

Lyonshall Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses
25th October - 7th December 2018

Table 3 Residents' Comments

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| (1.1) | 18 & 20 | 1.13 | | Object | <p>I have been assured by a personal visit (am 22 Aug 2018) and confirmed by an Email (26 Oct 2018 10:42) from the owners of the land cited as 'Area E' in your Proposal that <i>"We have no immediate plans to seek planning permission to build on our land, but have simply asked for a portion of it to be included in the NDP boundary to match the boundary on the other side of the A480"</i></p> <p><u>If this is indeed the case</u>, why does The October 2018 NDP Proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Show that two [2] <i>properties are planned</i> for this piece of land? 2. Why does this piece of land [Block 'E'] not <i>"match the boundary"</i> of Block 'D' on the other side of the A480? | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The area of land shown as Site E was included as a late addition within the settlement boundary following a representation from the landowner during the informal consultation on the emerging Draft Plan carried out in Summer 2018. The plan period is the same as that for the Core Strategy - up to 2031 and a Grampian condition required by Welsh Water requires any development to commence after 2020. Therefore, although there may not be immediate plans to bring forward development on the site, by including it within the settlement boundary, there is</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | Is this an oversight, poor map reading or a wilful deception? | <p>a presumption that development is likely to be acceptable in principle over the next 12 years or so.</p> <p>The density of development on the site has been agreed informally with the landowner. The proposed 2 dwellings reflects local low densities in the area.</p> <p>There is no requirement for the settlement boundary to "match" the boundary on the other side of the A480, nor was this proposed in the NDP.</p> | |
| (1.2) | 18 & 20 | 3.1.9 & 3.1.1 0 | | Object | <p>1. <u>Comment.:</u> The use of percentage figures is disingenuous as many of us can extrapolate % figures into real numbers and 'vice-versa'.</p> <p>1. <u>68.8%</u> of 93 responses = <u>16%</u> of <u>the Electorate.</u> i.e. <u>36 persons out of 576.</u></p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP has been prepared building on the responses to the emerging Plan during several phases of public consultation. During each one of the public consultation processes the responses submitted have been used to guide decisions about the</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>2. <u>60.2%</u> of 93 responses = <u>10.5%</u> “ ” i.e. <u>16 persons out of 576.</u></p> <p>3. <u>67.7%</u> out of 93 responses = 10.9% of the Electorate i.e. 12 out of 576.</p> <p>4. <u>75.3%</u> out of 93 responses = 13.8% of the Electorate i.e. 13 out of 576.</p> <p>2. <u>Paragraph 3.1.9</u> states that: <i>“The responses showed significant support for the inclusion of all four areas of land within the settlement boundary”.</i></p> <p>1. If a SUPPORT of 12.8% is <u>“Significant”</u> then I am amazed!</p> <p>3. <u>Paragraph 3.1.10</u> States that: <i>“Given the <u>clear support</u> for all four sites, the draft plan proposes that they be included within the settlement boundary”.</i></p> <p>1. If <i>“Clear Support”</i> means that all of <u>74 out of the 576</u> ‘registered’ Parishioner-Voters of Lyonshall [less than 13%]</p> | <p>next stage of NDP policies and proposals. The NDP supporting text (see 3.1.5) clearly shows that the percentages provided show the proportion of respondents and not the proportion of total residents in each consultation.</p> <p>The consultation processes were well publicised and further information about this is provided in the accompanying Consultation Statement. All residents were given several opportunities to comment and make representations on the NDP documents and all responses at each stage have been carefully considered.</p> <p>At the end of the NDP process all those on the electoral process will be invited to vote on whether the NDP should be used to help determine planning applications.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>within 'voting age' <u>might agree</u> with The Chairman of our CPC and his '<u>two-person</u> Sub-Committee' who am I to object? After all  know exactly what they are doing about building consent and quality of life on our ('The Parishioners') behalves.</p> | | |
| (1.3) | All | | | Comment / Object | <p>Having subscribed to <u>the latest</u> (of Three [3]) "Steering Groups" to weigh-up and advise us - the Council Tax payers of 'The Parish of Lyonshall – about 600 of us, on The Lyonshall NDP since 2012 I now find that their deliberations have at last reached the 'Regulation 14' stage and that we are obliged to fill in our forms for "The Public Consultation" on-or-by Friday 7th December 2018 – some 5 plus years after this lengthy process began.</p> <p>The 'Chair' of our Lyonshall CPC promised us in November 2016 that The Steering Group would consist of '6 Persons'. However by</p> | <p>The PC decided to form a steering group of 6 people, 3 from the PC and 3 parishioners. During preparation of the NDP unfortunately one member of the group suffered a stroke and resigned, another died unexpectedly and the 3rd member retired for business reasons. The responsible body for the SG decided unanimously the group should continue with the remaining members as the bulk of the work had already been completed.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>the time that their deliberations were submitted to The Lyonshall CPC for consideration in mid 2018 the 'Steering Group' consisted of The Chair of Lyonshall CPC and one other person [ably assisted by The Lyonshall CPC Clerk who, as a paid employee of The Lyonshall CPC is {like the "MP who takes The Chiltern Hundreds" } ineligible to vote. i.e. The Steering Group consisted of <u>two (2) persons only</u>).</p> <p>Judging by the latest Lyonshall CPC insert into "<i>The Arrowvale Group of Parishes messenger</i>" (sic) which we received today [6th December 2018] our NDP Steering Group (of at least one person – The Chair of The Lyonshall CPC) has decided to forward all our comments [which are not yet complete until tomorrow the 7th December 2018] to "the Consultants to review". Only then will The Parish Council [of which the Chairman is the main (and only?) representative on The NDP Steering Group] will review the next draft for approval, (presumably by us - 'The Council Tax Payers' or are we ignored?) before submission to Herefordshire</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>CC? These documents will then “form the basis for the Regulation 15/16 stages of the plan”.</p> <p>My questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why did we ever need all these NDP “Steering Groups”? All 3 of them over 6 years. 2. Why do we need a 10 person CPC for a Parish of approximately 600 voters when nobody can remember having voted for any single Member of The CPC – let alone our “Lyonshall CPC Chair”? 3. Is this procedure within “The Meaning of The Law”? <p>I am assured by The Chair of The Lyonshall CPC that it is within “The Letter of The Law” and I do not doubt it.</p> | | |
| (2.0) | 26 | 3.2.6 | | Comment | <p>There is no industrial estate at the Ovals Farm. There have been quarry lorries at the buildings since 2015. The farm buildings are used to house cattle in winter and store farm machinery and straw. The grass car racing is held a maximum</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend text as suggested to remove reference to industrial estate.</p> | <p>Amend:</p> <p>Take out Ovals farm references and consequential numbering 3.2.6 and from policy LB1.</p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | of 4 weekends per year and Kington Show is held on an adjacent field once per year. The track to the buildings was tarmacked as it was rough and potholed. The barn extension currently being built is for grain drying. | | |
| (3.1) | 26 | 3.2.6 | 3.2 | Comment | Surely there are other potential industrial sites along the A44 besides Burgoynes or the Ovals Farm? What about Penrhos Farm, Yaidon, Red Hill farm and Tack Barn, all of these are accessible from A44. If it is small workshops that need to be set up, then these are lots of farm buildings along some of the little back lanes in this Parish that would be suitable sites. | Accepted. The NDP does not seek to identify all possible sites in the parish. | Amend NDP. |
| (3.2) | 23 | 3.1.1 9 | LH2 | Comment | Surely housing for elderly <u>IS</u> specialist. Doorways need to be wide enough for wheel chairs, premises should be on the level and if there are stairs then there should be a lift. Power points at waist height and lever type door handles and taps. This should be pointed out by P.C. to developers backed up with the projected population growth of 80-84 year old over the county). Developers | Accepted. Policy LH2 could be strengthened to support specialist housing for older people. | Amend NDP. Amend Policy LH2 Criterion 2. Insert further text: <i>"Schemes that provide specialist supported accommodation for older residents will also be supported."</i> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | <p>would sell their houses much quicker if these facilities were added.</p> <p>The housing strategy for England (2011) identified 60% of projected household growth to 2033 will be from households aged 65+. Good housing for older people can help reduce the number of people moving into long term care and reduce costs to the NHS & social care. Attractive housing choices for older people to move to smaller more suitable housing frees up family houses.</p> | | |
| (3.3) | 23 | LH2 | | General Comment | <p>The NDP doesn't appear to take into account the county's 50+ population growth. HCC research team 2012, Hfds projection – older people in Herefordshire.) There is projected to be an increase in 85-89 year olds by 68.9% and for 90+ a 26.3%.</p> <p>Vague aspiration for dwellings suitable for the elderly needs to be tightened up.</p> <p>The process of completing this form is very complicated and it will</p> | Noted. See 3.2 above. | No further change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | be no surprise if there is very little response from other parishioners. (Note: attached older people in Herefordshire report with this comment form) | | |
| (4.0) | 23 | 3.1.1 7 | Site A LH1 | Object | To protect nature, preserve wildlife. Too much traffic – Lorries etc. Keep village way of life. Want to keep it as a small village. | Not accepted. Site A is proposed for around 5 units and is therefore a modest extension to the existing village. Development is unlikely to have a major impact on local traffic. Other NDP policies protect wildlife and landscape character and promote walking and cycling. Parish consultations support village growth. | No change. |
| (5.0) | 23 | 3.1.1 9 | LH1 | Object | We need to keep small villages small. Once you start to build in these small rural locations, it will not stop and we will destroy the countryside. | Not accepted. The Parish Council considers that new development is needed in Lyonshall to help support and improve local services and facilities and to provide a range of housing to meet local needs. The NDP supports a suitable level of new development to help promote a more | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | | sustainable future for the village. | |
| (6.1) | 6,20 &22 | | LH1 Site A | Objection | <i>Site allocation</i> Sites D is of historical and archaeological importance as it is in an area of the known medieval shrunken village. Thorough archaeological excavation and evaluation needs to be made in advance of any development at the developer's/landowner's expense. Ditto with any possible development of the field opposite The Close. | Not accepted. Refer to Table 2 - the NDP is supported by Historic England, the Government body responsible for protecting sites of archaeological interest and Herefordshire Council - see Table 1. Site D is not identified as having historical significance by either body. | No change. |
| (6.2) | | | LH1 Sites A, D and E | Not accepted. | However, I do believe sites A (small pasture behind Howe Terrace), D (small field below Lyonshall Memorial Hall) and E (pasture opposite Memorial Hall), as well as the land opposite The Close, should be preserved as they are old back-lands and pockets of relatively unspoilt land which give Lyonshall its distinctive and attractive character. They are also of great value for wildlife as these pools of 'unimproved' land link with | Not accepted. The proposed sites were supported by respondents in earlier consultations on the emerging Draft Plan and should be retained in the submission plan. Wildlife and landscape character are protected in other NDP policies and the NDP also supports the re-use of redundant former agricultural buildings. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>hedgerows to form vital corridors for wildlife movement and sustenance. The cynical spraying of such areas with pesticides/herbicides, or ploughing up a few years before planning applications (presumably to ensure there is nothing of wildlife importance left) is therefore repugnant and should be stopped.</p> <p>Surely brown-field sites (there are enough dilapidated semi-industrial/agricultural buildings in Lyonshall which could certainly do with a face-lift) or intensively-farmed sites could be used instead? Why do pockets of land of ecological, wildlife and historical/archaeological importance have to be destroyed? This archaeological, historical and wildlife heritage is not there to be destroyed by landowners or developers – it is our collective heritage.</p> | | |
| (6.3) | 8 | Note 6 | LH3 | Comment | The use of blank gable ends; of roofs with virtually no overhang; of bland window and door styles should be discouraged on every type of new buildings. | Partially accepted. These design details make up a personal view. Stores Row has none of them, and is a charming village streetscape. | Amend NDP.- LH3 can be made stronger on design and materials. Amend criteria 5 and 6 to: 5. <i>Groups of new buildings should contain a mixture of types, in sympathy with each other,</i> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | String-courses, and using occasional different colour bricks and designs break up the monotony of modern designs – it is probably small fry for the builder/developer but makes all the difference to those actually living there. The rendering and painting of elevations (another cheap alternative for the developer) should be discouraged as such finishes age quickly and become mildewed unless regularly painted – stone and brick does not become discoloured or age in this way. | There is a risk that developers will gladly (and cheaply) incorporate them, in the belief that their schemes must thereby be accepted. They will be seen as a winning prescription. These detailed points could be added to Policy LH3. | <i>but not identical in shape, style or design. The form and detailing of individual dwellings is expected to be robust and engaging, designed to give pleasure to occupiers, villagers and passers-by.</i> <i>6. Materials should be chosen to add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment. Their quality is very important, and in particular their weathering characteristics over the life of the building. Where possible, locally appropriate materials should be used. However, new development proposals need not imitate earlier architectural periods or styles, and imaginative modern designs will be encouraged.</i> |
| (6.4) | Page 8 | Point 7 | LH3 | Comment | Yes, try living in a house on the roadside when the feed lorries, chicken transporters and various other of the HGVs servicing the poultry/chicken units thunder by day and night. Coming back from Wales on numerous occasions we hit a wall of smells as we enter Lyonshall parish. We look at each other then, penny dropping, comment resignedly 'Oh yes, it's Lyonshall – Old Stinkyville!' Goodness knows what visitors to the place think. | Noted. The NDP cannot control noxious or unpleasant odours - these are matters for Environmental Health and Planning at Herefordshire Council. However, the NDP does seek to encourage the siting of new agricultural buildings to minimise adverse impacts such as smells on local residents. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| (6.5) | 8 | Point 2 | LB1 | Comment | <p>The aim/statement 'Adequate on-site car parking is provided for occupiers and visitors and suitable access is provided to the A480 and A44 respectively' sounds quite bland, but it could allow for the construction of large areas of concrete or other hard-standing for car parks, access roads and pull-ins, which, again, will undermine the rural character of the parish.</p> <p>Industrial designs (and I include modern farming in this) are so often taken off-the-peg by developers with little understanding of the local area, thus any commercial development often ends up looking as though it could be in any part of industrial, urban Britain.</p> <p>It does not have to be like this – developers and farmers can do much to ameliorate the visual and ecological impact of their buildings and associated open areas. Instead of planting the bog-standard municipal/agricultural grass mixes for open areas in industrial zones, why not sow wild seed mixes to create traditional meadows? This</p> | <p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>New developments should provide suitable on site parking to minimise the risk of parking on existing rural roads.</p> <p>Policy LE2 encourages developments to incorporate natural habitats such as trees and hedgerows but reference to wildlife meadows may also be appropriate.</p> | <p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy LE2: Add further text to final paragraph:</p> <p><i>"Where possible, schemes should incorporate measures which support and enhance local wildlife such as swift bricks, owl and bat boxes, and landscaping schemes should include the planting of locally appropriate species <u>and wildflower meadows</u> which support biodiversity."</i></p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | would attract pollinators and so help with pollination and thus be beneficial to farmers). Studies in England have found that when wild-flower mixes were sown in open areas by tower blocks; along road and footpath verges; and in other municipal areas, vandalism rates went down and people living there had a renewed sense of pride in their surroundings. This has to be worth trying in a village and its parish | | |
| (6.6) | 8 & 31 | Point 2 | LH1 | Comment | <p>Car park and access roads also add to the hard-standing of the parish to which domestic housing (including roof areas) contribute greatly. Where is extra the run-off going to end up? Can the streams cope, or the minimal surface drainage in Lyonshall parish already in existence? I don't think it is.</p> <p>Lyonshall centre acts as a natural sump. Therefore, developers should pay for any extra surface draining and NOT allow be added to parish or county rates/charges. How about if developers were to create wetland and pool areas from the additional run-off they create? These would be attractive</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Surface water drainage is addressed in LH1 (6) and further information about flooding and drainage has been included in the submission plan following consideration of representations from the Environment Agency and Welsh Water.</p> <p>The NDP does not include proposals for orbital or ring roads.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>aesthetically and immensely important for wildlife and the environment. These are such small schemes that could really make a BIG difference.</p> <p>I also feel we have enough orbital 'ring roads' being driven through fields. It is well known that such tracks become roads and then roads with ribbon development. Such access roads and their concomitant pull-ins and lay-bys are usually starkly municipal in appearance and often attract nefarious after-dark activities and the dumping of litter/waste. Thus such infrastructure should only be countenanced when absolutely necessary for vehicular/pedestrian safety.</p> | | |
| (6.7) | 10 & 32 | | LE2 | Support | Big yes to these points but please remember that a replacement hedge or woodland, although better than nothing, is ecologically more barren than a mature hedgerow and woodland. Thus preservation rather than replacement should always be the first option. | Noted. | No change. |
| (6.8) | 10 &32 | LE1 | | Comment | <i>Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character and Built</i> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p><i>Heritage</i> for broadly the same principles.</p> <p>The increasing level of spraying with herbicides and pesticides needs addressing. I stopped spraying with these chemicals in my garden 24 years ago. Back then we had big problems with aphids and slugs, so I planted trees and hedges and, within a year, the birds were coming back, and beneficial insects, frogs and toads and hedgehogs took up residence and they ate the aphids and slugs, and we have never had to spray again.</p> <p>This may sound twee but it works and can easily be done on a large scale, and everyone benefits. The current practice of spraying gateways, verges and stubble fields before ploughing with chemicals is damaging the environment for shoddy short-term gain. With judicious mowing, plant species can be checked where visual access for drivers is necessary or where arable crops are grown. There is really NO such thing as a safe chemical pesticide or herbicide spray. Toxins damage the</p> | <p>Agricultural practices such as spraying cannot be addressed in an NDP which is a land use planning document.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>immediate areas by killing off the wild fauna and flora (including many beneficial species) and the chemicals eventually leach into watercourses and damage the natural balance of ecosystems of rivers, streams and, eventually, the oceans. The first colonisers after spraying are the rampant plant species such as nettles and docks - presumably the very species the farmer/industrialist want to destroy - and these plants are usually unpalatable to herbivores. I regularly walk past a recently 'nuked' margins of an arable field and all that is happening are grazers, such as rabbits, are moving into the sown crops – if a varied hedgerow had been left, this would not happen. Mowing has to be cheaper in man-hours than spraying, and there's no cost in chemicals.</p> <p>I am particularly relieved to hear that new housing developments are charged with planting a tree for every bedroom – but let's make sure this actually happens (rather than just being a tick-box requirement in the initial planning</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | process. Let's also ensure that native tree species are used and that covenants/Tree Preservation Orders are set in place so the trees aren't ripped out as soon as the site has been signed-off by the planning department/building control. Ditto hedges. Perhaps give the first inhabitants of said developments incentives (monetary or in materials) for creating wildlife areas in their gardens? | | |
| (6.9) | 23 | | LH2 LE1 | Comment | As stated on page 44, the large majority of the 126 respondents of the possible 500 to the housing survey, were over 56 and was thus skewed to the older segment of the population so has a limited use in determining overall housing needs. With this mind.... 3.1.17 Instead of three-bedroomed semi-detached with young owner-occupiers, try one or two-bedroom housing...Most local young people would be hard-pressed to buy these small houses given the national pay average and the rise of the 'gig' economy and zero-hours contracts. In this case social housing is needed, but landlords in | Noted and partially accepted. The NDP seeks to promote a good mix of housing in new developments including smaller and affordable housing for younger people. LE1 encourages use of appropriate native species in planting schemes. Hedgerows are encouraged in LE2. Further information about trees and woodlands has been added following comments from the Woodland Trust (Table 2). | Amend LE1 Add criterion 5: <i>" 5.Incorporate wire and hedging where possible for site and plot boundaries as this is more appropriate to the local context than solid fencing."</i> Change numbering as required |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>the guise of competent and LOCALLY-based housing associations, and not part of private, buy-to-let schemes which encourage cripplingly high rents.</p> <p>See also my point about redeveloping redundant buildings for affordable housing below.</p> <p>The current trend of developers in Lyonshall for using great swaths of board-fencing around sterile plots of grass is unfortunate as they are not only unattractive to look at (particularly so in the future when said fencing starts to age and collapse) but are sterile from an ecological point of view.</p> <p>These fences also make a development look part of some unimaginative, low-cost housing estate. Such areas can so easily be bordered with hedging encouraged from existing stock and/or planted in with mixed, deciduous species. I am told that this Village Plan is to stop developments by big corporate builders/developers but board-fencing and bland lawns are the very look they favour!</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| (6.10) | 26-27 | | LB1 point 2 | Comment | <p>Point 2 (top of page 27) Please discourage/stop screening with non-native coniferous species. As the Forestry Commission has found, conifers planted in tightly-spaced rows provide near sterile sites for wildlife and also acidify the soil. Any screening should be with mixed, native and deciduous species for the aesthetic, environmental and wildlife reasons already discussed.</p> <p>Mature hedges and trees should be protected at all costs. A newly planted hedge will take centuries to establish the incredible biodiversity of an old hedgerow - ditto woodlands.</p> <p>The creation of wildlife areas, amenity areas and the protection of historical sites should be a concrete part of the planning process, rather than spoken about in a vague ways as something which might be nice to do. Developers are making money of out developments and it is essential they give something back to the community and the environment they are benefiting</p> | <p>Noted. Amend LB1 to refer to local specials. See 6.9 above.</p> | <p>Amend LB1.</p> <p>Add to end of Point 3 <i>"... is provided using a mix of native, locally appropriate, deciduous species;</i> "</p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | from. Developments should only be signed-off when these measures have been put in place, and then they need to be inspected at regular intervals to prove compliance, even if by volunteers who have some speciality in the field. | | |
| (6.11) | 27 | 3.2.7 – 3.2.1 0 | LB2 | Comment | <p>I thoroughly support the sympathetic re-development of redundant buildings, however I would also add 're-development for affordable housing schemes' as another option. Nationally, empty/redundant buildings are a vastly under-utilised resource – surely these should get priority for development, and green-field sites only used when the former have been fully used up and there is an essential need for housing.</p> <p>Point 3.2.9 – 'a section of Offa's Dyke including several stretches of the original wall' – trust me, surviving walls on Offa's Dyke really would be as rare as hen's teeth!</p> <p>For 'walls' read 'banks', surely. Seriously, the Dyke needs greater protection in this parish – there is one field for example, at approx SO</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>LB2 supports schemes for affordable housing and conversions for residential use are supported in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Amend 3.2.9 to refer to "bank" rather than "walls".</p> | <p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend 3.2.9 to refer to "bank" rather than "wall".</p> <p>Amend LH2</p> <p>Add at No3 to read: " 4. <i>Proposals for the re-use of redundant agricultural buildings for housing will be supported where they meet the criteria set out in Policy LB2.</i>"</p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | 336 548 on OS Explorer Map no. 201 (Kington and Hay-On-Wye), where ploughing is getting dangerously close to the monument. This is a particularly fine stretch of dyke running between Holme Marsh and the Bollingham Lane. | | |
| (6.12) | 28 | LB3 3 rd para | | Comment | <p>What exactly does 'mitigation' mean in this context? - (the green block of text, 4th row down. Re: 3rd paragraph of same green block on text on p. 28: Yes, it would be nice if the rule that states industrial developments, such as chicken houses/broiler units, be 500 metres or more away from domestic housing was actually adhered to. And hurrah to the consensus that Lyonshall has more than its fair share of these odious broiler houses. Enough already!</p> <p>As a closing observation, I am sad that my offers of help on the wildlife/ecological and environmental front were ignored on at least two (and probably three) occasions when I offered help in writing at the end of consultative meetings and questionnaires were laid out asking</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Mitigation is a common planning terms and could be used to refer to a range of ways of reducing adverse impacts.</p> <p>The Parish Council is grateful for the detailed comments provided and hopes that the NDP will help to protect and enhance local wildlife as required in national planning policy.</p> <p>Steering Group meetings have always been open to the public and agendas published properly in the legal timeframe.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | for such assistance. I do have an Upper Second degree in Ecology, Conservation and Land-use and so could have been of some help. The offer is still there. In the very week the World Wildlife Fund have reported that human activity has destroyed about 60 % of animal populations since 1970, care for the environment, the natural world and wildlife has never been so vital. | | |
| (7.1) | 36 | Section 83 | Environmental Report And LB1 | Object / Comment | <p>I have one aspect of this plan to express an opinion upon: section B3 environmental report Lyonshall NDP. In this part of the report the sections headed 'To Avoid, reduce and manage flood risk' are on two occasions marked with three crosses and N/A, meaning 'No relationship' and with 3 zeros, meaning 'neutral'.</p> <p>This surprises me greatly, as the village centre is in a rather wet Valley with a water table near to the surface. just ONE storm drain to take water from the village centre to the bottom of Bogs Lane, With the affected landowners properly compensated so that they are completely satisfied with the arrangement, would solve the</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Refer to Responses in Table 2.</p> <p>The NDP has been amended to take account of areas of known flood risk and to include supporting text and amendments to policy wording to address drainage issues.</p> | No further change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>problem. Immediate attention should be paid to the improvement of surface drainage, both of which was laid out prior to 1691, and is commensurate with the number of buildings existing now. This existing drainage system will not cope with the increased quantity and velocity of displaced water due to the extra areas of hardstanding and roofs outlined for the proposed new buildings in the plan. The fact that additional drainage is not being put in place in preparation for this, and indeed that the need for it is not even discussed, strikes me as just plain wrong.</p> <p>The severity of the problem is emphasized by the fact that the County Council has stored supplies of sandbags with at least 2 properties within the village centre for many years, and that approximately every 7 or 8 years I see neighbours dashing frantically to and fro clutching these bags in a state of panic, as very heavy rain happens quite expectedly here at long intervals. These are not freak conditions they are completely anticipated.</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| (7.2) | | | | | <p>Weobley Village development plan has a flood risk policy on page 42 of its plan section 6.29 which states that when new developments of proposed, both sequential and exceptional flood risk assessments in line with National Development Policy Framework must be conducted, and any necessary flood defences or drainage be fitted at the expense of the developers and used to increase the ecological diversity of the parish, and has outlines of potential wetland and reedbed establishment to cope with the extra water displaced.</p> <p>In the Lyonshall NDP there is no suggestion the NDPF will be followed and risk assessments made. The Lyonshall NDP only says it will be 'Bourne in mind', nothing more. Weobley parishioners, living in a fairly flat area not prone to floods, appeared to be protected against flooding why do we who own property in Lyonshall, in a wet valley, not received the same consideration? Will those bodies in authority over the approval of</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Refer to responses Table 2.</p> <p>The NDP has been amended to take account of areas of known flood risk and to include supporting text and amendments to policy wording to address drainage issues.</p> | No further change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Village plans allow such disparity between parishes to occur? Also why is it that the developers in Weobley will be made to pay for the cost of extra drainage, yet there is no mention of this in Lyonshall NDP; why should ratepayers in this Village foot the cost ?</p> <p>Thirteen of the thirty houses, both large and small, between the Royal George and Curl Brook in the village centre are built at road level. If these 13 flood on a regular basis, then these, and the other 17 houses built at a higher level like mine will be declared to be within a flood zone, become uninsurable and unsaleable, thus creating a financial loss. What are the 30 houses worth? £7 million, all this at a risk for the sake of not building one flood ditch.</p> | | |
| (8.0) | All | | | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (9.0) | All | | | Support | I entirely support the contents of this report. | Noted. | No change. |
| (10.0) | All | | | Support | I am returning this form without specific comments. I am full of praise for those who have worked on the various plans and reports, but would not like it to be thought | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | that not sending in a form would be taken as having no interest on the plans or future. | | |
| (11.1) | 22 | 3,4 & 5 | LH1 | Object | <p>If these points were followed it would not be providing the mix of dwellings recommended elsewhere nor reflect the current composition of the parish which consists of a wide range of housing including market homes which could be afforded by ordinary people.</p> <p>The requirement for parking 2 cars off-road is particularly unrealistic and restricting.</p> <p>These points also contradict LH2 supporting small to medium-sized houses to which I have responded separately.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Policy has been prepared following consideration of responses to previous consultations. The parking requirement has been deleted in response to comments from Herefordshire Council (see Table 1).</p> <p>Recommended densities have been reviewed by the Steering Group and it is likely that most schemes will comprise a mix of large and smaller housing in order to be viable. Response table 1 point 3.7 demonstrates meeting these needs.</p> | No change. |
| (11.2) | 24 | 2 | LH2 | Strongly Support | <i>A suitable proportion of small to medium sized market homes and affordable housing (up to 3 bedrooms) will be encouraged for first time buyers, smaller households and older residents wishing to downsize within the local area.</i> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | This need has been demonstrated many times with most locals knowing people who live, have lived or have connections with the village being unable to afford to buy a house here creating an imbalance in our village population. This statement is also contradicted by points 3,4 & 5 in policy LH1. | | |
| (11.3) | 30 | | LB4 | Object | <p><i>The topographical and rural setting of Lyonshall parish is not suitable for wind turbine generators.</i></p> <p>I saw no evidence for this statement. Where are the findings published?</p> <p><i>They will be resisted.</i></p> <p>It would be a mistake to close down this option at this point as technology is improving and smaller, more efficient wind turbines are becoming available.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Due to change in central Government planning policy following a ministerial statement, on shore wind turbine schemes can only be supported through sites identified in an NDP or Local Plan and no such sites have been identified through the NDP process.</p> | No change. |
| (12.1) | 6&39 | 3 | LH1 | General | Referring to appendix 1 and LH1: I am confused by the conflict in housing density within Holme Marsh. The text stipulates housing density in Holme Marsh should not exceed 8dph but tabulates the | <p>Noted.</p> <p>LH1 refers to new schemes which will come forward over the plan period. Appendix 1 gives examples of recent</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | density in the proposed development NE of Beech House as 11dph. Please provide clarification of this apparent conflict. | schemes which already have planning consent. | |
| (12.2) | All | | | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (13.0) | All | | | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (14.1) | All | 3-4 | | Object & Comment | <p>I cannot support this approach. It is unnecessarily restrictive and does not reflect wider opinion in the parish. The parish was never consulted on whether the NDP should be just a “planning document” designed to appease the HCC planners and make life easier for property developers, instead of reflecting public opinion and/or safeguarding the village.</p> <p>I do not share the contempt for the more visionary approach adopted by other parishes in this area.</p> <p>Moreover it is inappropriate that the response to this consultation should be evaluated by a “steering committee” of just 2 people, one of whom is also Chairman of the Parish Council and therefore not unbiased.</p> <p>This puts NR in a very difficult position; it also, in my opinion,</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>An NDP is a planning policy document and has to meet the required "basic conditions" including the need to have regard to national planning policy and to be in general conformity with Herefordshire's strategic planning policies. Planning policies have to be positively worded to support appropriate new development.</p> <p>The Parish Council and Steering Group have worked hard to provide multiple opportunities for local people to be engaged in and to comment on the emerging policies and proposals in the NDP and will continue to do so. At the end of the day the NDP will be subjected to a</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | invalidates the whole evaluation process if he is taken ill or is otherwise unable to take part. The opinions of the Consultant and of the Clerk to the PC – while I am sure they will be given honestly, if sought – are invalidated by their roles as persons paid to implement the wishes of the Parish Council, not voluntary representatives of the parish electorate. | local referendum and local people will have the chance to vote on whether the NDP should be used to determine planning applications in the parish. | |
| (14.2) | | | | Object & Comment | Who determines what is “unachievable”? The NDP should reflect what parishioners want , not what the Parish Council can control – “achievability” can be decided later, when all practical and funding options have been thoroughly explored. I agree with all the other local NDPs – this is not supposed to be a limited Parish Council document. Even the Localism Act itself was more wide-thinking and generous in its ambition! | Not accepted. The NDP has been prepared with a thorough approach to community engagement. The approach is set out in more detail in the Consultation Statement. | No change. |
| (14.3) | 4 | 2 | | Comment | I am puzzled at the enormous delays in putting this NDP together. The initial steering group of volunteers was formed in 2011. By mid 2014 a fourth Draft had been prepared (following discussions | Noted. The NDP has been prepared by a steering group of volunteers and the length of time taken is a reflection of | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>with Hereford CC and Kirkwells (consultants) and in July 2014 that steering group handed over responsibilities to the Parish Council – who suspended the NDP pending completion of the Hereford CC Core Strategy (despite being advised by the County Councillor that this was not essential). The Hereford Core Strategy was finalised in October 2015. Nevertheless there was no further NDP action until over a year later, in November 2016, when the Chairman of the Parish Council convened a small new steering group, under his own chairmanship, and announced it to the Parish. This group met for the first time in December 2016. The first Public Meeting offered by this new Steering Group was then held in late July 2017 – the barbecue, 24-hour display and lengthy website document which constituted the “Ideas and Options” Consultation. No further Public Meetings were held until July 2018 (when I believe there was another barbecue) when the “Informal Consultation” document was launched. This “Regulation 14</p> | <p>local peoples' time, resources and the commitment to ensuring the document has been prepared through a thorough and detailed community consultation and engagement process.</p> <p>The NDP process is nearing completion now, with the proposed submission of the Plan to HC early in 2019.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | Draft” was launched in late October 2018 with no Public Meeting whatsoever. It seems certain that, even if all goes smoothly in presenting this NDP to Herefordshire Council advisors and planners and the subsequent referendum, this NDP will not be approved and finalised until mid 2019 . 8 years! Why? | | |
| (14.4) | 4 | 3 | | Object & Comment | I hope the Independent Inspector will have full access to the Evidence Bases so that he can see the very poor response to the badly-organised “consultations” of July 2017 and July 2018 (93 and 17 respondents respectively). Total NUMBERS are important, NOT JUST PERCENTAGES! | Not accepted. The Consultation Statement sets out in detail the thorough and extensive community consultation processes which have been undertaken over many years to inform the plan's preparation. | No change. |
| (14.5) | 6 | | | Object & Comment | Sites A to D inclusive were NOT included in any public document or mentioned at any public meeting prior to the “Issues and Options Consultation” of July 2017 when they are first shown as though a <i>fait accompli</i> and the only public opinion sought refers to the number of houses already allocated to each site and agreed | Not accepted. The sites were not proposed as a <i>fait accompli</i> and were retained following consideration of the responses to the Issues and Options and first Draft Plan. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>with the landowner by the NDP Steering Group. (<i>In fact, reference back to the NDP Steering Group minutes of April and May 2017 confirms this to be the case.</i>) The only way in which the parishioners of Lyonshall could have had an influence would have been by refusing ANY development on ANY of the sites proposed. However the questions asked in this part of the Issues and Options document certainly do not make that clear. They are based on three ill-founded assumptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That 56 of the 68 additional houses already approved within the 2011-2031 NDP period may not be built. (The HCC requirement is for 12% (36) in total) 2) That we need to massively increase the resident population of Lyonshall to support the pub and its ancillary facilities therefore a further 43 houses should be added. 3) That unless parishioners agree to these developments Lyonshall | <p>Further detail is provided in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>These were informal consultation processes and the Regulation 14 consultation responses are also being used to inform any changes to the NDP.</p> <p>Many residents as set out in this Table continue to support the proposed sites.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>will be unable to make other improvements within the parish such as upgrading the Memorial Hall.</p> <p>It is, of course, perfectly possible that some of the above-mentioned 56 will not be built; it is equally possible that some of the Sites A-D proposed 43 houses will not be built. However it is a dangerous practice to approve a plan on the basis that it is not going to happen! <i>(Would you bake a cake on the assumption that no one is going to eat it?)</i> The NDP Steering Group obviously expect these sites to be developed as they wrote to the landowners in <u>September 2017</u> asking for their development proposals "to support the progress of the NDP" (See NDP Minutes)</p> <p>A further 2 houses on a new site, Site E, are proposed in this Regulation 14 document, on which no public consultation has been held at all. The opinion of the NDP Steering Committee in August 2018 was that "a small plot for two houses would prove to be inconsequential" and that the Parish Council could "have the final</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>say". This is again presented as a <i>fait accompli</i> in the Regulation 14 document and no comment is invited. (As it happens, I know that the present owners of Site E merely asked for the Development Boundary Line to be drawn to include this site to improve the value of their property when/if they sell it. They have no immediate intention of building houses on it and I can only speculate on why the NDP Steering Committee chose to allocate 2 houses to the site and what the consequences of so doing might be.)</p> <p>If all the houses currently proposed are built the housing stock of the whole parish of Lyonshall will be increased by around 40% and the housing stock specifically within the Village and Holme Marsh "Development Area" will be increased by around 60% -- all this with no improvement in infrastructure, roads, pavements, sewage, drainage, facilities etc. (Despite demand for these evidenced on the July 2017 questionnaire). They will have a deleterious effect on the rurality of</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>the village, which the present residents are anxious to maintain, and may reduce its attractiveness to tourists, ecologists and other potential visitors who are essential to the pub.</p> <p>IF it is now too late to redraw the Development Boundary to exclude all these additional sites (A-E), I suggest a simple line is drawn around them but with NO allocation of number of houses per site – let that be decided when/if a developer finds a market for them.</p> | | |
| (14.6) | 18 | 3.1 | 9-14 | Object & Comment | <p>Further to my comments in Reponse (sic) JE5, this is very seriously misleading.</p> <p>This Regulation 14 document omits to mention that the questions asked in the July 2017 document were only about the number of houses to be built on each site, not whether or not the site should be developed at all. The “no development” option was not given, despite the fact that Lyonshall had already exceeded its HCC minimum/economically viable housing numbers (68 built or approved) for the period 2011-2031. (See Key Issue 1 of the July</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to 1.2 above and Consultation Statement.</p> <p>These comments regarding the consultations are factually incorrect.</p> <p>All parishioners were invited to attend public parish consultations.</p> <p>The NDP has been prepared building on the responses to the emerging Plan during several phases of public</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>2017 document) (Note: this figure has been reduced to 61 on the Regulation 14 Draft but with no explanation – see Repsonse JE7) Having previously noted that the Village and Holme Marsh were already committed to this additional 68 (?61), this section of the document goes on to imply that <u>only</u> another 45 houses are to be built (Sites A-E inc), whereas the total as at this point in time is 113. Some of the 68 are listed in Appendix 1 and/or shown on the confusing map on Page 40 which also includes a number of small estates (Burgage Close, Stepstile, The Close, Burgage Bank etc.) built well before 2011 and therefore totally irrelevant to this NDP. Among the 68 are: Fishpools – 8 (already built) Others – 4 (already built) White Lion Meadow - 5 (built or under construction) Opposite the Close – 11 (fully approved) NE of Holme Marsh – 8 Upper House A1 – 4 Upper House A2 – 3 Upper House B1 – 7 Upper House B2 – 7</p> | <p>consultation. During each of public consultation processes the responses submitted have been used to guide decisions about the next stage of NDP policies and proposals. The NDP supporting text (see 3.1.5) clearly shows that the percentages provided show the proportion of respondents and not the proportion of total residents in each consultation.</p> <p>The consultation processes were well publicised and further information about this is provided in the accompanying Consultation Statement. All residents were given several opportunities to comment and make representations on the NDP documents and all responses at each stage have been carefully considered.</p> <p>At the end of the NDP process all those on the electoral process will be invited to vote on whether the NDP should</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p style="text-align: center;">Sub-Total - 57</p> <p>Most important, the response figures for sites A – D are given only in percentages. (See also Repsonse JEB referring to Page 16 of this document). It is vital to note here that the total response on which these significant conclusions and recommendations are based was only 93 people of whom 5 abstained from giving an answer at all to this question. Therefore all percentage figures here are based on the responses of just 88 people – 15% of the Lyonshall electorate . In favour of Site A, for example, is therefore only 61 people (11% of the electorate) who may or may not be Lyonshall residents and may or may not have a vested interest! The “narrow majority in favour of more than 30 extra houses” (3.1.10) is a very curious interpretation of the figures. I assume it refers to Questions 2a and 2b where “more than 30” attracted 37 votes and “less than 30” attracted 36. Hardly conclusive! Once again, the question does not make it clear whether it refers to Sites A – D</p> | <p>be used to help determine planning applications.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | alone or whether it refers to the whole development of the village including the 68 houses already built or approved. | | |
| (14.7) | 6 | 1.2 | LH1 | Object & comment | <p>Further to my comments on JE5 and JE5A, I hope the Independent Inspector will be made aware that both the proposed Settlement Boundary and the Site Allocations were not disclosed even to the Parish Council before the "Ideas and Options" Consultation of July 2017.</p> <p>They appear to have been the subject of private discussions between the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group (who is also the Chairman of the Parish Council) and the landowners concerned.</p> <p>They are not mentioned in the Parish Council minutes prior to July 2017 and the references in the NDP Steering Group minutes are evasive. (Note: One member of the NDP Steering Group rightly made a Declaration of Interest and absented himself from the discussions). The impression given at the July 2017 Consultation that these sites were unchallengeable, a</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Steering Group has been tasked with preparing the NDP on behalf of the PC (as in other NDP areas) and has provided regular updates at every monthly Parish Council meeting except during the Regulation 14 consultation process on its progress.</p> <p>The NDP is a Parish Council document and it has ultimate decision power not the SG.</p> <p>The Chairman was approached in person by the landowners and properly referred the information to the steering group and the Parish Council. This was carried forward and the public were asked whether they wanted the sites included for development as part of the public consultations.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p><i>fait accompli</i>, is therefore down to the activities of the NDP Steering Group ALONE; the Parish Council as a whole must be exonerated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the Parish Council at some stage (it is not clear from this document or the PC Minutes exactly when) decided against seeking further land for development since the Hereford CC minimum had already been exceeded (Page 18/ JE5A). Note too that, so far as one can tell from the NDP Minutes and from this Regulation 14 document, the landowners themselves did NOT seek "Site Allocations" of ANY number of houses, merely that their parcels of land (Sites A – E) should be put within the Development Boundary <u>for future reference</u>. I believe the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group has exceeded his brief in this. | <p>Members of the PC and the Parish Clerk sit on the Steering Group.</p> <p>Minutes are not intended to be a transcript, they are a formal record of business transacted and decisions made.</p> <p>The proposed sites came in WHILE the Issues and Options presentation was being put together. The information was presented to the parish with a worst case proposal (25dph). If the sites (roughly 6 hectares in all) were merely allocated for development as suggested, a developer would look for at least 150 houses, rather than the 45 that the respondent is so alarmed by.</p> <p>Evidence supports smaller sites with a mix of housing types.</p> <p>.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For my own part, I would find simple inclusion of the sites within a boundary line drawn on the map much more acceptable than the proposal that a further 45 houses should be built on them. The pros and cons of any development requested by a property developer or the landowner at a future date could then be debated in accordance with normal planning procedures. <i>It is the threat of gross over-development that is alarming, not the prospect of modest development on these particular sites at some time during the next 10 or 12 years.</i> | | |
| (14.8) | 3 | 5.9 | | Object & Comment | <p>There is a lot in this Background which is seriously misleading. In short:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The original housing allocation of 2 per annum from 2011 – 2031 (NDP | This is factually incorrect please refer to question 8 of the first questionnaire. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>period) was NOT a recommendation by the then Steering Committee. We were TOLD by the Chairman of the Parish Council that that was all that could be built and the NDP could merely determine where they should be built. Moreover 8 of these had already been approved (the affordable homes now built and named Fishpools).</p> <p>2. The “village centre complex” was secondary to wanting the pub to reopen and to have a village shop again. Grandiose schemes were “wishful thinking” if deemed commercially necessary to the pub. There was no widespread wish to move the Memorial Hall.</p> <p>3. The parish subsequently supported Mr. Hern’s wish – expressed at well-attended public meetings which HE convened – to</p> | <p>The background information is not misleading, it is simply setting out the events leading to this production of the NDP.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>build 15 – 45 attractive and well-spaced houses on his own land to the edge of the village centre to help fund the restoration of the pub. Support was around 70% of a considerable turn-out (although some concerns were expressed that this might be “the thin end of the wedge”).</p> <p>4. The pub and the farm shop did NOT close through lack of use. The pub closed because Punch Taverns who owned it would not commit to essential restoration and because they both raised the rent and operated restrictive practices on beer sales (for which they were notorious throughout the UK!). It had previously been very busy, especially with tourists and visitors during the summer months. The farm shop closed because the owners wanted to move elsewhere. It also</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | received much of its custom from outside Lyonshall. | | |
| (14.9) | 16 | 3.1 | 3 | Object & Comment | <p>I note that the figure for houses built after 2011 in Lyonshall Village or Holme Marsh + the houses "committed" is now given as 61 (23+38).</p> <p>All previous Consultation documents (Issues & Options July 2017 + Draft for Informal Consultation July 2018) quote a figure of 68. Please advise as to where the "missing" 7 were to be sited and whether planning permission has been rescinded on them -- if so, why? This is obviously relevant to both the July 2017 responses and all subsequent figures.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The housing figure has been updated from time to time, to reflect the most up to date information provided by Herefordshire Council. Net housing requirement figures are calculated each April and can change based on the number of commitments at that time ie recent completions and extant (non expired) planning permissions</p> <p>The Reg 14 NDP includes the April 2018 figure.</p> | No change. |
| (14.10) | 16 | 3.1 | 4 | Object & Comment | <p>I assume the "survey" to which this refers was the July 2017 "Issues & Options" consultation document which had a total response of just 93, of whom some abstained from expressing an opinion on various questions (rather than the "Informal Consultation Draft" of July 2018 which had a total response of only 17).</p> | | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over 75% favoured “more development in the village” – where does that figure come from? Does it assume that this is “more development” over and above the 68 (61) new houses already built or committed (<i>see previous comments</i>)? NB Question 2 in the July 2017 document refers to LIMITED development. 2. If the latter, does it refer to Question 2 Site D (below the Memorial Hall), the only new Site to gain more than 75% approval? This Site is for just 2 houses, with the benefit of additional land to be ring-fenced to the Memorial Hall (an independently-funded and run 3. 84.9% of respondents wanted any new estates to be smaller than 15 houses (“around 5” is the figure given elsewhere). So how does the NDP justify recommending 2 | <p>77.4% favoured growth responding to Question 2 on the Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Because more than 65% of respondents were in favour of these sites.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>estates of 18 houses each – Sites B & C?</p> <p>4. "...to retain the essential rural character of Lyonshall" – by building over 100 new houses on farmland close to the village centre, thereby nearly doubling the size of the village? This substantial development will change the outstanding characteristic of Lyonshall dramatically and forever.</p> <p>5. "...sustainable in the broadest sense" . What does this gobbledygook mean? Herefordshire Council's own economists have recently (2015) determined the sustainable economic development of the whole parish of Lyonshall at 36 houses built between 2011 and 2031 so how can more than 3 times that number be "sustainable"? Or is the word "sustainable" being used here to mean something</p> | <p>Parishioners have responded that the essential character of Lyonshall is maintained whilst providing the growth requested. This plan aims to achieve this. This NDP executes the instructions of the parish expressed in the consultations.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | different? Just a “buzz-word” to curry approval??? | | |
| (14.11) | 16 | 3.1 | 6,7 | Object & Comment | <p>These paragraphs summarise the whole problem with the way that housing development has been handled in the Lyonshall NDP.</p> <p><i>“Since the Core Strategy housing requirement already has been more than met (by end of 2016 and convening of “new” NDP Steering Group, if not before) through new developments and commitments, the Parish Council considered that there was no need to undertake a call for sites and site assessment process for the NDP”.</i></p> <p>True! Because the Chairman of the new NDP Steering Group, who is also Chairman of the Parish Council, had already agreed 4 more sites and housing allocations on them totalling a further 43 houses with the local landowners concerned – all this BEFORE the “issues and Options Consultation” of July 2017 when, as previously noted, they were presented as a <i>fait accompli</i> to the parishioners! Nobody – not even the Parish Council – was given the</p> | <p>The Parish Council has followed the defined procedure for implementing an NDP and produced a plan from parish consultations and parishioner responses.</p> <p>SG did not have a call for sites as the minimum target for housing had been achieved through normal planning activities.</p> <p>Sites A -D came forward as part of the NDP process and Parishioners were asked if they should be included as part of the NDP in the issues and options consultation.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>opportunity to reject these sites! (<i>The NDP Minutes for March to May 2017 give no indication of any intention to discuss these sites with the Parish Council and they do not appear to have been raised according to draft Parish Council minutes for the same period. The NDP Minutes for September and October 2017 also confirm that the NDP Chairman intended to discuss the landowners' proposed developments with them – no suggestion that this was anything but serious planning!</i>)</p> <p>Why? Well, obviously not because Lyonshall needed these extra 43 houses to make up the numbers to the HCC minimum – as previously stated, the HCC minimum was 36 and the “new developments and commitments” mentioned above total 68. The reasons hinted at in the July 2017 Consultation document are fatuous; they predicate the possibility that the houses already approved won't be built and, while suggesting that the extra 43 will somehow make a financial contribution to the village, carefully omit to mention any down side or risk to their inclusion.</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | It seems to me that this is a particularly telling example of the Chairman's stated wish to make the Lyonshall NDP easy for Herefordshire CC planners to use, NOT reflective of Lyonshall residents' opinion or even what can be demonstrated as necessary for the Parish. I assume that, should this Regulation 14 draft go through with all these additional sites included, it will be very difficult indeed for Lyonshall residents to object to building on them as per the NDP at a later stage. | | |
| (14.12) | 23 | 3.1 | 18,19 | | It is difficult to know why : a) the excellent Herefordshire Council report " Herefordshire Older People's Housing Strategy and Pathway" of May 2015 was not considered, even before the Lyonshall Housing Survey of January 2017 and certainly before publication of this Regulation 14 document. b) The Herefordshire Council's "Older People's Integrated Needs | Not accepted: These comments are inaccurate and factually the survey was analysed by the five members of the steering group. The information is not misleading. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Assessment” of May 2018 has not also been considered.</p> <p>c) The results of the Lyonshall Housing Survey of January 2017 were suppressed before the “Issues and Options” Consultation in July of that year.</p> <p>If all three of these documents had been properly considered and, especially, if the Lyonshall Housing Survey had been analysed using common sense and without pre-judgement based on what the two remaining members of the NDP Steering Group wanted to hear, the daft and misleading statements incorporated in 3.1.19 and 3.1.20 might have been avoided.</p> <p><i>(With regard to the Lyonshall Housing Survey of January 2017, Appendix 4 of this Regulation 14 document states that response was “126 of 500”. I am not sure where that “500” figure comes from as this Survey was based on a per household distribution and in January 2017 there were only about 310 households in the whole</i></p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p><i>Parish. Response was therefore a very creditable 40% -- similar to the response to previous paper-based surveys in 2012 and 2013.)</i></p> <p>3.1.19 is particularly misleading because it claims that this document has <i>“recommended that the housing needs of the ageing population be addressed in various ways”</i> and that <i>“mixed developments were recommended to create genuine lifetime communities.”</i> Where do these fine recommendations occur? I haven't found them in any Draft NDP to date. These “lifetime communities” will exclude any older person who becomes frail, who is wheel-chair bound, who needs 24/7 care either from family or a live-in carer?? In a Parish which already has 27% over-65s and is likely to have 40% over-65s before the end of this NDP Planning Period (2031) it is highly unlikely that all these people (between 150 and 250) will remain fully fit and capable until the day they die. (<i>Outside this document, the recommendation has been made that they should “go to Kington” – regardless of the fact</i></p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <i>that Kington's only Surgery and its care facilities are already overloaded.)</i> | | |
| (14.13) | 24 | 3.1.2 4 | LH1 | Object & Comment | This is utterly confusing and, if I am right in my interpretation, complete nonsense! "Large numbers of unwanted houses are to be built on two sites (both substantially bigger than the maximum endorsed by the present Lyonshall residents) in order to force the developers into including affordable housing, for which there is currently no demand". That is ludicrous and immoral! This may not be what the NDP Steering Group intended but that's how it reads to me and probably to anyone else who can be bothered to read it. | Not accepted. Larger housing sites allow for flexibility for a mix of housing including affordable housing if required. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| (14.14) | 39/40 | | LH1 | General Comment | <p>I have no criticism of the housing design or density comments.</p> <p>However I think it is very important that anyone reading this page, including those not closely familiar with Lyonshall such as the Independent Advisor, should be able to differentiate between houses that pre-date 2011, i.e. before the 20-year NDP period, and houses that have been built or approved since 2011 and which therefore form part of the HCC Core Strategy/NDP requirement.</p> <p>(The fact that it is too late to vote against any of these is totally irrelevant).</p> <p>Thus Table 1 should simply be The Close, Stepstile and Burgage Close. Fishpools was always acknowledged as included in the Development Area and was not built until 2013. It should therefore be included in a re-titled Table 2.</p> <p>The Holme Marsh and Upper House sites shown under Table 3 could also be included in Table 2 since they are within the</p> | <p>Not accepted:</p> <p>The function of appendix 1 is as the title suggests, to consider the character and density, and this alone, history is irrelevant.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>previously-agreed Development Areas of Lyonshall and Holme Marsh – the fact that they are “outside the village centre” (as defined by the current Chairman of the NDP Steering Group/Parish Council) is also irrelevant.</p> <p>This distinction should be clearly made on the Map on Page 40, which should also have a title stating that it comprises both pre-2011 built sites and post-2011 already-approved or built sites, if this map is not to add to the confusion.</p> | | |
| (14.15) | Cover | | | | <p>I commented on the Informal Consultation that I disliked the fact that the Lyonshall NDP cover refers to “2018 – 2031” when those of us who have lived in the village and taken an interest in the NDP since 2011 know that the “start date” for all target numbers etc. is 2011, reinforced or otherwise by the Core Strategy of October 2015.</p> <p>The Chairman’s reply to my comment was that “<i>The dates on the consultation read 2018 to 2031 as this (is) how Herefordshire Council prefer to look forward.</i>”</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Although the entire plan period dates from 2011 (the Core Strategy Plan period), Examiners generally request that NDP covers have the current year as the date. The final Referendum Plan is therefore likely to date from 2019.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Is it? If so, why do Pembridge, Shobdon and Titley give their NDP dates as 2011 to 2031, even though their consultation documents were published in 2017 or the autumn of this year? (Eardisland avoids the controversy by entitling its plan "To 2031")</p> <p>One cannot have an arbitrary start-date on a policy! The Localism Act came into force in 2011. The first surveys for Lyonshall NDP were done in 2011-2014; the minimum number of new builds before 2031 was set by HCC based on the housing stock in 2011 (300 homes); the Housing Survey was conducted in January 2017 and the "Issues and Options Public Consultation" on which this Draft relies for so much of its "evidence" was conducted in July 2017. Neither you nor Hereford can casually decide that NDP policies now only relate to action post-2018 and ignore both the findings and actions of the last 7 years!</p> <p>I cannot help but wonder if this is an attempt to minimise any</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | parishioners' comments relating to the 68 houses built or approved in that time which already exceed Hereford's minimum requirement figure of 36 by 90%. (See Page 16, 3.1.6) (See also Page 17, 3.1.7 – the Parish Council Minutes prior to the July 2017 Consultation show no sign that the PC was “approached by local landowners” or even informed by the then NDP Steering Committee – a small point, perhaps, but another which raises doubts.) | | |
| (15.1) | 7 | 5.4 | 5 | Support option 3 | Habitats regulations Assessment Regulation 14 Objective 5 – Access Support option 3. | Noted. | No change. |
| (15.2) | 24 | 3.1.2 4 | LH2 | Support | House Types & sizes | Noted. | No change. |
| (15.3) | 25 | | LH3 | Support | Promoting High Quality Design | Noted. | No change. |
| (15.4) | 32 | 3.3.1 1 | LE2 | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (15.5) | 37 | 3.5.4 | LT1 | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (16.1) | All | | | Support | I have finally read the draft NDP. Congratulations on a mighty document, clearsighted, comprehensive and even comprehensible, which is rare in such screeds. I very much like the way Holme Marsh and Lyonshall | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | will be better linked, and that the plan manages to avoid anything resembling ribbon development. | | |
| (16.2) | | | General | Comment | A few things catch the eye. I am still not entirely clear how Kinsey has managed to parlay his purchase of the pub into permission to build thirty houses. I would be more convinced if something had actually happened these past few years. There has been someone there these last few weeks, true, but the speed of operations is making glaciers look sprightly. Since much of the plan hinges on his development of the pub site, he should get a move on. | Noted. New development in the village is being held back by a Grampian condition until 2020 - see Welsh Water comments in Response Table 2. | No change. |
| (16.3) | All | | | Comment | I notice that in the document walking and cycling seem to be regarded as leisure activities. If the village is to be a truly dynamic, internally coherent and carbon-appropriate living and working unit, not to mention a safe place in which to return from the pub if it ever gets finished, both these things should be classified as core transport imperatives. This means dedicated cycle tracks and vastly improved pavements. | Noted. See Table 1 Herefordshire Council Comments. Promoting access for walking and cycling have been added to Policies LH1 and LB1. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| (16.4) | | | LH2 | Comment | <p>The age profile of respondents to the Housing Survey is a bit odd.</p> <p>Suspect that younger respondents are conspicuous by their absence because they were putting the children to bed. The small proportion of newbuilds suggested for affordable housing may reflect this. In an age of greedy developers seeking to flog overpriced executive homes, the current plan risks attracting a lot of old people and commuters. This is not a recipe for a healthy community. More affordable homes should be mandatory, not based on the numbers put forward by a survey that one suspects may have been flawed in execution if not conception.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Affordable housing can only be required on schemes of 11 or more homes but the NDP aims to provide a greater mix of housing including smaller homes suitable for younger older people and first time buyers.</p> | No change. |
| (16.5) | | | LH3 | Comment | <p>House design: it is good that pastiches of olde worlde residences are approached with some reservation, and that new design elements will be encouraged.</p> <p>Suggest that the new houses going up on the east side of the main road through the village are neither decent pastiches nor (from what I have seen of their construction as I</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP cannot influence designs that already have planning consent.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | pass) any more sustainable than lipstick on a pig, and that if this is what the NDP is talking about it will scarcely be worth the paper it is written on. Very much hope that future houses will be more authentic to themselves, and that designs ancient and modern should be not only carbon neutral but built from sustainable materials, which will not include (for instance) polythene. | | |
| (16.6) | | | LE2 | Comment | The wildlife section is a fine vote for motherhood and apple pie. It ignores the depredations of pheasant rearing, which when practised at its current ludicrously high densities will certainly be affecting the biodiversity of the rural fringes. | Noted. The NDP is a planning policy document and can only be used to guide decisions on planning applications, and not rural land management practices. | No change. |
| (16.6) | | | LH1 LC2 | Comment | A specific site for allotments should be a priority, not an afterthought or an add-on. | Accepted. Policy LH1 encourages the provision of suitable garden space for food growing on housing developments. Policy LC1 could be amended to include support for future allotment provision. | Amend NDP. Amend LC2: Amend second paragraph to: <i>" Provision of new and enhanced public open space which gives improved facilities for the community, <u>such as allotments</u>, will be supported and encouraged as part of developer contributions."</i> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | | Allotment provision may also be a matter for the Parish Council and could be considered as a future action, subject to demand. | |
| (17.0) | All | | | Support | I fully support the Lyonshall NDP | Noted. | No change. |
| (18.1) | All | | | Support | My overall comment on the NDP is:- I hugely welcome the extent and type of growth envisaged. We desperately need new blood and new money in the area to support the services we want and to support local employment. The chosen locations all seem v sensible, helping to create a cohesive and co-ordinated community. | Noted. | No change. |
| (18.2) | | | LC1 LH1 (B) | Support / Comment | A specific comment:- The NDP and the growth envisaged provides a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create a new and fit-for-purpose village hall / Memorial Hall in the right place - i.e. in the centre of the village mass adjacent to the new car park (providing the George allows access). S106 monies from developments and property | Noted. The proposed site densities of all site allocations have been reviewed by the Steering Group. This could be the subject of future negotiations provided densities are maintained. | No further change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>development of the existing Memorial Hall land should be used to fund a new purpose-built facility that will last.</p> <p>Marginally higher housing density could be allowed on the Plot B on the plan (which would be in keeping with the local housing there) to compensate for building land lost to the developer as a result of 'gifting' land for the New Memorial Hall to the parish.</p> | | |
| (19.0) | All | | | Support | <p>████████████████████ who all reside in Winton House in the centre of the village fully support the NDP proposal</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (20.0) | All | | | Support | <p>████████████████████ who all reside in Winton House in the centre of the village fully support the NDP proposal</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (21.0) | All | | | Support | <p>████████████████████ who all reside in Winton House in the centre of the village fully support the NDP proposal</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (22.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I support the current NDP proposals with the suggested sustainable growth to the village that will help to sustain the proposed pub, coffee shop and village shop developments bring a centre to the community.</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| (23.1) | All | | | Support | <p>I have read the draft plan thoroughly and fully support the proposed policies.</p> <p>I do, however, have a small number of comments to make which I think will clarify some points.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (23.2) | | | LB3 | | <p>Draft Policy LB3 para 1 (page 8): later in the document there is a statement to the effect that public opinion is tending towards the parish being near to saturation with chicken houses. The statement referring to chicken sheds here would appear to be to the contrary. Would it be possible to make a similar statement here such as "the public opinion within the parish is that chicken accommodation is almost at capacity so additional broiler houses would only be after special consideration."</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Each planning application will be considered on its own merits and the NDP cannot limit the number of agricultural buildings to a number considered acceptable by local residents.</p> <p>The NDP does however aim to provide criteria based planning policies which require the adverse impacts of future proposals to be considered and managed accordingly.</p> | No change. |
| (23.3) | | | LB3 | Comment | <p>Draft Policy LB3, para3 (2nd para on page 9): the first half states such developments will not be permitted but the final sentence appears to contradict this. After a few reads, I know what you mean</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The wording of the Policy is supported by Herefordshire Council for determining planning applications. The Examiner may recommend</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | but if it could be revised or reworded to remove doubt. | changes if he/she considers that the Policy wording is not clear. | |
| (23.4) | | | LE2 | Comment | Draft policy LE2 (page 10): What sort of development does this refer to? I assumed residential development would be confined to within the settlement boundary; this implies development out with this envelope. I assumed you meant business/industrial/agricultural? Should it be more explicit? | Noted. The Policy will be used for all development in the Parish. Although most development will be within the settlement boundaries it is likely that there will be some limited development in the wider rural area eg conversions, agricultural buildings and "exception" housing. | No change. |
| (23.5) | | | LC1 | Comment | Draft policy LC1 (page 11): If a new hall is to be built one day, I would have thought that it should be encouraged to have well over the capacity of the present all (c100) so a more aspirational at "at least 200" might be more appropriate which would then be able to accommodate a large wedding party for example. | Not accepted. The policy gives a broad indicative figure of 100-200 people but the final figure will be dependent upon such matters as cost / funding and viability. | No change. |
| (23.6) | 13 | 1.1.1 | | Comment | Page 13 para 1.1.1 The A44 traverses the parish east-west but bisects it in to north/south | Accepted. | Amend second sentence in 1.1.1 to wording as suggested: <i>" The A44 traverses the parish east-west and bisects it north/south"</i> |
| (23.7) | All | | | Support | These were the only areas of the draft where I felt the wording | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | might be misinterpreted, otherwise this is a well written document and the working group should be congratulated for digesting the mass of data and opinion presented to them to this concise policy document. | | |
| (24.0) | All | | | Support | In my opinion the Lyonshall NDP has made a very good attempt at meeting the needs of the village as expressed in both meetings and consultations and I heartily support it. | Noted. | No change. |
| -(25.0) | All | | | Support | As a [REDACTED], I have read the Lyonshall NDP and am very happy to support the plan. Although it is looking to control the development, it is allowing development and planning for it. This will breathe new life into the village, and significantly help our chances of rebuilding the village pub into a viable and bustling centre for all of the community and visitors to use and enjoy. I look forward to Lyonshall moving in a positive direction over the timeline of the proposed plan. | Noted. | No change |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| (26.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I have read the Lyonshall NDP and fully support it.</p> <p>The Lyonshall NDP outlines in a practical way how Lyonshall can become a attractive sustainable community. The NDP together with the development of the pub and all the facilities that it will offer will produce a centre for the village which will be used by many Parishioners for different reasons. It will above all else be a meeting point for the people of the parish. This can only create greater community cohesion.</p> <p>All the consultations, and there have been many, have shown that people want to maintain the essential character of Lyonshall. At the same time there is a recognition that the village needs to grow to sustain the facilities that the Parish Consultations show that people want. The planning policies set out in the Lyonshall NDP ensure that the essential character will be maintained but allow the village to expand with suitable and varied village housing in sensible plot sizes set back from the road in a proper</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>village country setting whilst respecting and improving the landscape in a sensible and practical way.</p> <p>The Lyonshall NDP opens up an exciting future for Lyonshall which is why I back it wholeheartedly.</p> | | |
| (27.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I am writing this in support of the proposed draft plan.</p> <p>Having moved to Lyonshall in 2011, the Royal George has been closed for all of this time, and the village has been a bit lost without it's focal point of the pub. The positive form in which the NDP document has been compiled means there is a real chance of a bright future for Lyonshall. It allows for development of sensible and beneficial projects, enhancing the character of the village and best of all looks like it will be giving the Royal George redevelopment programme the best chance of success.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (28.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I would like to add my personal support for the Lyonshall NDP. It is a good document that has been thoroughly consulted on as the</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>SG agree to this dedication and will seek PC support</p> | <p>Insert dedication to Ron Addis - SG please provide wording.</p> <p><i>"It is the collective wish of the It is the collective wish of the Parish Council and the Steering</i></p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>information on the website demonstrates.</p> <p>I would also like to add my thanks to the 6 people who comprised that working group.</p> <p>The six people with three from the Parish Council and three non councillors have done a great job. I understand that the working group suffered three departures after it had completed the bulk of its work.</p> <p>One member Ron Addis died tragically, another had to leave following a stroke to concentrate on her recovery, and a local businessman found it increasingly difficult to balance the demands of his business, the NDP and his family.</p> <p>I see from the PC minutes that the remaining three members felt that as the bulk of the policy work had been completed they were able to complete and tidy up the details of the plan, rather than introduce new members who would inevitably take time to get up to speed. The Parish Council</p> | | <p><i>Group that this Neighbourhood Development Plan be dedicated to Ron Addis, colleague and friend, and a man who carried Lyonshall in his heart. He gave his best efforts to it, and his unwavering common sense and eye for detail made the compiling of it a lighter task."</i></p> |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>unanimously agreed this course of action. I also understand that most NDPs end up being completed by a smaller group.</p> <p>The only change to the document that I would suggest is that the working group add a dedication to Ron Addis without whose sensible and balanced influence the NDP would have been a poorer document.</p> | | |
| (29.0) | All | | | Support | As a younger member of the Parish coming towards the end of my education I fully support the Draft Neighbourhood plan because it sets out a positive and exciting future for my village. | Noted. | No change. |
| (30.0) | All | | | Support | I refer to the draft Lyonshall NDP Regulation 14 Consultation and having read and fully considered the document I am in full agreement with all the proposals. I am of the opinion that the plan represents an excellent foundation for the continuing development of the village whilst retaining it's character and that of the rest of the parish. | Noted. | No change. |
| (31.0) | All | | | Support | I have lived and farmed on the edge of Lyonshall my entire life, | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>and it is great to see such a positive document relating to development in the village and surrounding area. The growth in the village and parish will bring investment into the area, creating jobs and helping to rebuild the village centre through the redevelopment of the village pub.</p> <p>I support the draft plan, and hope it will get signed off to allow for the village to come back to life, as it once was.</p> | | |
| (32.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I have farmed on the side of Lyonshall for over 40 years, and many things have changed in this time. The village has struggled as the services have closed and disappeared over the years, through a lack of investment or viability to maintain the services.</p> <p>I am extremely encouraged by the Lyonshall NDP draft which offers to buck the trend and allow for sensible investment which will bring life back into the area. It cannot happen soon enough.</p> <p>I would like to offer my support to the plan.</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| (34.0) | | | | Support | I am supportive of the NDP and hope Lyonshall grows in size so we can have more facilities and jobs. | Noted. | No change. |
| (35.0) | All | | | Support | I support the NDP for Lyonshall. I would like to see a new modern village hall more centrally located. | Noted. | No change. |
| (36.0) | All | | | Support | I am happy with the NDP. I would like to see a more up to date village hall. | Noted. | No change. |
| (37.0) | All | | | Support | I fully support the Lyonshall NDP. | Noted. | No change. |
| (38.1) | 3 | 3.38, 3.39, 3.3.1 03.3. 11 | | Support & Comment | Support – Conserve and enhance the natural historic and scenic beauty of important landscapes and features. Lyonshall Park Wood is an ancient hunting forest – which is currently being devastated by felling all the trees -! With permission of the forestry commission apparently! The impact of this to wildlife and the impact of weekly and sometimes bi weekly shooting is devastating as well. No deer remains, squirrels shot or trapped etc. Otter wildlife scared away. | Noted. The NDP is a planning policy document and cannot control woodland management. | No change. |
| (38.2) | 25 | 3.4.6 | LH3 | Support & Comment | Imaginative modern designs will be encouraged – an excellent clause as there is far too much emphasis | Noted and accepted. The NDP should support sustainable design in LH3 as | Amend NDP. Amend LH3 to: |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>on cheap lo-cost or border oak type housing these days.</p> <p>Also there should be a clause that says that low carbon or zero carbon houses should be a priority in this day and age when the planet is threatened by CO2 emissions!</p> | part of measures to tackle climate change and LH3 could be amended to include a reference to this. | <i>7 "... imaginative modern and sustainable designs will be encouraged wherever possible"</i> |
| (38.3) | All | | | General | All forms should be able to complete online | Noted. | No change. |
| (38.4) | 26/27 | 3.2.2 | LB2 | Comment | Draft policy LB2 enhances the quality of living for the inhabitants, which seems to imply redundant buildings (subject to a number of criteria – what are these Criteria??) could be used for housing – yet 3.2.2 mentions only renovation of redundant buildings for leisure use. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>LB2 has been widened to include other uses - see 3.1 above.</p> <p>3.2.2 includes a range of uses - perhaps this refers to 3.2.8? if so this also mentions a range of uses.</p> | No change. |
| (38.5) | 24 | | | Comment | <p>P24 mentions older residents wishing to downsize within the local area and schemes for self build housing will be encouraged.</p> <p>I would like to somewhere in the plan – a clause which actually says renovation of the redundant buildings to small or medium sized homes for older residents wishing to downsize in the local area will be encouraged.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 6.11.</p> <p>Policy LH2 has already been strengthened to refer to housing for older residents.</p> <p>LH2 will apply for all schemes (not just new build) for housing.</p> | No further change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| (38.6) | 30 | | LB4 | Support/ Object/ Comment | <p>Great that solar panels will be supported all new houses should have them!!</p> <p>However – why are biodigesters not supported – they are the most environmental and require less emptying than cesspits where local sewerage facilities are not available.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Response Table 2 - Welsh Water's comments.</p> <p>Policy refers to industrial biodigesters which do not make environmental sense.</p> | No change. |
| (38.7) | All | | | Comment | <p>Not all areas of Lyonshall are areas restricted with local highway infrastructure especially those directly off the A44 where there are two companies that specialise in emptying sewerage!</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (39.0) | All | | | Support | <p>I have read the above document and I am in full agreement with all the proposals. I believe the plan will allow the village and the whole parish to develop in accordance with the needs of the residents and should help to provide and sustain the services that we very much need.</p> | Noted. | No change. |
| (40.1) | All | | | Support / Comment | <p>The Neighbourhood Development scheme, goes into great detail, and looks to be a good step forward to increase the size of our village.</p> <p>Fundamentally, I have no problem with this, especially if we can keep</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>the character it has at the moment, which is down to sympathetic, architectural design.</p> <p>I believe that affordable housing is necessary, especially in 'quaint old' villages that have lost their primary school.</p> <p>Eardisley and Weobley have plenty of young families in them, while Eardisland suffers from an average age, well into retirement.</p> <p>It would be a shame to see Lyonshall becoming a waiting room for St. Peter's, though that will be my intention.</p> <p>It would also be a shame not to see the playground getting much use after all your hard work getting the funding.</p> <p>The increase in size of the village, will probably help sustain the pub too, as would increased tourism.</p> <p>When you look at the boundaries for development and know who owns the land the proposed sites are placed upon, you soon realise that there are one or two</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>people/families who will benefit greatly from this scheme.</p> <p>I'm not sure who owns Howe Orchard, but next to the playground is probably Burgoynes.</p> <p>Much of the rest is probably Kinsey's.</p> | | |
| (40.2) | | | LB2 LB3 | | <p>If we look at the business side of things, then this scheme will help chicken farmers too..... as well as smaller businesses.</p> <p>This scheme looks to me like the local landowners are going to very well out of it.</p> <p>Boundaries, stop me from being one of them, but that's just selfish. It begs the question, who's it making richer?</p> <p>Sorry for being blunt, nothing personal.</p> <p>It's not sour grapes for not being one of the chosen few landowners, but as you know, I may try to do something down here one day.</p> <p>So, on a personal level:</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | There is a couple of lines referring to redundant buildings, and holiday lets, which is helpful, but we're out of bounds. | | |
| (41.1) | 28 | 3.2.1 2 | LB3 | Comment | In relation to large broiler units p.28 3.2.12 states "there is now a rising opinion in the parish that saturation level has been reached." However, Policy LB3 seems to be supportive of more broiler units as long as they adhere to various requirements. | Not accepted. Planning policies have to be positively worded and Policy LB3 provides a detailed framework for guiding decisions on new development. The Policy is accepted by Herefordshire Council. | No change. |
| (41.2) | 16,18 22 | 3.1.4 3.1.1 3 | LH1 | Comment | Paragraph 3.1.4 states "There are two estates of 15 houses, but 84% of the respondents to the last survey wanted only smaller-scale mixed developments in the future. The housing policies in the NDP reflect those wishes..." Yet in Paragraph 3.1.13 Table 1 shows Potential Housing Numbers on Site B and Site C as 18 - more than the current estates and certainly not small-scale. Policy LH1 states "Schemes are small to medium in scale | Noted. The NDP includes references to earlier consultations but over the lifetime of the preparation of the NDP responses to more recent consultations (including the Reg 14 responses) show support for additional housing in the village to support services and facilities. The Parish Council is therefore promoting a growth led NDP with flexible policies for a range of housing to | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>.....larger schemes of around 18-20 units will be considered” Surely this does not protect the wish of 84.9% of the respondents (a large majority) who want only small-scale developments.</p> <p>Page 16 Paragraph 3.1.3 As we have already far exceeded the housing growth target for Lyonshall in recent years there should be no huge rush to build lots of houses over the next ten years or so.</p> | meet different peoples' needs. | |
| (43.0) | All | | | Support | I support the NDP and agree that we need additional homes in a range of sizes so we can attract people to Lyonshall and provide housing for our children and local people. | Noted. | No change. |
| (44.0) | All | | | Support | <p>As I understand it the parish is going to have to accept a significant amount of housing development whatever happens.</p> <p>Without a neighbourhood development plan we would have little control over, or say in, that development. In my view the draft NDP as presented provides a good compromise between the need to accept development and</p> | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | maintaining and advancing the appeal of the environment in which we live. I am reassured by the residential design requirements, which should enhance the appeal of the village, and is much to be preferred to the kind of modern developments to which we might otherwise be subjected. The draft NDP is a thorough, comprehensive and clear document, and I support it. | | |
| (3 people) (45.1) | All | | | Object | <p>A lot of work has gone into this document and process, for which those involved should be thanked.</p> <p>However, it makes rather sad reading. It seems to be all about new housing and a desire for the village to expand, rather than about re-establishing the reason for Lyonshall and how the community might rebuild. Rightly or wrongly, one is left with the view that the wishes of local landowners to sell land for housing has been a priority, rather than developing the heart of the village where a mix of people could live together as a thriving community.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP includes a range of policies to protect and enhance the parish and is not just focussed on housing.</p> <p>However the Parish Council is promoting a growth led NDP with flexible policies for a range of housing to meet different peoples' needs and to support and enhance services and facilities.</p> <p>Housing policies promote a suitable mix of house sizes and tenures including housing for older and younger people.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>The number of new houses is already well ahead of those needed or required. There is no demonstration that the majority of Lyonshall owners support the big (and legally unnecessary) expansion of the village and what benefits this might bring. Indeed, one of the few arguments – that it will justify the reopening of The Royal George – is highly questionable (see below).</p> <p>Already it can be seen that the take-up of housing on new developments already approved isn't happening and they don't take into account integration with neighbouring long-established properties. The Burnt Orchard/ White Lion Meadow development, in particular, has been going on for a long time as a building site with only one house completed and occupied. If there was demand, surely this would have been long-since completed and sold? Thought should have been given in the plan to how new developments need to integrate with neighbouring, long-established properties. In this case, it resulted</p> | <p>The consultation responses demonstrate a high level of support to this approach, with some detailed objections from a few individuals.</p> <p>At the end of the process all those on the electoral role in the Parish will be invited to vote on whether the NDP should be used to determine planning applications.</p> | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>in a huge, tall solid wooden fence being erected in very close proximity to White Lion Cottage and which has adversely and unnecessarily affected the setting and enjoyment of it.</p> <p>There is very little in the consultation devoted to the population imbalance in Lyonshall and how this might be redressed to make for a sustainable community.</p> <p>It is estimated that already, about 30% of the entire population is aged over 65. Building more luxury houses in isolation, without the necessary back-up infrastructure – nearby shops, nursery, pre-school and primary/ secondary schools (including 6th form), social facilities etc – will not encourage more younger people to move to and live in Lyonshall. Indeed, as with many villages, the drain of the young (those needing work and raising a family) and the very old (those needing specialist care) is likely to leave Lyonshall even more of a car-dependant, isolated community largely attractive only for the healthy retired 60 to 80 year olds.</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | It is these issues that should form the basis of long-term Neighbourhood Development Plans. | | |
| (45.2) | All | P3 | | Object & Comment | <p><i>“Our conclusion was that people had accepted the argument that a pub and a shop, both of which had closed owing to lack of use, would not be sustainable in the future without more growth in the village”.</i></p> <p>This is demonstrably not the case. Numerous hugely successful pubs operate in tiny villages eg: The Stag at Titley.</p> <p>Even with the number of houses planned to be built, this will only have a very marginal effect on the pub’s viability as most people will cook and drink at home most nights. It will be visitors – staying in the area in holiday cottages, B&Bs, hotels, camping and day visitors plus those in the area on business that will determine the success of the pub/ shop/ cinema.</p> <p>Equally, with the expansion of online deliveries and a the massive Morrisons in Leominster, it is</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that a larger local population would help to sustain and even improve local services and facilities.</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | wishful thinking that villagers will use a local shop for all their grocery needs. | | |
| (45.3) | 16 | 3.1.3 | 3.1 Housing | Object & Comment | <p><i>“From 2011 to April 2017 (the latest figures available from Herefordshire Council), 23 new houses were built in the parish. Existing commitments (where planning permission has been granted but development has not been implemented) number a further 38 houses. This gives a total figure of 61 new houses already built or committed in Lyonshall parish, exceeding the minimum indicative housing growth target for Lyonshall by 25 units. However, NDPs can plan for more housing than the minimum requirement”</i></p> <p>The plan does NOT demonstrate why there is a need to build more houses than the growth target. There appears to be no shortage of homes in the village at the moment and no excessive demand over supply. Indeed, it is arguable that the reverse is the case (there is more supply than demand). Building more homes where there is not the demand, is not the answer.</p> | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP can plan for more development than that proposed in a local plan and this is a decision for the qualifying body (the Parish Council).</p> <p>The rationale for the additional housing provision is set out in the supporting text in the NDP and the approach is supported by many local residents, and Herefordshire Council (see Table 1).</p> | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| (45.4) | 16 | 3.1.5 | 3.1 Housing | Object & comment | <p><i>“The response to the Issues and Options consultation demonstrated overwhelming local support for some further new housing development in the Parish, provided it is sensitive to local character. 77.4% of respondents supported more new housing and, of these, 39.8% favoured more than 30 units, with 37.6% preferring fewer than 30 units. 71% of respondents also supported further development which could include developer contributions towards improving community assets such as the Memorial Hall”</i></p> <p>There is no indication as to how many respondents these figures are based upon. E.g: 77.4% of what number? We were completely unaware of any survey and therefore unable to respond. Did a majority of the population respond? Appendix 4 suggests a response rate of 25% to the Housing Survey. If this is the level, surely it is too low to be regarded as representative</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The figures are provided as a percentage of the responses at each stage of the consultation process. For the survey mentioned, every home received an invitation by post, it was also advertised on the Lyonshall website and parish magazine and posters were put up in the village.</p> | No change. |
| (45.5) | 17 | 3.1.1 7 | 3.1 Housing | Object Comment | <i>“However, leading up to and during the consultation on Issues and</i> | Not accepted - refer to 45.1 above. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p><i>Options, the Parish Council was approached by local landowners proposing potential areas of land as suitable for new housing development around Lyonshall village. There was therefore a need to consider whether any or all of those areas should be included within the new settlement boundary as possible housing site allocations"</i></p> <p>Why was there a need to extend the settlement boundary, just because local landowners proposed areas of land suitable for development, when the target number of new homes had already been met? The Burnt Orchard/ "White Lion Meadow" development is a classic case. How many of the new homes have been built and how many sold? Where is the need and where is the demand?</p> | There wasn't a need to extend the settlement boundary but having received these proposals there was a need to ask the parish. | |
| (45.6) | 17 | 3.1.8 Map | 3.1 Housing | Object & Comment | Even if there is demand (which is questionable), why does the village development boundary need to be extended in a linear way along the A480? This takes away the village feel, by making a | Not accepted. The Policy Map does not promote linear development but includes several proposed housing sites clustered | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>disproportionately long, overly linear village.</p> <p>Linear development has blighted many villages and why so many have increasingly suffered from having no "heart". Not so much in Lyonshall, but where linear development has occurred along a main trunk road, you now have numerous examples where a village is effectively bisected, with two halves not able to integrate due to the constant heavy lorries and traffic thundering through a village divided into two and people (especially the young and the elderly) fearful of crossing into "the other half".</p> <p>It defeats the argument about needing more houses to justify The Royal George, if people can't quickly walk to it. If they have to drive because the village has become linear, then people can't (by definition) then drink alcohol.</p> | around the existing village core and more recent commitments and development sites. | |
| (45.7) | 18 & 23 | 3.1.9 3.1.2 1 | 3.1 Housing | Object & Comment | Again, the number of respondents is not indicated. Appendix 4 suggests a response rate of 25% which is surely too low to be regarded as representative. | Not accepted. The policies and proposals in the NDP have been prepared in response to the comments | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | What has been the response rate to the surveys and questionnaires that the draft plan is based upon? | and representations submitted during earlier consultations and further changes are proposed following the Reg 14 consultation. The Parish Council has provided multiple opportunities for people to comment but it cannot compel people to be engaged in the process. | |
| (46.0) | All | | | Support | Thank you, NDP Steering Group, for all of your hard work. This draft plan is clear, well-written and easy for the rest of us to access and understand. It's hard to combine the sensitive (and interwoven) areas of agricultural changes, housing development, business and employment growth, transport functions and environmental requirements. It's even harder to do it while ensuring that the needs of the whole Lyonshall community are taken into account, including the provision of leisure facilities such as the pub and the Memorial Hall. | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | The plan also tackles something that's very important to me personally, and to a lot of other residents - the way the parish looks and feels to live in. It seems that without an agreed NDP we're in danger of having intrusive, large-scale housing development forced on us by Herefordshire Council so that it can meet its goals. I'd rather that we, the Lyonshall community, made the decisions about the way we live. I therefore support this plan. | | |
| (47.0) | All | | | Support | A very well constructed document. Congratulations to all involved. Any chance on progress of the Royal George, lots of disgruntled comments on the mess. | Noted. | No change. |
| (48.0) | 18 | 3.1.1 3.1.4 | 3 | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (49.0) | 18 | 3.1.1 4 | 3.0 | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (50.0) | All | | | Support | One would hope it is understood that a Neighbourhood development plans purpose is for a local community to have some involvement in new housing development in their parish within the scope of planning law. | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>The Government, through Herefordshire Council needs to provide more homes and it tasked all parishes with a requirement to provide new homes to for the period 2011 to 2031. Lyonshall has already reached its target of planning approvals with committed allocations before the plan's completion.</p> <p>A Plan's aim is to be positive towards growth, look for and identify possible land allocation for development and offer some control of what is developed on it. The fact that the majority of parishioners, after consultation, would still like to see more development within the enlarged settlement boundary supports village sustainability and will help to protect local services and facilities in our parish as well as our neighbouring parishes. It may also help to promote further employment opportunities locally too.</p> <p>The plan clearly identifies house size and type within the wishes of the parishioner criteria. It is very</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>hard to produce policies that conform with Herefordshire Local Strategy without the proposed development sites being filled with many homes. Lyonshall is a rural community where large housing estates would be detrimental to character.</p> <p>It is reassuring to see that local landowners are happy to restrict the number of houses on each site and I can appreciate that it would be difficult considering how many houses of size or type the owner believes would make a viable development. I hope that a mix of housing types and sizes to suit all; especially young locals or current parishioners wishing to downsize are options to be made available.</p> <p>It is good to see provision; should it arise; for a new Village Hall facility.</p> <p>Finally, the well-publicised parish consultations have given everyone an opportunity to offer their comments and make suggestions throughout the process.</p> | | |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | I think this is a well written and presented plan offering positive opportunity for Lyonshall to develop organically as the need arises. | | |
| (51.0) | | | | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.1) | 33 | All | LE2 | Support | Wildlife is important, it should be encouraged rather than concreted over! | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.2) | 32 | ALL | LE1 | Support | The character of Lyonshall needs a facelift without destroying its natural attraction to residence and visitors alike. | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.3) | 33 | ALL | LH1 | Support | Good suggestion for modern day life! | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.4) | 25 | ALL | LH2 | Support | A sustainable population rather than people have "retired" to the area should be encouraged with affordable housing and first time buyers. | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.5) | 26 | ALL | LH3 | Support | Makes perfect sense to me! | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.6) | 27 | All | LB1 | Support | The more business activity the better. More employment = more visitors= greater economy for all | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.7) | 28 | All | LB2` | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.8) | 31 | All | LB4 | Support | Solar panel should be encouraged. The village needs to think about off-grid facilities to important | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | places like the village hall community centres. Tesla batteries can be linked together to make this possible for back up generators. | | |
| (52.9) | 38 | All | LC2 | Support | | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.10) | 38 | 1&2 | LT1 | Support | Keep people fit & healthy | Noted. | No change. |
| (52.11) | 37 | All | LC1 | Support | Most villages have moved into the 21 st century with modernising the village halls. It should be encouraged more interaction with all age groups and social standings. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.1) | 10 | 2 | LE1 | Support | Tree cover is an important part of the character of the village – good to see it catered for. | | |
| (53.2) | 10 | | LE2 | Support | A good balance between the need to protect the natural environment and the need to develop the village in a sympathetic and sustainable way. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.3) | 11 | | LC1 | Support | This is important as the village needs a modern facility in addition to the pub to enhance and foster village community spirit. Good point about support for modern design as the current hall is bit of an eyesore but is in a prominent position. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.4) | All | | | Support | A well-structured cogent plan that balances a range of interests of Lyonshall parishioners within the | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>context of the core strategy – allowing for growth and development of our community whilst preserving our environment (both built and natural) which we know and love- for future generations.</p> <p>A lot of effort has clearly gone in make the plan both concise and relevant.</p> | | |
| (53.5) | 6 | 1 | LH1 | Support | Good to see flexibility on scheme size and the caveat that larger (18-20 schemes) must provide affordable units. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.6) | 6 | 6.3 | LH1 | Support | Good to see recognition of unit densities' contribution to character and existing densities ie. Holme Marsh being set at 8 dph rather than 12 dph in the village. | Noted. The Steering group have reviewed the proposed densities. | No change. |
| (53.7) | 6 | 5 | LH1 | Support | Particularly important point about two space car parking even for smaller units as even couples living in one bed units may have two cars to allow them to travel to work. Public transport in rural communities is generally poor so this provision for two car parking spaces is particularly important as on street parking is both dangerous | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | for children crossing the road and detrimental to the character of the village. | | |
| (53.8) | 7 | 1 | LH2 | Support | If Lyonshall is to thrive it needs “ a heart” (pub, shop, post office, memorial hall) and that heart needs a proportionate population to support it to patronise/support it if it is to be sustainable. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.9) | 7 | 2 | LH2 | Support | Very good point, as there are lots of elderly who would like to remain in the village, they love but can't cope with the larger properties they raised their family in, in old age. Allowing the elderly to downsize and remain within the village will encourage greater age diversity in our village which is currently skewed towards the elderly. When coupled with the provision for affordable units this is very positive. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.10) | 7 | 4 | LH3 | Support | This is very positive. The village has excellent broadband and providing for | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | homeworking will help family members both live and work in the village | | |
| (53.11) | 8 | 6 | LH3 | Support | It is very important to encourage modern design. The beautiful built environment we have inherited in Lyonshall was once “ modern”. The other measures within the policies will help to ensure modern designs are sympathetic to the existing environment. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.12) | 8 | 1 | LH1 | Support | Creating employment opportunities in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the village is import for our villages future. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.13) | 8 | 4 | LH1 | Support | It is just as important to have business units which are sympathetic to the character of the village and sustainable as it is for residential units. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.14) | 8 | 4 | LB1 | Support | Good to see this, as modernity renders certain buildings obsolete for the original purpose over time, however we can repurpose them whilst retaining their part in the heritage of our village. | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| (53.15) | 9 | | LB4 | Support | Good to see support for solar on unit such as chicken houses etc, of which we have many. Also good to see biodigesters will not be supported as the stench from these can be appalling. | Noted. | No change. |
| (53.16) | 9 | | LB3 | Support | Particularly important point about noise, as well as light smell and the look of " facilities", as noise pollution at night from chicken houses for example and the traffic services such sites can be a nuisance so restrictions on traffic between 10pm-6am is also good to see. | Noted. | No change. |
| (54.1) | All | | | Support | Dear Clerk, I'm writing to express my support for the NDP as presently drafted. My particular comment concerns the Housing section 3.1. What's best for Lyonshall is difficult to predict. And even if one could make a decent stab at it, making a plan to get there would be more difficult still. So the process here has been:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to listen to the parishioners, including those possessing the large | Noted. | No change. |

| Consultee Name Address Ref. No. | Page No. | Para. No. | Vision/ Objective / Policy No. | Support / Object / Comment | Comments received | Parish Council's Consideration | Amendments to NDP |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | <p>resources required to bring about change,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to learn from them that growth – sufficient to give us back our pub, for example – is generally supported, ○ to respond by setting out policies which encourage growth, ○ to safeguard the character of the village, particularly by setting housing densities in step with what exists already, and which large-scale developers will not find attractive. <p>Whether all the houses made possible by this NDP will be built is uncertain: most probably they will not. But the potential for dozens of new Lyonshall families, using the pub, supporting community activities and getting on and off the buses, should not be stifled.</p> | | |
| | | | | | | | |