

**Stretton Grandison Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Regulation 14 Public Consultation - Monday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 to Monday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

**Table 3 Residents' and Landowners' Consultation Responses**

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Councils' Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NP</b>
							SG please note I have kept to previous reference numbers and labelled late Highways England as 005.1 in Table 2 for ease of reference.
Ref No 006	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 007	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 008	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
2 residents  Ref No 009	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 010	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 011	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 012	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 013	All		Whole Plan	Support		Noted.	No change.
Ref No 014a			SG3	Comment	Wording of SG3 should change from "8 units" to "up to 8 units" as current plans are only for 3 units.	Noted.  Amend wording as suggested.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Amend Title of SG3 to:</b>  <u>"Affordable Housing at Canon Frome Court (up to 8 units)"</u>
Ref No 014b			SG3	Comment	Wording of SG3 Point 3 should change to "Properties to be sized to meet local community need".  Need to have flexibility until need is clearly identified - but they will not be executive homes! 2 will be very small 2 beds constrained by conversion site; one new build may be up to 3 bed.	Noted.  Amend wording as suggested.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <b>Amend SG3 criterion 3 to:</b>  <u>"Development is for smaller properties (of up to 3 bedrooms) to meet local community needs."</u>
2 residents	28		SG2 Site 1	Comment	Site 1: 1) Very safe access for a new building development on a speed controlled area which	Noted.  The Technical Site Assessment Appendix A	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 015a					<p>already has a safe access for a nursery.</p> <p>2) Plenty of room for run-off water and effluent disposal from BIO-TECH type treatment plants.</p> <p>3) Has 1/3 housing density as the other projects. WHY?</p> <p>4) Sensible housing density would take the pressure off the other housing sites.</p>	<p>Individual Site Pro Formas, Dec 18, for Site 1 indicated that potential housing development capacity for the site is 5 (based on 30dph).</p> <p>The Site Assessment Report set out that the sites were assessed on the basis of 30 dwellings per hectare, given the rural nature of the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Discussions have also been held with the landowner and 4-5 houses is believed to be achievable.</p> <p>The proposed housing numbers for other sites are also based on the 30 dph density set out in the Site Assessment Report, apart from Site 4 (former Site 10) which has a lower</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						proposed density due to its sensitive location on an open space in the conservation area as explained in criterion 4.	
Ref No 015b	29 & 30		SG2  Sites 2 and 3 (former sites 5 and 6)	Comment	<p>Sites 5 &amp; 6, so close to each other, treat as one.</p> <p>Safety Concerns</p> <p>1) The limited access on the single track road with few passing places is compounded when the A4103 is blocked by accidents or flooding, or snow; all the traffic to and from the bottom of Fromes Hill comes along this small road. Not a rare occurrence.</p> <p>2) To say it is not on the A417 so is safer is incorrect, as almost all the traffic from Canon Frome has to come from or to the A417 where there is no speed restriction.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to Site Assessment Report and Appendix A Individual Site Pro formas.</p> <p>Site 5 - Key points in the Pro forma include:</p> <p><u>"Suitability:</u>  <i>There is an access to the site from the highway which runs adjacent to the south boundary of the site. This would need to be upgraded to provide a suitable access for residential development.</i></p> <p><u>Is the site accessible?</u>  <i>The site is approximately 160 metres from bus stops</i></p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Environmental Concerns</p> <p>1) All run off water and effluent from bio-treatment plants will likely end up in roadside ditches in the winter months.</p> <p>2) Site 5/6 would add up to 57% of the required housing allocation increasing the village by 50%. Not what we would call a small site.</p>	<p><i>at the junction with Millfield which provides an infrequent service to Ledbury.</i></p> <p><i>There are no footways or street lighting on the roads surrounding the site.</i></p> <p><i>The nearest train station is Ledbury which is approximately 7 miles from the site."</i></p> <p>Site 6 - Key points in the Pro forma include:</p> <p><u>"Suitability:</u></p> <p><i>There is an access to the site from the highway which runs adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. This would need to be upgraded to provide a suitable access for residential development.</i></p> <p><u>Is the site accessible?</u></p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p><i>The site is approximately 160 metres from bus stops at the junction with Millfield which provides an infrequent service to Ledbury.</i></p> <p><i>There are no footways or street lighting on the roads surrounding the site.</i></p> <p><i>The nearest train station is Ledbury which is approximately 7 miles from the site."</i></p> <p>Refer to Table 2 - Comments from Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (Ref 005) for comments about waste water: <i>"The remainder of the Group area will need private foul treatment, in line with Policy SD4 of the Core Strategy."</i> This is a detailed development management matter and would be addressed as and</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>when a planning application is submitted. Canon Frome is identified in the Core Strategy (Policy RA2 and Figure 4.15) as one of the "Other settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate." The NDP has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Core Strategy and support the delivery of new housing to meet the indicative target for the Group Parish.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council support the site allocation and NDP generally - refer to Table 1.</p> <p>Detailed comments have not been provided by Highways.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 015c	31		SG2 Site 4	Comment	<p>Site 4:</p> <p>1) One has to presume that the housing allocation for some reason has changed from 6 to 2.</p> <p>2) We would hope it is not a serious comment to discharge dirty water from septic tanks into soakaways in modern times.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed capacity of 2 houses is explained in criterion 4 and reflects the site's sensitive location as a green space in the conservation. <b>Discussions have also been held with the landowner.</b></p> <p>Refer to Core Strategy Policy SD4 - Wastewater treatment and river quality. This allows for <i>"the provision of or connection to a package sewage treatment works (discharging to watercourse or soakaway) or septic tank (discharging to soakaway)"</i> where connection to the wastewater infrastructure network is not practical.</p>	



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>Refer also to Table 2 Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (Ref 005) for comments about waste water:</p> <p><i>" As you may be aware, only part of the settlement of Stretton Grandison is served by public sewerage. For the number of units proposed on the two locations within the settlement, there are no issues should they wish to connect to the public sewerage network and Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW), though "Site 1" will require some level of offsite works to connect to the network."</i></p> <p>Therefore it may be possible to connect Site 4 to the sewerage network and this is reflected in proposed changes to the supporting text.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 015d			Objective s  SG2	Comment	<p>Aims? To provide housing probably for working families rather than encourage retirees from elsewhere who would put more pressure on local services.</p> <p>Recommended by Steering Group: SG Site 1: 4 houses at 10 units per hectare CF Site 2: 3 houses at 30 units per hectare CF Site 3: 6 houses at 26 units per hectare SG Site 4: 2 houses at 9 units per hectare Site 12: 0 houses Site 13: 0 houses</p> <p>In the meeting we attended the overwhelming wish seemed to be in favour of SITE 13 as listed in the Local Plan Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Objective HO4 is To support a suitable and appropriate mix of house types, tenures and sizes in both new development and residential conversions across the Group Parish.</p> <p>The NDP area, as with Herefordshire as a whole, has an ageing population and should support a suitable mix of house types including housing for older people.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Report recommends a suitable density of 30 dph and this has been carried forward into most of the site allocations in the NDP to provide an indicative</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>figure. Numbers of houses on the sites may change as part of the development management process.</p> <p>The Steering Group considered the responses to the Issues and Options and First Draft Plan consultations and this is documented in paras 4.25 - 4.26. The full report on the consultation responses (provided through completed questionnaires) to the First Draft Plan with Site Options is provided on the NDP website.</p> <p>Site 13 had capacity for 19 houses and was therefore considered to be a large site.</p> <p>Although Site 13 had the highest score for large sites from the consultation (167</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						points) the Steering Group and Parish Council noted the local preference for development to be spread across several small sites rather than concentrated on a single or a couple of larger sites and the site was not included in the Draft Plan.	
Ref No 016a	29 & 30		SG2 Site 2 Site 3	Object	I feel Canon Frome could not cope with another 8 houses along this stretch of road. It is used as a rat run as it is, with more houses it will mean more cars to add to those who already use it. There is no footpath from The Barn down past the Vicarage Cottage, hence walkers/dogs have no choice but to use the road - we often have to dive out of the way of cars coming round the corner at speed both just past the Vicarage Cottage and	Noted.  Canon Frome is identified in the Core Strategy (Policy RA2 and Figure 4.15) as one of the "Other settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate." The NDP has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Core Strategy and support the delivery of new housing to meet the indicative target for the Group Parish.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>adjacent to Millfield/Forge courtyard.</p> <p>I think if planning is granted, as a resident a footpath must be put in place from The Barn all the way down to the corner for pedestrians to use - one day there will be a serious accident. With more people living here, especially young families, we will all be out walking, using pushchairs etc. It has to be safe. Also, can a speed limit be put in place? Is this something that can be granted too? Or at least "Slow" signs or "20 is plenty" sign put in place.</p>	<p>Herefordshire Council (see Table 1) are largely supportive of the NDP and proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Highways have not submitted comments on the Draft Plan but access issues should be dealt with through the development management process as and when planning applications are submitted. There will also be opportunities to comment on any planning applications.</p> <p>The Parish Council intends to continue working with Herefordshire Council to address local problems of traffic and speeding in the Group Parish.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 017a			NDP process  SG2 (non allocated site 12)	Object	<p>I would like my opposition documented to the outcome of the consultation as to my opinion the whole NDP process is flawed due to a wrongly designated report on Site 12 Land north of A4103, Lower Eggleton.</p> <p>It was designated wrongly as a "LARGE" site where in fact it was numerous small individual sites. This had a big effect on the outcome of the consultation document vote when we were asked if we wanted a large or a small development and the result was in favour of "Small" developments.</p> <p>Site 12 Land north of A4103, Eggleton. Small scale housing growth [Aerial photo of Site 12 &amp; quote from change record following questionnaire consultation inserted]</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Site 12 was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites although it comprised a series of individual parcels of land along the A4103.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Report (Executive Summary) notes that Site 12 is considered to be potentially the most constrained of the larger individual sites which could each individually accommodate the total housing requirement for the NDP. A site boundary was not provided but the gross area in Table 2 is identified as 0.68 ha giving a potential capacity of about 20 houses at 30 dph. The aerial photograph in the Site Assessment</p>	<p>SG - to discuss but I think there are grounds for no change.</p> <p>If you do want to change the NDP site allocations you should probably re-run the Reg 14.</p> <p>You could add this one in as well or instead of one of the others. However if you want to include it you will need Highways comments as this could be a major constraint.</p> <p>Perhaps ask for Highways comments anyway? If they object you probably couldn't include it even if more "popular".</p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Sit 12 was stated in the original NDP document as the "PREFERRED" option for building development in our Parishes.</p> <p>The problem is that somehow it became designated "a large site". I asked the NDP committee at the consultation on Friday 22 November 2019 meeting who authorised the change, but no one was able to tell me who or why they did this. In the NDP questionnaire the parishioners were asked whether they preferred "SMALL" or "LARGE" sites and the majority opted for "SMALL" sites. This has meant that Site 12 was rejected and as a consequence 2 sites in Stretton Grandison were chosen meaning that 50% of the approved construction has now been designated to a small hamlet that has no facilities, a</p>	<p>Proforma for Site 12 identifies a series of plots (12 in total) between existing dwellings at the boundary of larger agricultural fields.</p> <p>The NPPF defines major development in the Glossary: <i>"For housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more."</i></p> <p>Therefore as the site was submitted as a single site in the Call for Sites which could accommodate more than 10 houses and it was over 0.5 ha, it was appropriate to refer to the site as a large site in the consultation on the First Draft NDP.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					speeding traffic issue and has already been over developed in comparison to other locations within the 4 parishes.	<p>Residents were invited to comment on a number of different sites in the informal consultation on the First Draft Plan with Site Options. In the first Draft Plan an indicative capacity of 16 dwellings was proposed.  (SG - did this figure come from the landowner?).</p> <p>A map of the site was provided on p30 and clearly indicated the 6 different parcels of land.  These were identified by the landowner.</p> <p>Site 12 was the second most popular "large site" with 127 points.</p> <p>However, taking into account local residents' preferences for several smaller sites in the Issues and Options and First Draft</p>	



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>Plan consultations it was decided that the development strategy should focus on the smaller sites, all of which had more points than site 12 (as set out in paragraphs 4.25 - 4.26).</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Site Assessment Report sets out in paragraph 4.11 that <i>"In terms of Site 12 the most significant constraints related to access and landscape. It is likely that each parcel along this stretch of highway would need its own access and the Highways Authority may have some concern about the impact of several new accesses on the free-flow of traffic along the road. The views of the highways officers at HC should be</i></p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p><i>sought in relation to the number of new accesses that would need to be created along this relatively short stretch of road. If suitable access cannot be provided then the Site's traffic light rating would change to red. In addition, whilst the parcels may 'infill' between existing dwellings this area is in a relatively elevated position in the wider landscape. There are also heritage considerations to be considered. Finally Lower Eggleton is not considered to be a particularly sustainable location for additional housing in comparison to other settlements within the NA, whilst acknowledging Policy RA2 of the Herefordshire Core Strategy."</i></p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p>The parcels of land are located in an area characterised by individual detached dwellings in large plots. If the development of Site 12 responded to surrounding character and plot density (as set out in NDP Policy SG7 Design Principles - Protecting and Enhancing Heritage and Local Character) it would be unlikely to provide the house types and sizes needed by the local community as set out in Policy SG4.</p> <p>The other sites were all assessed on their own merits and decisions about proposed site allocations were taken following consideration of the responses to the consultations.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 017b			SG2 Site 1  SG6	Object	<p>Site 1:</p> <p>At the start of the NDP procedure when they had the call for sites and they held discussions on what was acceptable to the community, the comments made at that time regarding Site 1 were "They are only intending 3 or 4 houses. Otherwise all fine".</p> <p>The settlement boundary is shown below. [Map insert from original draft plan]</p> <p>By the time the original DRAFT NDP document was put out for discussion Site 1 had changed the proposed boundary to a square site and was intending 4 houses (see below) [Insert Table 2 from booklet shown]</p> <p>In the October 2019 Draft proposal Site 1 has now been</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Proforma: Site 1 sets out that the site is 0.4ha and a density of 30 dph would provide 5 houses. Table 2 in the Site Assessment Report identifies a proposed capacity of 4 houses based on landowner information. The First Draft Plan with Site Options suggested an indicative capacity of 5 houses and the Draft Plan (Reg 14) suggested 4-5 houses. However the exact number of houses would be determined through the development management process.</p> <p>Stretton Grandison is identified in the Core Strategy as one of the "other settlements where</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>designated suitable for 4 to 5 houses (see below) [Insert Site 1 Map from Reg 14 consultation]</p> <p>I feel that Stretton Grandison has been overdeveloped in past years without thought for the existing residents and 5 additional houses on Site 1 is too many considering past developments.</p> <p>Previous development in Stretton Grandison The Grange development provided 3 new Oak framed houses, 3 luxury apartments (conversion of the OAP home), 1 new 3 storey house, the conversion of the existing barn to provide a further 3 homes. The development of the Townsend Barns providing 5 new homes. In total 15 new residences.</p>	<p>proportionate housing is appropriate" (Policy RA2 and Figure 4.15). The NDP has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Core Strategy and support the delivery of new housing to meet the indicative target for the Group Parish.</p> <p>All the relevant policies in the NDP will apply in the consideration of planning applications. Proposals will be required to be sited and designed sensitively taking account of context and local character and any impacts on heritage assets and landscape character and views.</p> <p>The proposed site allocations have been identified through a</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					SG6 states that in Stretton Grandison any new development should incorporate the following: Protect and enhance the setting of listed buildings, important open spaces and "views". OVER DEVELOPMENT ON SITE 1 WILL NOT DO THIS	thorough process of technical assessment and community consultation and engagement.	
Ref No 018a			SG2 Site 12	Object / Comment	Page 16 Policy Maps; Map 2 Lower Eggleton Settlement Boundary; In the consultation parishioners were asked if they preferred large or small sites.  Site 12 was re-designated as a large site.  I believe if it had stayed as a small site it would have been well supported and so in some ways the consultation had a flaw from the onset. In the consultation February 2017 Lower Eggleton was a preferred settlement for growth. This was	Noted.  Refer to 17a above.  Site 12 was not "re-designated" as a large site but was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites (although it comprised a series of individual parcels of land along the A4103).  The parcels of land comprising Site 12 were identified on a clear map in the First Draft Plan with	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					when the settlement boundary was designated as 5 small sites.	Site Options and were indicated on an aerial photograph in the Site Assessment Proforma: Site 12.	
Ref No 018b	28		SG2 SG6	Object / Comment	<p>Design Guidelines</p> <p>SG6: suitable height which reflects those of surrounding buildings; Mix of semi- and detached houses; Mostly facing and set well back from the roadside; Hedges are a feature and should be retained; Protect and enhance the setting of listed buildings, important open spaces, views.</p> <p>If 4/5 house are to be located on Site 1 they will only be detached houses. The surrounding listed buildings at Townsend Farm are mainly single storey and so the new buildings will not meet the guidelines. It will be very difficult to accommodate 4/5</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All the relevant policies in the NDP will apply in the consideration of planning applications. Proposals will be required to be sited and designed sensitively taking account of context and local character and any impacts on heritage assets and landscape character and views (refer to Policies SG5 and SG7 for example).</p> <p>The precise design, type and size of houses will be determined through the development management process. NDP Policy SG6 requires development to</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>houses set back from the road and also a new entrance will have to be at the cost of the hedge. The new houses will dominate the roadside and curtail views.</p> <p>SG7.4: Set back from the roadside with front gardens and on-site parking areas.</p> <p>SG7.5: Development should reflect the HEIGHT SCALE and proportions of surrounding buildings.</p>	<p>respond to local needs for medium sized family housing (up to three bedrooms), starter homes of one or two bedrooms, housing designed for older people and those with particular needs such as mobility impairments or other disabilities.</p> <p>Any loss to biodiversity / hedges will be required to be addressed through compensatory measures as set out in the criteria for the site allocation and other NDP Policies including SG5.</p> <p>Private views are not protected in planning.</p>	
Ref No 018c			SG12	Comment	SG12 Reducing Flood Risk: 2007 the Townsend Barn experienced flooding from run off from the fields opposite, Appropriate action needs to be taken to	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed site allocation offers an opportunity to address</p>	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>ensure that drains/ditches can cope with excess water.</p> <p>The proposed Site 1 is a working agricultural field used to store large quantities of bales and trailers.</p>	<p>localised issues related to flood risk from run off through provision of improved drainage measures.</p> <p>Such matters should be addressed through the development management process as and when a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>The site was submitted for consideration by the land owner in response to the Call for Sites.</p>	
2 residents  Ref No 019	26, 27		SG2  Site 12	Object / Comment	<p>In the first draft of the NDP, Site 12 (page 30) is shown as individual small sites.</p> <p>In the Regulation 14 Draft Plan for Consultation, under the ranking of sites, (pages 26-27), Site 12 is now classified as a Large site. This excludes it from being a "preferred" option. No</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 17a above.</p> <p>Site 12 was not re-classified as a large site during the NDP process. It was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites (although it comprised a</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>reason appears to be given for the change from small to large.</p> <p>This would appear to be a major consideration in the choosing of the sites to be put forward.</p>	<p>series of individual parcels of land along the A4103). Maps and aerial photographs in the First Draft Plan with Site Options and Site Assessment Pro Forma clearly indicated the parcels of land.</p>	
Ref No 020a	All		Whole Plan	Object / Comment	<p>[I] would like to put on record concerns regarding the validity of the conclusions drawn from the consultation questionnaire.</p> <p>These concerns arise from issues outlines within our questionnaire responses. From the now published summary of all responses, we are aware that others reported similar issues.</p> <p>These issues are acknowledged and commented upon to a degree within the published Results of the Public Consultation on the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 17a above.</p> <p>Site 12 was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites (although it comprised a series of individual parcels of land along the A4103). Maps and aerial photographs in the First Draft Plan with Site Options and Site Assessment Pro Forma clearly indicated the parcels of land. The site was consequently assessed</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stretton Grandison Group Parishes (v2 updated September 2019) - but despite what appeared to be flawed methodology, the results have been viewed from a statistical majority perspective and the conclusions drawn are to be used to progress the draft plan to the next stage with Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>To explain, Question 1 asked respondents whether their overall preference was for "small" or "large" sites. In following the questionnaire format respondents were then only able to rank either small or large sites, based on their response to the opening question, i.e. following the format it was not possible to include a "large" site in your ranking if you had preferred "small" sites at Q1, and vice-</p>	<p>as a single site in the Site Assessment Report and Pro Forma for Site 12.</p> <p>The NDP process has included several stages of consultation and individuals' general written comments were invited as well as responses to questions. All responses have been considered very carefully at all stages by member of the Steering Group and Parish Council and have informed decisions about the next stages of the NDP.</p> <p>It is accepted that there was criticism about the questionnaire questions for the First Draft Plan with Site Options and in particular the questions asking for a preference for development to be</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>versa. This methodology was flawed in that it immediately limited the responses available.</p> <p>Views may have been more accurately gathered had respondents been able to rank all sites throughout (whether categorised by the steering group as "large" or "small").</p> <p>This may not have been an issue had Site 12 (five separate building plots interspersed between seven existing properties along the north side of the A4103 near Lower Eggleton), not been included in the listed "large" sites for some unknown reason(?). Hence those initially stating a preference for "small" sites were prevented from including this option within their ranked list of preferred sites.</p> <p>We note that Site 12 proved</p>	<p>concentrated on 1 or 2 large sites or across several smaller sites and then to rank sites according to their preference for large or small sites. Concerns are recorded in the published report on the consultation; " <i>Some respondents were unhappy about making a choice based on site size and felt pressurised by the affordable housing condition.</i>"</p> <p>The Steering Group were responding to the results of the Issues and Options consultation (see NDP paragraph 4.23) which showed a preference for smaller sites. The Group wished to make sure that if the preference for smaller sites remained, consultees were informed and</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>relatively popular with those ranking "large" sites and believe that had this option been corrected included within "small" sites (as stated being a collection of five individual plots), it would have possibly been one of the most popular options for continued inclusion in the draft plan.</p> <p>The significance being that had this option been preferred and still included, in order to meet the plan target of 14 properties, development would not now be required of other consequently less popular "small" sites (which are currently still included in the draft plan).</p>	<p>understood that the development of several small sites of less than 11 units may not deliver any local affordable housing.</p> <p>It is worth noting that Q14 asked for any other comments about the NDP and the responses submitted were considered by the Group and helped to inform decisions about site allocations.</p> <p>The site specific comments related to Site 12 showed a mixed response. These were summarised below.</p> <p><i>"Multiple access onto the A4103 could be disastrous"</i> (5)</p> <p><i>"Site has good access to Hereford and Worcester"</i> (2)</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						<p><i>"Site 12 could develop into a self-contained community"</i></p> <p><i>"Development at site 12 would have the least impact on the villages"</i></p> <p><i>"Infill is preferable to new estates"</i></p> <p><i>"Better to infill than build a soulless block of new houses" (2)</i></p> <p><i>"This site would infill parcels of land not suitable for farming" (3)</i></p> <p><i>"Considerable drainage work would be required"</i></p> <p><i>"Does not appear to impact on significant landscape" (2)</i></p> <p><i>"Lower Eggleton has no amenities."</i></p> <p>The Site Assessment Report (see 17a above) notes the constraints for Site 12 and suggests that access could be a</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
						significant constraint, depending on the views of HC's Highways officers. The report notes in para 4.11 that " <i>if suitable access cannot be provided then the Site's traffic light rating would change to red.</i> "	
Ref No 020b			SG2  Site 12	Objection / Comment	We believe that at the consultation meeting on 22nd November the steering committee were asked why and by whom site 12 had been listed within "large" sites but those present were unable to clarify how this had happened. We believe both the questionnaire methodology and site categorisation has compromised the questionnaire results and therefore wish to put on record our concerns as to the validity of the consultation conclusions drawn from it.	Noted.  Refer to 17a and 020a above.  Site 12 was submitted as a single site to the Call for Sites and was assessed as a single site accordingly in the Site Assessment Report and Site Assessment Pro-Forma: Site 12. The individual parcels of land were clearly identified in the Pro-Forma and in the First Draft Plan with Site Options.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					As stated at the outset, the above outlines the representations of each of three adults on the electoral roll at this address, who all independently completed the consultation questionnaire and drew the same conclusions regarding the issues raised.		
Ref No 021			Whole Plan	Object / Comment	<p><b>Repeats Ref No 20 above.</b></p> <p>[I] would like to put on record concerns regarding the validity of the conclusions drawn from the consultation questionnaire. These concerns arise from issues outlines within our questionnaire responses. From the now published summary of all responses, we are aware that others reported similar issues. These issues are acknowledged and commented upon to a degree within the published Results of the Public Consultation on the Neighbourhood Development</p>	Ref to Ref No 20 above.	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Plan for Stretton Grandison Group Parishes (v2 updated September 2019) - but despite what appeared to be flawed methodology, the results have been viewed from a statistical majority perspective and the conclusions drawn are to be used to progress the draft plan to the next stage with Herefordshire Council. To explain, Question 1 asked respondents whether their overall preference was for "small" or "large" sites. In following the questionnaire format respondents were then only able to rank either small or large sites, based on their response to the opening question, i.e. following the format it was not possible to include a "large" site in your ranking if you had preferred "small" sites at Q1, and vice-versa. This methodology was flawed in that it immediately</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>limited the responses available. Views may have been more accurately gathered had respondents been able to rank all sites throughout (whether categorised by the steering group as "large" or "small"). This may not have been an issue had Site 12 (five separate building plots interspersed between seven existing properties along the north side of the A4103 near Lower Eggleton), not been included in the listed "large" sites for some unknown reason(?). Hence those initially stating a preference for "small" sites were prevented from including this option within their ranked list of preferred sites. We note that Site 12 proved relatively popular with those ranking "large" sites and believe that had this option been corrected included within "small" sites (as stated being a</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>collection of five individual plots), it would have possibly been one of the most popular options for continued inclusion in the draft plan. The significance being that had this option been preferred and still included, in order to meet the plan target of 14 properties, development would not now be required of other consequently less popular "small" sites (which are currently still included in the draft plan).</p> <p>We note that Site 12 proved relatively popular with those ranking "large" sites and believe that had this option been corrected included within "small" sites (as stated being a collection of five individual plots), it would have possibly been one of the most popular options for continued inclusion in the draft plan. The significance being that had this</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>option been preferred and still included, in order to meet the plan target of 14 properties, development would not be required of other consequently less popular "small" sites (which are currently still included in the draft plan).</p> <p>We believe that at the consultation meeting on 22nd November the steering committee were asked why and by whom site 12 had been listed within "large" sites but those present were unable to clarify how this had happened. We believe both the questionnaire methodology and site categorisation has compromised the questionnaire results and therefore wish to put on record our concerns as to the validity of the consultation conclusions drawn from it.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					As stated at the outset, the above outlines the representations of each of three adults on the electoral roll at this address, who all independently completed the consultation questionnaire and drew the same conclusions regarding the issues raised.		
Ref No 022			Whole Plan	Object / Comment	<p><b>Repeats Ref No 20 above.</b></p> <p>[I] would like to put on record concerns regarding the validity of the conclusions drawn from the consultation questionnaire. These concerns arise from issues outlines within our questionnaire responses. From the now published summary of all responses, we are aware that others reported similar issues. These issues are acknowledged and commented upon to a degree within the published Results of the Public Consultation on the</p>	Ref to Ref No 20 above.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stretton Grandison Group Parishes (v2 updated September 2019) - but despite what appeared to be flawed methodology, the results have been viewed from a statistical majority perspective and the conclusions drawn are to be used to progress the draft plan to the next stage with Herefordshire Council. To explain, Question 1 asked respondents whether their overall preference was for "small" or "large" sites. In following the questionnaire format respondents were then only able to rank either small or large sites, based on their response to the opening question, i.e. following the format it was not possible to include a "large" site in your ranking if you had preferred "small" sites at Q1, and vice-versa. This methodology was		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>flawed in that it immediately limited the responses available. Views may have been more accurately gathered had respondents been able to rank all sites throughout (whether categorised by the steering group as "large" or "small"). This may not have been an issue had Site 12 (five separate building plots interspersed between seven existing properties along the north side of the A4103 near Lower Eggleton), not been included in the listed "large" sites for some unknown reason(?). Hence those initially stating a preference for "small" sites were prevented from including this option within their ranked list of preferred sites.</p> <p>We note that Site 12 proved relatively popular with those ranking "large" sites and believe that had this option been corrected included within</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>"small" sites (as stated being a collection of five individual plots), it would have possibly been one of the most popular options for continued inclusion in the draft plan. The significance being that had this option been preferred and still included, in order to meet the plan target of 14 properties, development would not now be required of other consequently less popular "small" sites (which are currently still included in the draft plan).</p> <p>We note that Site 12 proved relatively popular with those ranking "large" sites and believe that had this option been corrected included within "small" sites (as stated being a collection of five individual plots), it would have possibly been one of the most popular options for continued inclusion in the draft plan. The</p>		



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>significance being that had this option been preferred and still included, in order to meet the plan target of 14 properties, development would not be required of other consequently less popular "small" sites (which are currently still included in the draft plan).</p> <p>We believe that at the consultation meeting on 22nd November the steering committee were asked why and by whom site 12 had been listed within "large" sites but those present were unable to clarify how this had happened. We believe both the questionnaire methodology and site categorisation has compromised the questionnaire results and therefore wish to put on record our concerns as to the validity of the consultation conclusions drawn from it.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					As stated at the outset, the above outlines the representations of each of three adults on the electoral roll at this address, who all independently completed the consultation questionnaire and drew the same conclusions regarding the issues raised.		
Ref No 023	27	4.25, 4.26, 4.27	SG2 Site 4	Object / Comment	<p>Having taken a closer look at Site 10/4, I believe that it would be far less suitable for development than suggested.</p> <p>Apart from the obvious problem - the communal septic tank - I note that the site overlooks the housing at the back almost to the extent that it deprives it of light.</p> <p>In my opinion the site, which is currently a neglected eyesore mown just once a year, should be re-planted as a communal orchard with benches, fruit</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 2 for comments from Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (Ref 005) about waste water and this is addressed in the criteria for the site allocation. Planning policies should protect local residential amenity and this would be addressed through the development management process.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					trees or bearing trees and a traditional hay meadow mixture of grasses with wildflowers. It would then become a pleasant amenity for the village.	The site was put forward for consideration as a housing site during the Call for Sites and is in private ownership. An alternative proposal for a community garden would be subject to the landowner's agreement.	
Ref No 024	31		SG2 Site 4	Object / Comment	<p>This site [10/4] is within the Stretton Grandison Conservation Area and is listed as an important open space and should be retained as such. The adjoining Old School House faces directly onto this site and as such will lose light, view etc. This cannot be right.</p> <p>Another concern is drainage. There is no mains drainage in the village. The existing septic tank on this site serves 4 properties and is problematic. I have seen it being emptied on a</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is within the conservation area. This is noted in the NDP and policy criteria for SG2 Site 4 and other Policies such as SG6 Design Guidelines for Stretton Grandison Conservation Area would apply.</p> <p>Refer to Table 2 for comments from Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (Ref 005) about waste water</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>regular basis by a Welsh Water tanker. There is visible see page on occasions into the adjacent ditch. I am also aware that there is seepage into the garden of The Threshing Barn property on the north of the site. The Threshing Barn property would be affected by loss of light, view and privacy.</p> <p>Suitable and safe access to this site would have to be well away from the A417. This is due to the great danger posed by vehicles turning left off the A417 (which is on a dangerous bend) onto the unclassified road fronting this site. Similarly but to a slightly lesser degree, for vehicles turning right off the A 417.</p>	<p>and this is addressed in the criteria for the site allocation.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Proforma: Site 10 notes that "<i>there is potential for suitable access to be provided to the site. The site is close to bus stops on the A417 in Stretton Grandison which provide an infrequent service to Ledbury. There are no footways or street lighting in the vicinity of the site.</i>"</p> <p>Access would be assessed as part of the development management process as and when a planning application is submitted.</p>	
Ref No 025			SG2 Site 4	Object / Comment	<p><b>Repeats Ref 24 above.</b></p> <p>This site [10/4] is within the Stretton Grandison Conservation Area and is listed</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 24 above.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>as an important open space and should be retained as such. The adjoining Old School House faces directly onto this site and as such will lose light, view etc. This cannot be right.</p> <p>Another concern is drainage. There is no mains drainage in the village. The existing septic tank on this site serves 4 properties and is problematic. I have seen it being emptied on a regular basis by a Welsh Water tanker. There is visible see page on occasions into the adjacent ditch. I am also aware that there is seepage into the garden of The Threshing Barn property on the north of the site. The Threshing Barn property would be affected by loss of light, view and privacy.</p> <p>Suitable and safe access to this site would have to be well away from the A417. This is due to</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					the great danger posed by vehicles turning left off the A417 (which is on a dangerous bend) onto the unclassified road fronting this site. Similarly but to a slightly lesser degree, for vehicles turning right off the A 417.		
Ref No 026a	31		SG2 Site 4	Object	<p>I strongly object to Site 10/4 being used because this would block the only view out of my windows from my home. It would seriously block the light over my garden.</p> <p>This site is also full of the most amazing wildlife -(Great Crested Newts, which are a protected species). There are bats and a huge amount of wild flowers and herbs.</p> <p>If houses are built on this site it would seriously impact on my well being from a light point of view as the site is also much higher than my property.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Planning policies do not protect an individual's private view from their property. Impacts on residential amenity including daylight would be considered during the development management process.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Proforma: Site 10 notes " <i>The development of the site would have some impact on the site's habitats and biodiversity</i>" and goes on to say " <i>There</i></p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					It was also the least popular of the small sites submitted and should be withdrawn from the site submissions.	<p><i>is some potential for protected species given the presence of hedgerows and vegetation within the site."</i></p> <p>Criterion 2 protects wildlife. Any planning proposal would be required to undertake appropriate assessments as part of the development management process and to avoid negative impacts or where this is not possible, to provide appropriate mitigation or compensatory measures.</p> <p>If the site was withdrawn an alternative site allocation may have to be considered for the NDP to meet the indicative minimum housing target for the plan period.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 026b	24	4.14	SG2 Site 12	Object	I object to Site 12 being submitted as a large site. It should be submitted as several small sites which would act as infill. The site was one of the preferred sites, so should be submitted as a number of small sites.	Noted.  Refer to 17a above.  Site 12 was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites although it comprised a series of individual parcels of land along the A4103.	No change.
Ref No 027a	31		SG2 Site 4	Object	Site 10(4) was the least favoured small site in the NDP. It is in a Conservation Area (surely this means it needs conserving).  This site is due East from my home and would massively impact on my quality of life should it be used for housing. The site is approx 3m higher than my home so any development would block my only far reaching view from upstairs and impact on the light reaching our garden and home.	Noted.  Refer to 26a above.  The site's location in a conservation area does not preclude development although designs would have to be sensitive to the special character of the conservation area and its setting and address criteria in Policy SG6.  Planning policies do not protect an individual's	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>Apart from the impact on me and my family - the field is a haven for wildlife and the feeding ground for colonies of bats and newts.</p> <p>The site also houses the surface water run-off/septic tank for Hopton Cottages, a system that only just about copes. Further development would only increase the surface water run-off leading to my property.</p> <p>Having spent over £20k on protecting my property from flooding, I do not appreciate this further threat of flooding hanging over us.</p>	<p>private view from their property. Impacts on residential amenity including daylight would be considered during the development management process.</p> <p>Refer to Table 2 for comments from Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (Ref 005) about waste water and this is addressed in the criteria for the site allocation. There may be an opportunity to connect to the mains sewerage.</p>	
Ref No 027b	24	4.14		Object	I object to site 12 being considered as a large site. By doing so, infill sites for housing which would be appropriate has been removed from the NDP.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 17a above.</p> <p>Site 12 was submitted as a single site during the Call for Sites although it comprised a series of</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					<p>The plots on Site 12 should be reconsidered as infill plots and included within the plan.</p> <p>Site 12 is one of the areas highlighted as suitable by Herefordshire Council. We've managed to have this removed by calling it a large site! Infill is not an inappropriate housing estate - it fits with the rest of the housing along the A4103. Please reconsider this as several small sites and include it within the plan.</p>	<p>individual parcels of land along the A4103.</p> <p>Site 12 has potential constraints linked to access and may not provide the house types and sizes identified in the NDP as needed by the local community.</p>	
Ref No 028a	7	2.5		Support / Comment	What does "severance mean in relation to traffic "excessive traffic speeds and road safety"?	Noted. The reference to "Severance" means that busy main roads can act as barriers between areas and communities.	No change.
Ref No 028b	7	2.6		Comment	Include a statement "no effective public transport in Stretton Grandison"	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>There is a limited bus service along the A417 linking to Ledbury.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p>Insert additional text to 2.6:  <u>" There is a limited bus service along the A417 serving Stretton Grandison and linking to Ledbury."</u></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
Ref No 028c	7	2.7		Comment	Do any parishes have more than 1 church as it states: "churches"?	Accepted. Amend wording.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  Change final sentence of 2.7 to " <u>Each of the parishes has their own church.</u> "
Ref No 028d	22	4.6		Comment	States: "extended to amended to include" Typo?	Accepted. Amend wording.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  Delete in 4.6: "to amended"
Ref No 028e	22	4.6		Comment	States: "Upper Eggleton shows no Settlement Boundary - Steering Group propose no new build housing but in Page 21 - Para 4.4 it states "Eggleton" is appropriate for proportionate housing. This clearly refers to Upper Eggleton because Lower Eggleton is identified in the same paragraph.	Noted.  The Core Strategy identifies only Lower Eggleton and Eggleton as suitable for new housing. See para 4.4.	No change.
Ref No 028f	23	4.11		Comment	Refers to Hertfordshire! Typo?	Accepted. Amend wording.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  4.11 - change to "Herefordshire".
Ref No 028g	38	5.9		Comment	Refer to NPPF and HARC respectively. Can a list of	Accepted. Include list of acronyms.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  <u>Include list of acronyms.</u>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					acronyms be included? [ As compiled by Marjie}		<a href="#">(Provided by Marjie?)</a>  <a href="#">What is HARC? Is it Herefordshire Archive and Records Centre?</a>
Ref No 028h	40	5.12		Comment	???? SG Please insert	?	?
Ref No 028i	45	5.19		Comment	First line states: " there are a 17 listed buildings etc" Typo?	Accepted. Amend Typo.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  Delete "a" in 5.19
Ref No 028k	45	5.19		Comment	States St Lawrence Church as Grade 1 listed, Page 49 - 5.29 states Grade 2 listed. Clarification needed.	Accepted. Amend typo. Church is Grade I.	<b>Amend NDP.</b>  5.29 - amend to Grade I.
Ref No 028l	49	5.29		Comment	States: "the open paddock and pond to its South form its immediate setting". What does this mean!	Noted. This is taken from the conservation area description and is a standard way of describing a setting in a planning document.	No change.
Ref No 028j	63	8.4		Comment	Identifies areas of concern of the community that need addressing.	Noted.  The site was submitted for consideration as a housing site in the Call for Sites.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NP
					Consideration could be given to the development of Site 10/4 other than housing, which could detract from the existing conservation area. The land could become a Park and Ride point for the village, or allotments, or a nature conservation area suitably protected from the A417 traffic, etc.	Other proposals would need to be discussed with the landowner.	
Ref No 028k			Appendix 1		Letter received from Bruton Knowles in support of proposed development on Site 3 (formerly Site 6); The letter seek to re-enforce the site submission through arguments thought more appropriate to a detailed planning application. It is noted that the site owners have expressed their full support for the NDP at Lines 15 & 17 above.	Noted.	No change.