

## Progression to Examination Decision Document

### Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

Name of neighbourhood area	Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor Group Neighbourhood Area
Parish Council	Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor Group Parish Council
Draft Consultation period (Reg14)	12 March to 24 April 2018
Submission consultation period (Reg16)	4 October to 15 November 2018

#### Determination

Is the organisation making the area application the relevant body under section 61G (2) of the 1990 Act		Yes
Are all the relevant documentation included within the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map showing the area</li> <li>• The Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Consultation Statement</li> <li>• SEA/HRA</li> <li>• Basic Condition statement</li> </ul>	Reg15	Yes
Does the plan meet the definition of a NDP - 'a plan which sets out policies in relation to the development use of land in the whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the plan'	Localism Act 38A (2)	Yes
Does the plan specify the period for which it is to have effect?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes

<p>Are any 'excluded development' included?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County matter</li> <li>• Any operation relating to waste development</li> <li>• National infrastructure project</li> </ul>	1990 61K / Schedule 1	No
Does it relation to only one neighbourhood area?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
Have the parish council undertaken the correct procedures in relation to consultation under Reg14?		Yes
<p>Is this a repeat proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has an proposal been refused in the last 2 years or</li> <li>• Has a referendum relating to a similar proposal had been held and</li> <li>• No significant change in national or local strategic policies since the refusal or referendum.</li> </ul>	Schedule 4B para 5	No

### Summary of comments received during submission consultation

Herefordshire Council – Strategic Planning	<p>Confirm conformity with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Details contained within appendix 1</p>
Herefordshire Council – Conservation	No comments to make
<p>Herefordshire Council – Environmental Health</p> <p>(Noise)</p> <p>(Air quality)</p>	<p>Serious concerns regarding the proposal for housing within GWB15 due to high noise risk and potential significant adverse impact as a result of road traffic noise from the A40.</p> <p>The site at Dean Swift Close and former Nutshell caravan site are not suitable from a noise perspective and have reservations regarding the site at Goodrich Manor.</p> <p>Even a good acoustic design process it is questionable whether significant impacts could be mitigated.</p> <p>Serious concerns in relation to potential air quality issues regarding the housing developments in GWB15. Due to emissions from traffic on the A40 that may impact on the sites,</p>

	these site are not suitable for housing from an air quality perspective.
Herefordshire Council – Environmental Health (contamination)	Two sites (land opposite Dean Swift Close and land comprising of the former Nutshell Caravan park) have no previous historic potentially contaminative uses.
Historic England	Consider that the approaches taken in the plan exemplify 'constructive conservation' and those responsible should be congratulated.
Forest of Dean District Council	No comments to make
National Grid	National Grid has identified the 5 high voltage power lines or cables within the neighbourhood area.  These do not interact with any of the proposed development sites.
Coal Authority	No specific comments to make
Welsh Water	No further comments to make
Natural England	No specific comments to make
John Prime  Local resident	High quality piece of work.  Section 3.4 – a gravelled parking area has now been constructed for us by the church so some text out of date  Policy GWB4 – should include specific reference to providing protection for the church  Policy GWB8 – both roads linking the A40 with the B4229 are used as short cuts by through traffic, generates excessive amount of traffic on unsuitable roads and creating hazards to vehicles, pedestrians and property  Policy GWB13 – strongly support the designation of two sites as LGS. Final paragraph of 7.6 should be deleted as it is not consistent of policy.  The land south west of the church 'church field' was a designated protected area in the former village design statement. It is important to the character of the village, reflecting historic development and forming an essential part of the

	<p>church settings</p> <p>Believe that this significance would be better reflected in para 7.6 supporting the designation of Church field as a LGS</p>
<p>Charles Laughton and Penny Avery</p> <p>Local residents</p>	<p>Para 3.3 – glad to see the acknowledgement of the roads blighted by rat run drivers.</p> <p>Policy GWB13 – needs to be clarified. Should refer to the LGS being to the south and south west of the church.</p> <p>Para 7.6 should refer to the space being south and south west and the final sentence should be deleted as it is irrelevant.</p>
<p>Daniel and Patricia Jones</p> <p>Local residents</p>	<p>Revise sentence 7.6 to highlight the importance of the whole of the open space not just part of it.</p>
<p>Julie Joseph</p> <p>On behalf of Mr Whittal Williams and Mrs I Roper</p>	<p>Object to Policy GWB13 - Moors Meadow and Church Field as Local Green Space</p> <p>Unlike the land at Moors Meadow the site is not in public ownership or of public use. No high value hedges or trees and of little environmental merit. View overstated and limited.</p> <p>Reg14 draft identified only part of the site in recognition of development proposal. No reasoning given to alter the draft policy to include land at Church Field.</p> <p>Suggested amended wording to Policy GWB13</p>
<p>John and Rosemary Ryan</p> <p>Local residents</p>	<p>Policy GWB13 para 7.6</p> <p>Suggest the last paragraph is omitted</p>
<p>Michael and Nicky Smith</p> <p>Local resident</p>	<p>General supportive of the document. Delighted to see the whole of Church Field is now designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The plan clearly show the area protected, the wording in para 7.6 is ambiguous. Last sentence should be removed so that the protection of the entire field is unequivocal.</p>
<p>Andrew Bartle</p>	<p>Support Church Field in Policy GWB1 and ask that the supporting statement 7.6 be altered to remove any ambiguity.</p>

<p>John Bloxham</p> <p>Local resident</p>	<p>Concerned about traffic on Church Pitch.</p> <p>Traffic uses Church Pitch to access Goodrich Castle and cut through to towns in the Forest of Dean</p> <p>New houses will add pressure.</p> <p>Appendix 2 designates a number of important views from Coppet Hill to Goodrich Castle. St Giles Church should also be considered as the view will be destroyed if proposed housing goes ahead.</p>
<p>Paul Smith</p> <p>On behalf of Mr and Mrs Watson</p> <p>Local residents</p>	<p>Policy GWB1 – inconsistent to not protect residents living environment from noise beyond the two proposed housing allocations.</p> <p>Policy GWB1 and GWB6 should include criteria protecting residents from excessive levels of noise.</p> <p>Policy GWB14 – settlement boundary is supported in principle however it should include land to the north and west of Dean Swift Close which has been proven to be less prone to traffic noise from the A40</p> <p>Policy GWB15 – strongly object to the proposed allocation of land opposite Dean Swift Close and Nutshell Caravan site. Misplaced and inappropriate as adjacent to the A40 subject to heavy noise.</p> <p>Noise assessment is a pre-requisite of the allocation and not an afterthought. The policy relies on landscaping and design to mitigate.</p> <p>Settlement boundary should be amended to include refer to the recent planning permission north of Dean Swift Close, which was subject to a noise assessment prior to its determination.</p> <p>Any shortfall of housing needs to be met by alternative sites such as the land to the north and west of Dean Swift Close.</p> <p>Policy GWB16 – fails to reflect national planning policy and guidance on the provision of affordable housing</p>
<p>Stephen Holloway (Fisher German)</p> <p>On behalf of Roland Trafford-Roberts</p>	<p>Policy GWB4 – whilst the wording is supportive of conversions, it only refers to farmsteads. It is unclear if the policy would allow historic estate buildings. Policy should be expanded to include</p>

Local landowner	<p>historic estate buildings.</p> <p>References to the NPPF need to be updated.</p> <p>Policy should be reworded to reference RA3 and NPPF.</p>
-----------------	---

**Please note the above are summaries of the response received during the submission consultation. Full copies of the representations will be sent to the examiner in due course.**

### **Officer appraisal**

This plan has met the requirements of the regulations as set out in the table above. All the requirements of regulation 14 were undertaken by the parish council and all the required documentation was submitted under regulation 15.

A total of 35 representations were received during the submission consultation period. 5 from service providers of Herefordshire Council and 6 from statutory consultees. 9 representations were received from members of the public.

The main issues raised by the representations were concerning the Local Green Space at Church Field and this description within the supporting paragraph; the noise and air pollution issues surrounding two allocation sites and potential alternative sites.

The proportional growth requirement for the parish is 35 and as at April 2018, 14 have been built, 14 committed with a 7 remaining. Existing commitments and plan policies demonstrate that the remaining proportional growth within the plan area can be achieved even if the two allocation sites were removed due to concerns over environmental issues.

The Strategic Planning team have also confirmed that the NDP is in general conformity within the Core Strategy.

The plan has met the requirements to move forward to examination.

### **Assistant Director's comments**

Decision under Regulation 17 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Approved

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Richard Gabb', with a large, sweeping blue circle above it.

Richard Gabb

Programme Director – Housing and Growth

Date: 23/11/18

## Appendix 1

### Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) – Core Strategy Conformity Assessment

From Herefordshire Council Strategic Planning Team

Name of NDP: Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor- Regulation 16 submission draft

Date: 12/10/18

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
GWB1- Promoting Sustainable Development	SS1; RA2; SC1; E4; LD1; LD4; SD1	Y	
GWB2- Conserving the Landscape and Scenic Beauty of the Wye Valley AONB	SS1; SS6; LD1	Y	
GWB3- Enhancement of the Natural Environment	SS1; SS6; LD2; LD3	Y	
GWB4- Protecting Heritage Assets	SS1; SS6; LD4; RA3; RA5	Y	
GWB5- Protection from Flood Risk	SS1; SD3	Y	
GWB6- Sustainable Design	SS1; SS7; MT1; SD1; SD2	Y	
GWB7- Sewerage Infrastructure	SS1; SD4	Y	
GWB8- Traffic Measures within the Group Parish	SS1; SS4; MT1	Y	
GWB9- Highway Design Requirements	SS1; SS4; MT1	Y	Criterion B- Not a conformity issue as such, but setting these minimum car parking spaces for all dwellings may prove to be difficult to enforce in practice.



<b>Draft Neighbourhood plan policy</b>	<b>Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)</b>	<b>In general conformity (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
GWB10- Broadband and Telecommunication Infrastructure	SS1; SS5	Y	
GWB11- Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Services	SS1; SC1	Y	
GWB12- Contributions to Community Services, Youth Provision and Recreation Facilities	SS1; SC1	Y	
GWB13- Moors Meadow Local Green Space	N/A	Y	
GWB14- Housing Development in Goodrich Village	SS1; RA2; MT1; LD1; LD2; LD4; SD1	Y	
GWB15- Housing Sites in Goodrich Village	N/A	Y	It is noted that it has been made a requirement that development proposals should address the site constraints highlighted at regulation 14. It is important that overcoming these constraints through design and layout is achievable in order for the sites to be deliverable.
GWB16- Meeting Housing Needs	SS1; H1; H3; E3	Y	
GWB17- Affordable and Intermediate Homes	SS1; H1; H2	Y	
GWB18- Tourism Enterprises	SS1; E4	Y	
GWB19- Scale of Economic Development	SS1; RA6	Y	Appropriate safeguards against the loss of existing employment in the Parish in accordance with

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
			CS policy E2 will also apply.
GWB20- Farm Diversification	SS1; RA4; RA5	Y	
GWB21- Working from Home	SS1; E3	Y	