

Latham, James

From: Banks, Samantha
Sent: 22 November 2018 13:46
To: Latham, James
Subject: FW: Questions arising from the examination and site visit to Pembridge

From: Liz Beth
Sent: 22 November 2018 13:37
To: Banks, Samantha <Samantha.Banks2@herefordshire.gov.uk>; clerk@pembridgeparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: Questions arising from the examination and site visit to Pembridge

Initial work and review of the Pembridge Neighbourhood Plan has raised the following questions for me. I would be glad to receive your response to these, at your convenience but by the end of this month if my initial deadline of the middle of December is to be met.

While both the parish council and LPA are welcome to comment as they wish, I would be particularly interested in the views of the LPA on question 1.

1. Settlement boundary: There are two areas of land with a general agricultural use included within the settlement boundary (sites 8 and 9 on the Village Map), which do not appear to have any planning history of consent for residential development, and were not included in the original definition of the settlement boundary in the UDP. Herefordshire's guidance on determining a settlement boundary does state "Your settlement boundaries should be drawn to facilitate an appropriate level of proportional growth within the plan period." However the Plan has generous site allocations for residential development, and both of these areas are included within the conservation area – a sign that their current open land status has historic relevance. Although the text of the document sets out how they could be developed sensitively (paras 5.8 and 5.9), there is no policy setting out this requirement or formally allocating them. I do not consider therefore that an adequate process has been undertaken that would justify including them in the revised settlement boundary, and would be interested to learn the thinking behind this process?
2. Policy PEM14 refers to the possible acceptability of "Individual small-scale turbines", but the phrase 'small-scale' is not precise or generally understood in the context of a turbine. Can you please advise a more precise definition, which I would suggest could be in terms of either: - - - height about the ground to either the tip of the rotor blades or the central hub;
 - Power of the generator defined in KW.

From previous experience I know that efficient operation needs the hub of a small stand-alone system to be at least 12m above ground, assuming no wind-distorting factors nearby causing turbulence. The industry seems to consider the rated power of a small system to be between 5kW and 15kW – the higher level generally requiring a tower of at least 20m.

3. Policy PEM15 protects 'existing community facilities', but does not state what they are. Appendix 2 discusses some potential projects for community facilities, but does not appear to be a definitive list. For reasons of clarity the policy should list the existing community facilities. I would draw your attention to the

comments from Sport England about the school and playing fields, which you may want to consider defining as a community facility?

4. The following corrections for greater clarity would seem to be needed: (bold text is new, strike-through indicates words I think should go:

Para 9.3 line 3: 'in~~the~~ Pembridge **village** where...'

Policy PEM9 (e): **They** include dwellings **and** associated enterprises...

Happy to clarify further,

Best wishes

Liz

Ms L Beth BA (2.1 hon) MA MRTPI Dip Design in the Built Environment

