such unsustainable locations would conflict with the NPPF and CS.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Partially agreed – see Exception Case for Kynaston published on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p>	<p>Site allocated for housing, subject to habitat compensation for loss of Priority BAP Habitat.</p> <p>Site withdrawn from housing site allocations.</p> <p>Following discussions about the Exception Case for Kynaston with Strategic Planning & Development Management on 26/9/17, in principle agreement was reached to treat Rushall & Kynaston as a single settlement within scope of CS Policy RA2, and housing site allocations were amended accordingly.</p>
<p>Planning Policy 11/11/16</p>	<p>Are there any assurances that the identified sites to be used for housing are deliverable?</p> <p>Are they going to be available to come forward for development in the plan period?</p> <p>Are there any facilities that there is an identified need or desire for in the Parish that are not currently provided, but could be sought with new development?</p> <p>Settlements that are not identified in Figures 4.14 and 4.15 of the Core Strategy, which applies to Kynaston, should be treated in policy terms as countryside. Any new housing development here would therefore need to accord with the criteria of Policy RA3. This limits the scope for the delivery of any significant housing development in this location.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes – see Consultation Summary Report published on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p> <p>Partially agreed – see Exception Case for Kynaston published on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org</p>	<p>Owners of all the housing site allocations (including redundant buildings for conversion) have been approached and replied affirming their willingness to bring sites forward in the plan period.</p> <p>Following discussions about the Exception Case for Kynaston with Strategic Planning & Development Management on 26/9/17, in principle agreement was reached to treat Rushall & Kynaston as a single settlement within scope of CS Policy</p>

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

			RA2, and housing site allocations were amended accordingly.
Environmental Health 10/11/16	We recommend additional criterion to Policy MM3 on Housing Sites ...complement adjacent properties, would not result in loss of amenity for existing residents and <i>where the amenity of future residential occupants is not impacted by existing development</i> . This is to ensure that future residential occupants are not nuisanced as a result of existing business activity. (agricultural/industrial/commercial).	Not agreed.	The intended outcome of this additional criterion will be achieved by the choice of housing site allocations.
Environmental Health – Air Water Waste 29/11/16	Refer to historical use as orchards of various housing land allocations and possible legacy of contamination from spraying practices; and to the Hazerdine site as a former sand and clay quarry.	Nil	None
Natural England 01/12/16	No specific comments.		
Historic England 28/11/16	Supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it. <i>“The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness and the protection of rural landscape character including important views is commendable. We consider the Plan takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the area. Beyond that observation we have no substantive comments to make on what Historic England considers is a good example of community led planning.”</i>		
Environment Agency 01/12/16	<i>“Whilst we welcome reference to flood risk within the Draft Plan we would not, in the absence of any specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment at this time.”</i>		

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

Severn Trent Water 23/11/16	Generic response – no specific comments.		
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (undated)	Generic response stated “ <i>There are no issues with supplying any of the proposed allocations with a supply of potable water, though in some instances the provision of off-site water mains may be required in order to connect to the existing network.</i> ”		
CPRE Herefordshire Branch 08/11/16	No specific comments.		
Anthony & Virginia Carlton Hill View Much Marcle HR8 2NX 21/11/16	Practical difficulties with affordable housing provision at Old Pike and excessive traffic movements.	Issues raised are similar to those in previous email correspondence to which the Working Group responded by letter dated 15/7/16. Mr & Mrs M & WP Miller of Dingle Cottage HR8 2NU raised similar issues in a letter dated 23/4/16.	Working Group Chair responded by further letter dated 26/2/17 to invite Mr & Mrs Carlton to attend a meeting on 6/3/17, which they declined (non-attendance).
Judy Brierley The Row Much Marcle HR8 2NU 30/11/16	Additional social housing at Old Pike does not comply with the MMNP’s own guidelines for the following reasons: traffic hazards, distance from and accessibility to community facilities, loss of informal play area, impact on personal business.	Issues raised are similar to those in previous letter dated 24/4/16 to which the Working Group responded by letter dated 20/5/16.	Working Group Chair responded by further letter dated 26/2/17 to invite Mrs Brierley to attend a meeting on 6/3/17, which she declined. Mrs Brierley subsequently met the Chair on 9/3/17 to discuss her concerns.
Peter & Alice Montague-Fuller Gatchapin Farm Rushall HR8 2PE 23/12/16	Allocation of 50% housing growth to Rushall and Kynaston seems disproportionate. Allocation of housing land opposite Rushall Club is flawed – not brownfield and would lose car park area. Allocation of housing land at rear of Council Houses	Incorrect analysis of proposed housing site allocations and new housing built/committed since 2011. Agreed. Agreed.	Public meeting held at Rushall Club on 23/1/17 and residents invited to join Working Group – see report on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org Housing land allocation opposite Rushall Club withdrawn. Housing land allocation at rear of

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

	(Orchard View) impacts agricultural land with drainage/flood risk issues and existing residents' views. Rushall Settlement Boundary does not follow any physical feature.	Agreed.	Orchard View withdrawn. Rushall Settlement Boundary amended by local residents and endorsed by Working Group.
Julian & Alison Baldwin The Walkers Rushall HR8 2PE 29/12/16	Similar comments to Montague-Fullers with addition: Housing allocations and settlement policies are flawed. Much Marcle Conservation Area used as excuse for imposing growth on outlying hamlets.	See above.	See above.
Robert & Mary Jolly Jubilate Rushall HR8 2PE 30/12/16	Similar comments to Montague-Fullers and Baldwins with addition: Lack of definition of what is a “developed frontage” would make policy difficult to apply.	See above. Agreed.	See above. Policy and justification wording amended.
Doreen Pockwell Clems Cottage Rushall 3/1/17	Allocation of housing land opposite Rushall Club is flawed – not brownfield and would lose car park area.	Agreed.	Housing land allocation opposite Rushall Club withdrawn.
Sian Nunn 2 Orchard View Rushall 3/1/17	Similar comments to Montague-Fullers, Baldwins and Jollys.	See above.	See above.
Stuart McCarthy Orchard View Rushall 3/1/17	Similar comments to Montague-Fullers, Baldwins and Jollys.	See above.	See above.

Much Marcle Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement Summary – please read together with the Consultation Summary Report V1.5-19/05/17 available for scrutiny on www.muchmarcleparishcouncil.org

Informal Pre-Regulation 14 Consultation			
Herefordshire Council Neighbourhood Planning 23/9/16	<i>"I think the best way forward to be able for you to allocate housing sites in Kynaston, is to include this as part of the Rushall settlement; as stated in your plan. I have spoken with [Strategic Planning] on this matter and think this is possibly the best solution, if you want to have housing sites within Kynaston. Acceptability of including Kynaston as part of Rushall can be further determined at Regulation 14 consultation, Regulation 16 consultation and at Examination"</i> (email response from Neighbourhood Planning).	Agreed.	Confirmed approach to treat Rushall & Kynaston as a single settlement within scope of CS Policy RA2.