

Results of the
Public Consultation on the Neighbourhood Development Plan
For
Stretton Grandison Group Parishes
V2 Updated September 2019

Andy Towers 10 July 2019
(Updated by Kirkwells, September 2019)

Contents	Page No
Introduction	3
Summary of Results in Numbers	4
Comment & Discussion:	
Q1: Would you prefer large or small Sites for development?	7
Q2: Ranking of Sites	8
Q3: Do you support Draft Policy SG1 Settlement Boundaries?	13
Q4: Do you support Draft Policy SG3 Affordable Housing at CFC?	14
Q5: Do you support Draft Policy SG4 Housing Mix?	15
Q6: Do you support Draft Policy SG5 Protecting Local Landscape Character and Wildlife:	16
Q7: Do you support Draft Policy SG6 Design Guidelines for Stretton Grandison Conservation Area?	17
Q8: Do you support Draft Policy SG7 Design Principles - Protecting And Enhancing Heritage and Local Character?	18
Q9: Do you support Draft Policy SG8 Design Principles - Promoting High Quality and Sustainable Design?	19
Q10: Do you support Draft Policy SG9 Re-Use of Former Agricultural Buildings and Poly Tunnels?	20
Q11: Do you support Draft Policy SG10 New Agricultural Buildings And Poly Tunnels?	21
Q12: Do you support Draft Policy SG11 Community-Led Renewable Energy Schemes?	22
Q13: Do you support Draft Policy SG12 Reducing Flood Risk?	23
Q14: Any Other Comments about the NDP?	24
Public Meetings and Documents Received	26
Conclusions	27

Introduction:

A copy of the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, (NDP), for the Stretton Grandison Group of parishes, (Stretton Grandison, Upper and Lower Eggleton, Canon Frome and Castle Frome), was delivered to each household in the area at the beginning of June 2019.

Householders were asked to read the plan and to express their agreement/disagreement with the policies on the accompanying questionnaire, together with any additional comments.

Three open meetings were held during June where parishioners could discuss any matters requiring clarification with members of the NDP steering group.

Questionnaires were collected from households at the end of June 2019.

177 questionnaires were issued and 120 completed questionnaire returned; a response rate of 68%.

A further completed questionnaire was submitted at the NDP Steering Group meeting on 18th September 2019 by one of the Steering Group members, bringing the total number to 121. The overall response rate remained at 68%. The completed responses have been added to this report.

A few people thought that there should have been a questionnaire for each parishioner rather than one per household. They requested additional copies and have been included in the results. (7 instances)

Some respondents chose not to answer all the questions,

Some respondents chose not to supply age and gender information.

Summary of Results in Numbers

Options for Housing Sites

Q1: Would you prefer:

A: Development concentrated on large sites	Votes: 44
Or	
B: Development spread across smaller sites	Votes: 71

Q2: Ranking of Sites*

Large Sites: Site 11	Points: 111
Site 12	Points: 127
Site 13**	Points: 167
Small Sites: Site 1	Points: 198
Site 5	Points: 259
Site 6	Points: 228
Site 10	Points: 146

* Points are the total of the ranks given to each site. Hence the max score for a large site would be $3 \times 121 = 363$, and for a small site $4 \times 121 = 484$.

** The validity of Site 13 was challenged during the consultation. See the comment and discussion section for clarification.

Q3: Do you support Policy SG1 Settlement Boundaries:

Yes: **86**

No: **29**

Q4: Do you support Policy SG3 Affordable Housing at Canon Frome Court?

Yes: **97**

No: **20**

Q5: Do you support Policy SG4 Housing Mix?

Yes: 94

No: 17

Q6: Do you support Policy SG5 Protecting Local Landscape Character & Wildlife?

Yes: 110

No: 4

Q7: Do you support Policy SG6 Design Guidelines for Stretton Grandison Cons'n Area?

Yes: 104

No: 10

Q8: Do you support Policy SG7 Design Principles – Protecting & Enhancing Heritage & Local Character?

Yes: 103

No: 2

Q9: Do you support Policy SG8 Design Principles – Promoting High Quality & Sustainable Design?

Yes: 100

No: 14

Q10: Do you support Policy SG9 Re-use of Former Agricultural Buildings for Local Economic Development?

Yes: 105

No: 9

Q11: Do you support Policy SG10 New Agricultural Buildings & Poly Tunnels?

Yes: 72

No: 38

Q12: Do you support Policy SG11 Community-Led Renewable Energy Schemes?

Yes: **104**

No: **7**

Q13: Do you support Policy SG12 Reducing Flood Risk?

Yes: **105**

No: **9**

Q14, Any Other Comments?, is included in the discussion and comments section.

Some respondents did not provide an answer to all the questions, so all the responses do not total to 120.

Comment & Discussion

Comments are listed under the question to which they were supplied.

Numbers in brackets, (), show the number of times the comment was made.

Q1: Do you prefer development on large or small sites?

Result: For Large Sites: **44** For Small Sites: **71**

Some respondents were unhappy about making a choice based on site size and felt pressurised by the affordable housing condition.

10 people opted not to make a preference; **5** people opted to choose both.

This is detailed in Comments Q14.

This question did not ask for comment, which was a mistake in hindsight. Consequently, there were a lot of answers under Q2 which are actually comments on Q1. A number of people felt that the fact that Affordable Housing could only be a mandatory planning requirement for larger schemes was not made sufficiently clear. This can be seen in the quoted comments below.

Comments:

“Phrasing of the question is unhelpful in implying that only large developments will have affordable housing.”

“Neither A nor B is preferable. Would prefer affordable housing on smaller sites” (8)

“We need affordable housing so will have to accept a large development.” (3)

“A large development would help generate a community”

“The infrastructure is not set up for more housing”

“Part B is inaccurate regarding affordable housing.”

“Don’t like Q1; Affordable housing could be on Site 13 for 11 houses with the addition one or two smaller sites to make up the rest”

“For Q1 we would prefer to have a combination of A & B, i.e. the affordable housing at Canon Frome Court combined with houses built at a variety of the other sites.”

“I find it difficult to answer this on an ‘either – or’ basis. Unfortunately, asking the question like this may have inadvertently restricted those responding to answering in a constrained way and may influence the consultation results.

My preference would be for housing development spread across several small sites; however, for reasons that follow, I believe that one large site may be preferable to some of the smaller sites proposed. Therefore my final ranked preference would include certain small sites; then certain large sites then (the rest of the sites in descending order). The questionnaire in its current format would not allow others sharing similar views to record this response.”

“I cannot make a ‘large’ or ‘small’ site preferred decision. I have considered each site independently on its impact and merit. No site would be preferable “

Ranking of Sites

Q2: Asked for either the large sites or the small site to be ranked, dependant on the option chosen in Q1.

Echoing the sentiments expressed under Q1 comments, a large proportion ranked both large and small sites. All these rankings are included in the results figures.

Large Sites:

Results: For Site 11: **111** For Site 12: **127** For Site 13: **167**

General Comments:

“Not clear about the ranking options”

“Strongly disagree with large sites”

“Large sites are the least disruptive overall”

“Large sites have the most room”

“Need more affordable housing in rural areas for young families” (4)

“We don’t need an estate but we do need some affordable housing

“Affordable housing is only available under option A” (2)

“Affordable housing is inappropriate in rural areas; it needs to be close to towns with jobs and lower travelling costs.” (2)

“One large estate with all 18 houses would be a blot on the rural landscape, regardless of disguising features.” (2)

“The larger sites are near busy roads, already less rural”

“one large site would be dangerous due to the extra traffic generated.”

Site Specific Comments:

Site 11:

Development of Site11 would:

“Obstruct views of the church” (7)

“Be prone to flooding” (9)

Site 11 experiences regular ground water flooding. Its surface level is higher than the adjoining Nurses Cottage. Any development on Site11 would affect the land drainage and make flooding of Nurses Cottage by run-off very probable.”

“Be disproportionate to the size of the village” (4)

“Be an eyesore to existing residents” (2)

“Depress prices of other properties in the village”

“Would not fit with Herefordshire Core Strategy”

“Would be in conflict with Policy SG5 protecting local character and landscape”

“Be too near a dangerous corner of the A417 with ongoing speeding issues.” (6)

“Would provide a balance of old and new”

“Be not acceptable at all”

“Site 11 is in a rural area and could stand a few houses opposite the church but not a large development”

“Stretton Grandison is the only village with a church, a conservation area and listed buildings which would be visually impacted by development” (2)

“Site 11 is visible from the road from some distance and has no existing screening.”

“Affordable housing would not be in keeping with existing neighbouring properties.”

“Access can be achieved without emerging directly onto the A417”

“A small development on this site would leave the door open for a later, greater expansion of numbers”

“Development on this site would result in a large increase of traffic through Homend Park, which is already dangerous.” (2)

Site 12:

“Multiple access onto the A4103 could be disastrous” (5)

“Site has good access to Hereford and Worcester” (2)

“Site 12 could develop into a self-contained community”

“Development at site 12 would have the least impact on the villages”

“Infill is preferable to new estates”

“Better to infill than build a soulless block of new houses” (2)

“This site would infill parcels of land not suitable for farming” (3)

“Considerable drainage work would be required”

“Does not appear to impact on significant landscape” (2)

“Lower Eggleton has no amenities.

Site 13: [The most preferred large site but planning & owners intentions to be clarified]

“Site 13 is the one location where affordable housing is written in” (3)

“Site 13 is already a largish community with amenities such as shop, pub, restaurant etc and good transport links.” (23)

“Site 13 has good main road access in a speed controlled area” (7)

“Would have low visual impact” (3)

“Is the most sensible of the larger sites” (2)

“Is not prone to flooding”

“More housing could enhance the possibility of better community facilities.”

“Would have low impact on the existing character.”

Frome's Hill is by far the most appropriate (large) site. There are already more recently built houses across the main road, so new buildings would fit in better & would house more customers for the existing businesses.

Small Sites:

Results:

For Site1: **198** For Site 5: **259** For Site 6: **228** For Site 10: **146**

General Comments:

- “Why can’t affordable housing be made a planning criterion for small sites?” (6)
- “Several brownfield sites have been ruled out inappropriately”
- “(AECOM) site assessments do not meet reasonable standards”
- “Maximum site size should be 6 houses.”
- “Sites with impact on Heritage Assets should be avoided.”
- “The smaller sites would have less visual impact.” (3)
- “The smaller sites have no amenities.” (2)
- “All small sites are better than big sites.” (2)
- “The proposals are reasonable infill” (3)
- “Need to take account of tree preservation orders in Stretton Grandison.”
- “The better transport links are on the main(A4103) road, rather than creating hazards on the Canon Frome road.” (2)
- “Any new build should complement existing housing”. (2)
- “ The quality of our parishes is based on the integration of various ages of buildings and not being dominated by large modern estate, as has resulted in Bartestree and other local communities.”
- “Canon Frome is already a fully developed estate”.
- “Housing spread across small sites would be a better quality: have seen too many boxes put up by large companies recently in this area.”
- “The road through Stretton Grandison is dangerous; extra houses generate extra traffic.”
- “Stretton Grandison is not big enough to take any more properties.”

Site specific comments:

Site 1:

- “Site 1 is on the A 417 with already high volumes of speeding traffic.” (9)
- “Site 1 has good main road access in a speed controlled area.” (7)
- “Site 1 has the least visual impact on the heart of the village.” (2)
- “More development on site 1 seems overdue.” (2)
- “Development here should be in keeping with surrounding rural style properties – not affordable housing.”
- “This site is NOT infill. It is between listed buildings and adjacent to conservation/heritage buildings (3)
- “Stretton Grandison is already densely developed, with traffic problems.”
- “Too near main road”

Site 5:

- “Is not on A 417 therefore safer.” (2)
- “Has limited access on a busy road with no passing places.” (3)
- “Includes affordable housing.” (9)
- “Could easily be screened by tree planting.” (4)
- “Development intended as eco homes.”
- “There is already modern development in Canon Frome, so this would not be detrimental.”
- “Development not large enough to cause traffic problems.” (4)
- “Already has road access.” (4)

Site 6:

- “Is not on A 417 therefore safer.” (4)
- “Has limited access along a busy road with no passing places.” (4)
- “Does not complement existing housing.”
- “Would join up existing housing forming too big a mass.” (3)
- “Not large enough to create traffic problems.”
- “Already has road access.” (5)
- “Consider that site 6 would be overdeveloped.”
- “There is already modern development in Canon Frome, so this would not be detrimental.”
- “Site is not suitable for 6 dwellings.”

Site 10:

- “Is close to a dangerous junction on the A 417 with traffic volume and speed problems.” (13)
- “has limited access onto a road with no passing places.” (3)
- “Is in a conservation area so would be expensive to build sympathetically.” (10)
- “Has good main road access.”
- “Has the septic tank for Hopton Cottages.” (5)
- “Has masses of wildlife.” (3)
- “Is the habitat for a protected species of newt.” (2)
- “Has limited access.”
- “Would be overdeveloped at the proposed density.”
- “Stretton Grandison has listed buildings, heritage assets , a conservation area and is already densely developed, together with traffic problems.”
- “Development on Site 10 would completely change the whole look of Stretton Grandison , to the detriment of the village.” 2 instances
- “Site 10 should be for 2 houses maximum BUT would affect neighbouring property values.”

Site 7: Although ruled out by the AECOM assessment attracted one comment;

“Rochester House is more than suitable for development; score 4.”

Q3: Do you support Policy SG1 Settlement Boundaries?

Result: Yes: **86** No: **29**

Comments:

- “Why is Site 11 in the plan although outside the settlement boundary?” (3)
- “Development of Site 11 would be out of scale with the rest of Stretton Grandison” (2)
- “Sites 1 & 12 conflict with SG1 Point 3: no safe access onto the ‘A’ roads unless traffic calming structures built. Speed limits are not enforced. Sites 10 & 11 have exits onto the busy, high speed C1153, (Newton Cross bypass!) and are much too close to the dangerous junction with A 417. C1153 was originally a gated road and is not suitable as a rural through route. Housing on Site 11 would reduce food growing leading to more food imports.” (2)
- “Traffic restrictions and speed monitoring on A 417 also required.”
- “Site 11 would have a negative influence on the Conservation Area and the Grade 1 listed church.” (4)
- “[Re Site 11] The opinion of the heritage and landscape officers at Hereford Council should be sought.”
- “Site 10 is in the Conservation Area” (4)
- “Settlement Boundaries seem arbitrary”
- Settlement Boundaries appear to have no objective criteria” (2)
- “Canon Frome settlement boundary as drawn is inconsistent.”
- “Canon Frome Court boundary is incorrect.”
- “Rochester House boundary, Map 4, should include the garden.” (2)
- “Boundaries should include provisions for biodiversity protection and wildlife corridors.”
- “Don’t want any more houses in Canon Frome.”
- “Points 1 & 2 are in conflict when aiming modern design/technologies to be sympathetic to rural locations. Should be clarified.”
- “Point 1 is old fashioned. Climate change is the enemy; zero carbon footprint should be the main concern.”
- “Suggest Point 2 of SG3 be added to SG1.”
- “Points 4 & 6 are especially important.”
- “Point 6 should be expanded to include increasing performance to existing buildings.”
- “Point 5: Community allotments could be a benefit but orchards/gardens tend to become no-one’s responsibility.”
- “Disagree with Maps 3,4,5.” (2)
- “Council should limit development to towns and keep traffic there.” (2)
- “There are no amenities in our communities.”
- “There is a lack of service infrastructure; drainage, sewers, lighting, comms.”
- “Provision of broadband is key to keeping young families links in rural areas, otherwise they have to move to towns.”
- “Extra housing would benefit the businesses at Frome’s Hill.”
- “There are other parcels of land that have not been included but would be just as suitable.”
- “Should have ‘dark skies’ provision.”
- (4) Comments were made regarding Site 13 which are included in the discussion under Q14.

Q4: Do you support Policy SG3 Affordable Housing at Canon Frome Court (CFC)?

Result: Yes: **97**

No: **20**

Comments:

"An excellent way to get affordable housing without recourse to larger sites." (4)

"Seems to satisfy the NDP objective."

"CFC is the most suitable place for affordable housing."

"A good use of resources." (3)

"As long as it is within the confines of existing buildings." (4)

"Part of the site in the pre-planning application is outside the settlement boundary (2)

"No more housing in Canon Frome. More people and cars will spoil the area." (2)

"Affordable (subsidised) housing in rural areas with few employment opportunities is not suitable for low wage earners. They need to be closer to centres of employment to give maximum chances of finding reasonably paid jobs with lower travelling costs. (2)

"This development is not controlled by the Core Strategy Policy H1 @ If more than 10 market units then 40% affordable housing must be provided', so the residents of CFC must decide on this question."

"Point 4.39 is key: Housing should meet the needs of local people both for young families and those older looking to downsize." (2)

"CFC needs to be tidied up; it looks awful and run down. Could have lots of village amenities there."

"Unable to comment as don't know if all affordable housing residents would be part of the CFC community."

"The CFC community, after careful consideration wish to enhance the mix of residents to reflect wider society by developing affordable housing." (4)

"The character of the location must be maintained."

"Do not consider it practicable to do sympathetically to the character of existing buildings."

"Zero carbon footprint should be a criterion."

"The policy should include the provision of sufficient broadband."

"Access would be difficult without [residents] own transport."

"There should definitely be no further development at CFC with such a rich local history: Black Canons convent, Civil War siege, and most importantly a Roman archaeological site!"

Q5: Do you support Policy SG4 Housing Mix?

Result: Yes: **94**

No: **17**

Comments:

"Housing should be affordable for existing parishioners." (2)

"Youngsters should not be forced into towns by rural housing prices." (3)

"Over-emphasis on smaller homes might miss the real demand." (2)

"There should be a mix of housing types rather than focus on one sector." (3)

"[New developments] should be nearer to towns where there is access to facilities such as shops and hospitals." (2)

"Some control over buy-to-rent should be included."

"A proper mix should include large enough gardens."

"Prefer no new housing in Canon Frome."

"' Starter' homes very unsuitable for rural area. Occupants v likely to outgrow them quickly, requiring prohibitively expensive moves to more suitable accommodation, or overcrowding otherwise. Much more suitable for urban populations with many single people. Older people don't want to be housed in rural areas: they need ready access to medical and social facilities, friends and family. Looking after the disabled is not feasible in the countryside. Live/work accommodation.....would not only be unaffordable but would take up an unreasonable amount of land. The inhabitants of 'market' housing don't want to be integrated with those in 'affordable' housing, re-enforcing the class system rather than diluting it." (2)

"Enable people to stay in the area despite their economic status."

"Live/work needs to go hand-in-hand with infrastructure such as broadband."

"Individually sited affordable homes could be included on infill sites if the present landowners and neighbours agree."

"Policy SG4 needs supporting infrastructure, such as schools, buses, broadband, road width and quality."

"Don't want [to rely on] large developments to bring in affordable housing." (2)

"Large developments, such as those around Hereford, should be avoided as they appear to be large houses for commuters." (2)

"I have no confidence that the Policy would be enforced against pressure from developers and their legal representatives, as has been the case in recent developments elsewhere in England."

"Different community groups need different aspects of leisure, culture and specific dwelling types such as for the elderly and disabled."

"Affordable housing should be an essential feature regardless of the location chosen."

"Support [SG4] ONLY if smaller houses match existing houses for style and quality."

"Housing mix needs to encourage a good age distribution."

"Housing designed to support older people does not make sense as there are no regular buses or other support facilities."

"Support for SG4 would mean an influx of undesirable classes, which would be more suited to urban areas."

"More housing means more vehicles on already busy and dangerous roads."

"There are no facilities at Stretton Grandison. Development of Site 11 would ruin the village."

"Site 11 has the potential to overwhelm the character of Stretton Grandison. It would spoil views to and from the church and cause traffic problems at the A 417 junction."

Q6: Do you support Policy SG5 Protecting Local Landscape Character and Wildlife?

Result: Yes: **110** No: **4**

Comments:

"It is important to protect: Homend Park
Mature woodland
Green lanes
Old meadows
Dark skies
Views to and from Stretton Grandison church"

"Developers should be obliged to enact/fulfil landscape plans." (4)

"Need to protect and increase bio-diversity." (4)

"Landscaping should include new hedgerows." (2)

"We need new tree planting."

"Must protect wildlife." (4)

"Should keep the landscape basically as it is." (3)

"This [policy] includes retention of a dispersed settlement pattern which would mitigate against larger sites." (3)

"The landscape would be very adversely affected if all the housing requirement was to be lumped onto one site, particularly Site 11. It would be impossible to screen such developments adequately in the same way as individual or small plots; SG5 says 'The dispersed settlement pattern should be retained.' {Similarly, large scale renewable energy installations should not be permitted.}"

"I am particularly worried about light pollution, e.g. the new floodlit arena at Meephill, Canon Frome."

"Environmental impact studies should be considered paramount, not glossed over."

"I would support any regeneration of the Hereford – Gloucester canal."

"Riverside meadows should not be built on."

"Prime farming land should not be built on."

Only scrub and infertile land should be built on."

"To maintain this policy, Sites 10 & 11 should be removed from consideration." (2)

"Site 11 will not meet the criteria of SG5."

"Site 11 is totally unsuitable as it is partially on a flood plain and is not proportional to the existing settlement."

"Our parish group is unique in having some of the finest views in Herefordshire. There should be no damage to the area's distinctive character." (3)

"How were the monstrous chicken sheds allowed which blot the view from B?"

"DO NOT want street lighting in any of the group parishes."

Q7: Do you support Policy SG6 Design Guidelines for Stretton Grandison Conservation Area?

Result: Yes 104 No: 10

Comments:

“Any development in Stretton Grandison should be accompanied by Traffic Calming.” (2)

“Traffic speeds are too fast through the village.”

“There should be no development around or within the Conservation Area.” (4)

“Leave it to the existing Conservation Area rules.”

“The Conservation Area should be protected as an Heritage Asset.”

“There is no mention of sustainable construction/insulation” (2)

“Maintenance of wildlife habitats [should be included].”

“Buildings and materials should be in character.”

“Development on Sites 10 & 11, very close to or closely bounded by the Conservation Area, would overwhelm it. Houses on Site 11 would be a blot alongside the Conservation Area, and on Site 10 would destroy it from within. Any detailing of design in an attempt to suit the Area would be uneconomical, particularly for affordable homes.” (2)

“Site 11 should be discounted under this Policy to protect views to and from the church and other Heritage Assets in the Conservation Area.” (3)

“Point 5 is unnecessary. Point 6: There are better environmentally friendly solutions other than timber for window replacement.”

“Some leeway should be given to appropriate, innovative, tasteful, modern design.”

“There is a place for a more modern, eco-friendly approach to design. It is good to reflect that we are in 21st century and modern designs can complement tradition.”

“Support the Policy, but traditional materials often fail tests of sustainability/energy efficiency. We can’t have our cake and eat it!”

“Support the Policy so long as the Park is not destroyed.”

“Support [the Policy] with the caveat that most developers favour profit over design/build sensitivity; therefore they should be closely monitored to fulfil their brief.”

“Any new build should enhance the existing listed buildings.”

“The Policy should be extended to cover recently converted listed buildings such as Townsend Barns.”

“The Conservation Area shown on the map is inaccurate. It does NOT include the garden of Stretton Cottage.”

Q8: Do you support Policy SG7 Design Principles – Protecting and Enhancing Heritage and Local Character?

Result: Yes: 103 No: 2

Comments:

“This Policy is not consistent with intensive development or larger sites.”

“Any development should not change the nature of our locality.” (3)

“Larger developments would have a massive impact.” (2)

“The only new development should be to existing buildings.”

“I would not object to a modern eco-building with lots of glass, as it is important to embrace new technology.”

“Point 4 of SG7 is contradictory: if building is concentrated on ‘low densities on large plots’ then this is not congruent with ‘the dispersed settlement pattern’. The only places where the Policy statement ‘low densities in large plots and set back from the roadside’ might apply is Site 12.” (2)

“Point 4 is a request for ‘posh’ houses.”

“Although preferable, local materials are often more expensive than alternatives.”

“Undecided. 21st century buildings should not look like fake 19thC ones; Herefordshire demand this.”

“Developments should provide gardens and on-site parking.”

“It is the variety of design in our existing hamlets that makes them attractive and different.”

“Large plots reduce the number of houses to be built.”

“Local views must be protected.”

“All historic local buildings should be protected and nothing must detract from their aesthetic qualities.”

Q9: Do you support Policy SG8 Design Principles – Promoting High Quality and Sustainable Design?

Result: Yes: **100** No: **14**

Comments:

“Suggest that Point 1 should read ‘New development will ONLY be supported if incorporating imaginative....’.”

“Point 3 ‘Unobtrusive’ should not outrank environmental benefits.”

“Traffic calming can increase pollution, so have reservations on Point 5.”

“Should have traditional building materials ONLY.” (6)

“Good in principle but can be costly”

“Renewable energy schemes should not be enforced unless they make economic sense.”

“Small scale [renewable energy schemes] can be disastrous for household budgets when they eventually break down and the users find that replacement/repair costs hugely outweigh any current account savings.” (2)

“Should include air-source heat pumps.”

“I hate roof-mounted solar panels.”

“Solar panels should not be visible.”

“People need services rather than innovative design.”

“How does innovative and modern design fit with the heritage requirements of Questions 7 & 8?” (2)

“There should also be innovative design using modern technologies and materials, not resulting in the usual boxes.” (4)

“This also applies to affordable housing.” (2)

“Design needs to be sustainable, affordable and zero/low carbon.” (2)

“Wouldn’t like to see very modern designs, although renewable energy is a good idea.”

“Do NOT support modern architectural approach. DO support renewable energy schemes. Two important issues have been muddled together.”

“Frequency of public transport in rural areas should be addressed.”

“Cycling on narrow roads with potholes and lorries is dangerous.” (2)

“Public transport is a service that communities badly need. Traffic volume is a major issue in some of the villages and needs addressing.”

“Linking of public transport with traffic calming would be appreciated.”

“Point 4: There is no footpath provision that works from Stretton Grandison to any amenities.”

Q10: Do you support PolicySG9 Re-use of Former Agricultural Buildings for Local Economic Development?

Result: Yes: **105** No: **9**

Comments:

“Point 1 is the main criterion.”

“Point 3 is particularly important where sites are in close proximity and impact on listed buildings.” (3)

“We’d like [the Policy] to be strengthened to ensure only small scale. (For example, New House Farm could be developed into a large industrial site with associated noise levels and light pollution). Some of this is covered by SG9 but size of development is not, although Point 6.6 alludes to it.”

“Yes, provided that re-use is:	Appropriate to the rural environment	(2)
	Noise minimised	(2)
	Lighting minimised	(2)
	Odours minimised	(2)
	Environmental pollution minimised	(4)
	Minimal traffic generated	

“Would also support re-use of redundant buildings for housing.” (2)

“[Conversion] to live/work units would be good.”

“Home working can also be encouraged by incorporating home offices into new houses and enhancing broadband.”

“A better alternative to new build.”

“This is a way of preserving important local buildings with traditional design features.”

“Re-development is the life-blood of the rural community.” (2)

“[Redundant buildings] should be left for use by nature such as bats and barn owls.”

“The only area which might be developed for businesses is at New House Farm. All traffic for this location, (sometimes the heaviest of HGV’s), comes along the C1153. This road is already severely overused and cannot take any more traffic. There should be no further business use of properties fronting or taking access from the C1153.” (2)

“This requires investment in modern utilities such as broadband, without which local economic regeneration is inhibited.”

“[Re-use] generates too much traffic of vans and lorries on our side roads.”

“Access to B and C roads for large artics should be restricted.”

“The Hop Pocket struggles to get rural crafts into its premises. Why build more?”

“There should be no economic development in the Stretton Grandison Conservation Area.”

“Especially [support] if additional population leads to local employment and food outlets.”

Q11: Do you support Policy SG10 New Agricultural Buildings and Poly Tunnels?

Result: Yes: **72** No: **38**

A sizeable minority took this as a vote on the subject rather than the Policy

Comments:

"Poly tunnels and large agricultural buildings compromise the appearance of the countryside."

"Poly tunnels and large agricultural buildings generate further stress on rural roads." (4)

"Cannot support Point 1 because the ecological impact is huge."

"Don't want any intensive animal farming in the area." (10)

"Don't want any new buildings or poly tunnels." (7)

"Acceptable provided that there is no environmental pollution." (2)

"Poly tunnels are very visually intrusive and impact on our heritage assets". (13)

"Scrap plastic poly tunnels make environmental pollution worse."

"Controls on poly tunnels should be strictly enforced, and costs increased to make them less attractive." (3)

"SG10 should be supported only if the policy is firmly written into local planning regulations so that local people can make appropriate objections if the policy seems likely to be breached either before construction or through misuse and inappropriate modification after completion. There should be no development at all that requires access from the C1153." (2)

"It is hard to make a living in agriculture, so if poly tunnels save us importing – lets do it! Those who do not approve should live elsewhere."

"I support poly tunnels over buildings as they are temporary and the soil is not destroyed." (4)

"Not wishing to stifle local employment, but Herefordshire has exceeded its capacity for poly tunnels and intensive poultry units." (5)

"Whilst understanding the benefit of poly tunnels, they should be restricted and hidden from view. Account should be taken of their effects on local climate, water run-off and water management." (3)

"Happy with new buildings, but there are already enough poly tunnels."

"The poultry farm at Castle Frome causes odour problems at least 4 days per month, dependant on the wind direction."

"Industrial chicken units are legally required to be at least 400m from the nearest house."

"OK, subject to full environmental impact assessment."

"Who decides on 'significant visual intrusion'?"

"We don't support this Policy but recognise that broader planning rules might impose it on us. We would object strongly if it were to arise. If we have to have something in the NDP to qualify and tighten proposals being brought forward, then we could support subject to strengthening SG9 Point 6.6."

Q12: Do you support Policy SG11 Community-Led Renewable Energy Schemes?

Result: Yes: **104** No: **7**

Comments:

"I would welcome further consultation to see if any such schemes could be created or hosted in any new developments." (3)

"Renewables are good for the environment"

"Probably no meaningful opportunity outside Canon Frome Court."

"Yes, where feasible and cost effective."

"I support all renewables except solar panels."

"All 'renewable' (i.e. wind farms and solar panel arrays on agricultural land) power generation schemes are inherently uneconomical and exist only by taking subsidies from electricity consumers, the poorest being worst affected. These facts are consistently concealed from people. Small scale 'community-led' schemes are much worse as far as economics are concerned. The effect of wind farms and solar arrays would be devastating on the landscape and rural character of the area, contravening Policies SG5,6,7 & 10." (2)

"Agree with individual installations but [commercial] sized schemes would not be in keeping with the nature of our settlements. Individual schemes must not intrude on neighbours' views." (7)

"Renewable energy schemes should be encouraged."

"Local energy generation and storage should be encouraged."

"[It is] not worth investing so much in local sites when there are lots more choices."

"The more, the better!" (5)

"We have this model at Canon Frome Court and it should be integral to all new housing development."

"All schemes have a substantial visual impact."

"All new builds should emphasise 'green' technology."

Q13: Do you support Policy SG12 Reducing Flood Risk?

Result: Yes: **105** No: **9**

Comments:

“There should be no development in areas prone to flooding.” (5)

“Site 11 is not sustainable as it is on a flood risk area and bordered by fields that flood regularly.” (3)

“Before Site 1 is considered, work to prevent field run-off is required. Townsend Barns were flooded in 2007. This is not listed in ‘Areas at Risk’.”

“All Policies must be adhered to when creating any new structure to manage flood risk.”

“All road drains, gullies and ditches need to be kept clean and clear of undergrowth.” (2)

“Herefordshire Council has failed by not maintaining water courses/drainage already in place to control flooding.”

“Any development should have sufficient drainage.”

“The most effective way of reducing the risk from flood is not to build dwellings in flood risk areas. SG7.2 acknowledges the risk of flood ‘to part of Site 11’ but does not address the stark problem of waste water disposal in such an area. It does not make sense to build here. SG7.3 acknowledges that surface water run-off ends up on the A 417. Some of it gets there via the C1153, adjacent to Site 11 and may go through Site 10 to get there. SG7.5 ‘Guides development to areas of lower risk of flooding’ so must exclude Sites 10 & 11 from development. The same paragraph reminds of SG7 (climate change), inferring that flooding will probably become MORE likely rather than less.” (2)

“Building on flood risk sites is asking for trouble.”

“All car parking surfaces should be of porous materials to minimise run-off.”

“Flooding in an area of minor population is a natural benefit for pasture and wildlife etc.”

“Our well is our only source of water supply. Any flood prevention must not impact on dwellings reliant on natural water supply.”

Q14: Please provide any other comments about the NDP

Comments:

If Site 12 is chosen, there is no need for Policy SG3, [affordable housing at CFC]. The survey result should be percentages, not number of people in each parish.”

“There are enough small sites within the area that can provide the number and diversity of housing required without spoiling the environment with large developments. I refer to Point 4.27 where virtually nobody supports the idea of a large development.” (2)

“Draft Policy SG5 talks of protecting the dispersed settlement pattern. ANY large scale development would be counter to this. The dispersed settlement pattern is a core feature of the parish.
Medium or large scale development should not even be considered. Removal of the large sites 10 and 11 still gives us more than enough development to meet the Council target.”

“Work is scarce in the countryside. Transport to towns and cities will be by car on poorly maintained small roads. Why put more housing in the country when all the infrastructure is already in towns?”

“Not in favour of building in the countryside due to limited amenities. Every household needs 1-2 cars and has to travel to everything. So there is lots more traffic on roads mainly used by animals and agricultural machinery.”

“Support the policy of modest development in the NDP area, but only Frome’s Hill has amenities. There is a shortage of rural small houses to attract young families.
Small pockets of housing in Stretton Grandison and Canon Frome of a mixed nature would enhance rural areas and improve housing stock. [Policy] should also promote barn conversions.”

Smaller sites are the best option. Large sites are disproportionate to our rural hamlets.”

“Support the policy but cannot rank the small developments as they are too far away [from Frome’s Hill].”

“Q1 is inappropriate and inadmissible. There is no exclusive link between larger sites and affordable housing. In the writer’s opinion, this leaves the consultation open to legal challenge.

There has not been a consistent policy as to one questionnaire per household or one per resident. This is unacceptable and invalidates the consultation.

The Steering Group should consider, without Consultants, whether the NDP process has been fit for purpose and meets reasonable standards for a public consultation.

If it doesn’t, they should record that view and take appropriate action.

There appears to be pressure, (from both Consultants), in favour of larger sites, contrary to local opinion.”

“Q1 was restricted, so we have chosen both options.”

“Unfortunately Q1 is slightly inaccurate as option A has NO guarantee for affordable housing as ‘market conditions’ can be used to rescind any initial offer. Option B DOES allow affordable housing at the site owner’s discretion.”

“The questionnaire should allow comment on both options for housing sites.”

“Cannot make a ‘large’ or ‘small’ decision. Each site should be considered independently.” (2)

“[With reference to the] Questionnaire:

Confusion in Q1 & 2. Preferences in Q2 conditional upon answer to Q1. Prejudiced against those unfamiliar with form filling. Layout very poor. Q2, 4,7,8, 11 separated from their boxes. Questionnaire should be re-issued in a simpler and better laid out form.

{ With reference to the] NDP First Draft:

A5 format unsuitable, leading to difficulties with the scale of some of the maps; some map preparation is poor; there are one or two factual errors; jargon creeps in.

[Writer describes complaints about various maps colour ,scale and definition.]

NDP should have been produced in A4 format so as to accommodate suitable map scales and should have been proof read more efficiently. This poor effort should be scrapped, re-written and re-issued with an extended consultation period.”

“The NDP should outline an evolution of local development driven by residents of our parishes for the benefit of the parishes. Any development that significantly changes or dominates an area has failed the expectations of all present residents.”

“The Policy Document is thorough and well thought out. Keep the countryside beautiful. (2)

“Impressed by this consultation process and thank those who have done the work.” (9)

“The Draft Plan booklet is really helpful but the quality of the images on page 37 is poor. (2)

“Not sure that Herefordshire Planning is on board with the same perspective [as NDP]. They seem to be approving almost anything.”

Moved to Canon Frome for rural quiet. More houses means more traffic as all would have 2+ cars. No bus links in Canon Frome for the car-less (affordable) so developments are more suitable on A 4103 and A 417.”

“Realise that we can’t preserve Canon Frome in aspic but we want any development to be in keeping with the area in all ways possible.”

“Please don’t build in the West of the parish in view from the Malvern Hills.

“B and C roads need improvement to cope with additional traffic.” (2)

“Development [Planning] is not taking the roads into account, especially through Canon Frome, which cannot tolerate any more vehicles. There are no buses, so every household has at least 1 car. This is the countryside and should stay that way, not be over-developed.”

“The two most important considerations are Road Safety in Stretton Grandison and sustainable design respecting local architecture.”

“Are there any brownfield sites that would be more appropriate than the Greenfield sites shown in the booklet? Are all options on the table?”

“This is a great opportunity to introduce some individual-style housing into the area; but it would be a shame to see any larger scale development by faceless developers.

An improvement to local facilities – transport, BROADBAND, leisure facilities, business/employment opportunities would also be a huge advantage.”

“We appreciate the time and effort put into this ‘project’. We understand the difficulties in producing a plan that will meet everyone’s expectations but compromises have to be made. Putting forward, as the dominant thread, the idea of conservation based on aesthetic appearance seems old-fashioned in times of rapid change and needs. The plans seem based on ‘conservatism’ and not ‘progression’. Putting one large collection of dwellings together, in a suitable environment, could achieve the best compromise; minimum impact on existing sites, maximum opportunity for collective planning based upon the future towards a ‘carbon zero’ world.”

“The flood areas, traffic and noise/light pollution would have a significant impact on the wildlife and already strained services of this local environment. The roads are not fit to accommodate additional traffic and would make it more hazardous to the general public. The Council should consider other areas taking [these points] into account.

It was noted that retirees would move to this area. However, with the lack of local doctors, public services and the removal of the rapid response paramedic, the Council would be putting peoples lives and the environment in danger.

It is also worth noting that there are many badger setts in this area of Stretton Grandison which are a protected species; and damage to their environment would have a significant consequence to a protected animal.”

“Some houses planned as one large property could be built as two semi’s, then more affordable housing could be provided.”

“Agricultural land should only be used for [housing] development as a last resort. Its what makes the British countryside so popular with tourists etc. It should be monitored and protected vigorously to keep the landscape as pristine as possible, with any development being sensitive to local topography.”

“BEFORE any building sites are approves or decisions finalised, can we all be informed, please?”

“Who is paying for this NDP?

Why do we need more houses; has this become a salubrious area and has there been a recent population explosion leaving a queue of local residents waiting for houses?”

Public Meetings and Documents Received

At the first meeting, at the Wheatsheaf public house, Frome's Hill, issues raised were:

- 1) The status and validity of Site 13 was brought into question by the owners who presented documentation showing that the site had already been proposed and then withdrawn by Herefordshire Planning. The documentation has subsequently been provided appended to their questionnaire responses.

Following the meeting, it has been established that Site 13 **is** a valid proposal for the NDP.

- 2) The owner of Site 7 raised the point that his proposed development had had a positive reception from Herefordshire but an un-favourable assessment by AECOM. Consequently, it has not been presented as an option among the small sites in the NDP.
- 3) Residents from Stretton Grandison were keen to record that Site 10 is an essential wildlife habitat and that the bend on the A 417 adjacent to site 11 is not mapped correctly and is much tighter than shown.

Two meeting were held at The Stables, Canon Frome. The first was well attended; the second one was less well attended.

Several people were dissatisfied with Question1, feeling that it was biased to option A if they were in favour of affordable housing.

There were objections to a development on Site11.

Clarification and discussion took place concerning the issue of one questionnaire per household.

The likelihood of improved infrastructure for Site 12 was queried.

Better Broadband speeds were requested.

It was questioned whether the analysis of the questionnaires would result in the larger communities having more say than the smaller.

Thanks were expressed for the work of the Steering Group.

A household neighbouring Site10 has submitted a letter detailing reasons why Sites 10 and 11 would blight the Conservation Area, the approach to the church and the views of the church and village enjoyed by those approaching from the south.

The Owners of Site 6 submitted a letter from their planning consultant together with their questionnaire

Conclusions

There was strong engagement by the community with the NDP process, shown by vigorous doorstep conversations and attendance at the public discussion sessions.

The Draft NDP has been well received overall, with no serious disagreement.

In the Housing section, Q1 & Q2, the wording of Q1 seems to have caused problems, so could have been clearer.

Perhaps Sites should have been presented for ranking as one set, rather than split between a large group and a small group. The outcome would probably not have been different.

The majority prefer development on smaller sites rather than large ones.

There is strong support for a development at Frome's Hill as it is widely recognised that it has the best infrastructure.

Development at Site 12, at Lower Eggleton was the next favoured large site.

The smaller sites were ranked in the order Site 5, Site 6, Site 1, Site 10.

There is an understanding of the importance of affordable housing to be available in the area.

The Steering Group would like to thank all those who engaged with the NDP process.

