

Neighbourhood Planning Team

From: Turner, Andrew
Sent: 08 March 2019 14:35
To: Neighbourhood Planning Team
Subject: RE: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation

RE: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation

Dear Neighbourhood Planning Team,

I refer to the above and would make the following comments with regard to the above proposed development plan.

It is my understanding that you do not require comment on Core Strategy proposals as part of this consultation or comment on sites which are awaiting or have already been granted planning approval.

Having reviewed records readily available, I would advise the following:

- Ordnance survey historical plans indicate the two proposed housing sites (Policies DW3 & DW4) indicated in light brown on the 'Dilwyn Policies Map', appear to have had no previous historic potentially contaminative uses.

Please note it would make it easier to reference and identify sites in the next Dilwyn NDP if the proposed housing sites are given IDs on future plans.

General comments:

Developments such as hospitals, homes and schools may be considered 'sensitive' and as such consideration should be given to risk from contamination notwithstanding any comments. Please note that the above does not constitute a detailed investigation or desk study to consider risk from contamination. Should any information about the former uses of the proposed development areas be available I would recommend they be submitted for consideration as they may change the comments provided.

It should be recognised that contamination is a material planning consideration and is referred to within the NPPF. I would recommend applicants and those involved in the parish plan refer to the pertinent parts of the NPPF and be familiar with the requirements and meanings given when considering risk from contamination during development.

Finally it is also worth bearing in mind that the NPPF makes clear that the developer and/or landowner is responsible for securing safe development where a site is affected by contamination.

These comments are provided on the basis that any other developments would be subject to application through the normal planning process.

Kind regards

Andrew Turner
Technical Officer (Air, Land and Water Protection)
Environmental Health & Trading Standards,
Economy and Place Directorate
Herefordshire Council,
8 St Owen Street,
PO Box 233

Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) – Core Strategy Conformity Assessment

From Herefordshire Council Strategic Planning Team

Name of NDP: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission

Date: 06/03/18

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
Policy DW1: Promoting Sustainable Development	Policy SS1; SS2; SS6; SD1; RA1; RA6; SS7;	(Y)	
Policy DW2: Housing Development in Dilwyn Village	Policy RA3; RA2	(Y)	
Policy DW3: Housing Sites in Dilwyn Village	Policy H1; H2;	(Y)	
Policy DW4: Development Principles for Land to the south- west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound	Policy H3; MT1; SD1; LD1; LD2	(Y)	
Policy DW5: Affordable and Intermediate Homes	Policy H1	(Y)	
Policy DW6: Conserving the Landscape, Scenic Beauty and Natural Environment of the Parish	Policies LD1; LD2; LD3; SD1	(Y)	
Policy DW7: Protecting Heritage Assets	Policies LD4; SD1	(Y)	
Policy DW8: Development within Dilwyn Conservation Area	Policies LD4; SD1	(Y)	
Policy DW9: Foul and Storm Water Drainage and Flooding	Policies LD4; SD3; SS7	(Y)	
Policy DW10: Protection of Local Green Space	Policies LD3; LD4; OS3	(Y)	
Policy DW11: Design and	Policies MT1; LD2; SD1	(Y)	

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
Appearance			
Policy DW12: Small and Home-based businesses	Policies SS5; RA5; RA6; E1; E3	(Y)	
Policy DW13: Rural Enterprises, Diversification and Tourism.	Policies SS5; RA5; RA6; E1; E2; E3; E4	(Y)	
POLICY DW14: Promotion of High-Speed Broadband and Telecommunications	SS5	(Y)	
Policy DW15: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	SD2	(Y)	
Policy DW16: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Services	Policies SS5; SC1; OS3	(Y)	
Policy DW17: Contributions to Community Facilities.	Policies SS5; SC1; OS3	(Y)	
Policy DW18: Traffic Measures within the Parish	Policies SS4; MT1	(Y)	
Policy DW19: Highway Design Requirements	Policies MT1	(Y)	
Policy DW20: Protection and Enhancement of the Public Rights of Way Network	Policies SS4; MT1	(Y)	

Other comments/conformity issues:



The Coal
Authority



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



RTPI
Learning Partner

200 Lichfield Lane
Berry Hill
Mansfield
Nottinghamshire
NG18 4RG

Tel: 01623 637 119 (Planning Enquiries)

Email: planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk

Web: www.gov.uk/coalauthority

For the Attention of: Neighbourhood Planning and Strategic Planning
Herefordshire Council

[By Email: neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk]

15 February 2019

Dear Neighbourhood Planning and Strategic Planning teams

Dilwyn Neighbourhood Development Plan - Submission Draft

Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.

Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.

Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority using the contact details above.

Yours sincerely

Christopher Telford BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Principal Development Manager

Neighbourhood Planning Team

From: Norman Ryan <Ryan.Norman@dwrcymru.com>
Sent: 01 March 2019 15:20
To: Neighbourhood Planning Team
Cc: Evans Rhys
Subject: RE: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation
Attachments: DCWW consultation response - Dilwyn Reg 14 Neighbourhood Development Plan - Oct 2018.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to the below consultation and would like to thank you for consulting Welsh Water.

As you will be aware, we were consulted and provided representation as part of the Regulation 14 consultation in October 2018.

We wish to clarify one point from within the Schedule of Representations which the Parish Council may have misunderstood. We advised in the Regulation 14 representation that if the proposed allocation 'Land south west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound' was to come forward, it would likely result in hydraulic overload of the Dilwyn WwTW.

The Parish Council's response comment on this within the Schedule of Representations appears to imply that Welsh Water has committed to accommodating the growth set out. This is not the case and I can confirm there is no reinforcement scheme programmed at Dilwyn WwTW within our current Capital Investment Programme (AMP6 – 2015-2020), whilst at the current time we do not know what schemes will be within AMP7 (2020 – 2025). That being said, the wording of Policy DW9 is acceptable.

Please find attached a copy of our Regulation 14 consultation for your information.

If you require any further information, please let me know.

Kind regards,



Ryan Norman

Forward Plans Officer | Developer Services | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water

Linea | Cardiff | CF3 0LT | T: 0800 917 2652 | www.dwrcymru.com

We will respond to your email as soon as possible but you should allow up to 10 working days to receive a response. For most of the services we offer we set out the timescales that we work to on our Developer Services section of our website. Just follow this link <http://www.dwrcymru.com/en/Developer-Services.aspx> and select the service you require where you will find more information and guidance notes which should assist you. If you cannot find the information you are looking for then please call us on 0800 917 2652 as we can normally deal with any questions you have during the call.

If we've gone the extra mile to provide you with excellent service, let us know. You can nominate an individual or team for a Diolch award through our [website](#).

From: Neighbourhood Planning Team [mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk]

Sent: 25 January 2019 10:57

Subject: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation

***** External Mail *****

Dilwyn Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan
FAO Peter Kyles

Enquiries: Rhys Evans/Ryan Norman
0800 917 2652

19th October 2018
Sent via email

Dear Sir/Madam,

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION ON DILWYN NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN – OCTOBER 2018

I refer to the above consultation. Welsh Water appreciates the opportunity to respond and offers the following representation:

Given that the Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Core Strategy, we are supportive of the aims, objectives and policies set out.

Policy DW3: Housing sites in Dilwyn village

We understand through Policy DW2 that as the main settlement in the Parish Council area, Dilwyn is the focus of development growth and provision is made for a minimum of 46 dwellings, with two specific allocations set out under Policy DW3:

Land south west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound – minimum of 30 dwellings

Water supply

There are no problems envisaged in providing this site with a water supply. The site is traversed by a 4" distribution water main for which protection measures will be required in the form of a diversion or easement width.

Sewerage

There are no problems envisaged with the public sewerage network accommodating the foul flows from this site. However, offsite sewers will be required to be laid to the curtilage of the site.

Wastewater treatment

A development of 30 dwellings (minimum) would represent a 19% increase in loadings at our Dilwyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) and this would likely result in hydraulic overload, and as such would not meet the requirements of Policy DW9 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy SD4 of the Core Strategy.

There is no reinforcement scheme proposed in our current Capital Investment Programme (AMP6 – 2015-2020) therefore should potential developers wish to deliver the site prior to any future regulatory investment on our part, they will need to fund a feasibility study which would identify the reinforcement works required to accommodate the foul flows from their site, before entering into a section 106 (of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) agreement to fund the scheme.

Land east of Brookside Bungalow, Dilwyn Common Lane – minimum of 3 dwellings

Water supply

There are no problems envisaged in providing this site with a water supply.

Sewerage

There are no problems envisaged with the public sewerage network accommodating the foul flows from this site.

Wastewater treatment

There are no issues in Dilwyn WwTW accommodating the foul flows from this site.

Policy DW9: Foul and storm water drainage and flooding

We applaud the provisions of this policy which will ensure that development will only be allowed where there is sufficient capacity in the public sewerage system, and that if a development would hydraulically overload the public sewerage system then developers will need to work with Welsh Water to fund the required reinforcement works.

We also welcome the requirement for developers to utilise sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) in new development as this will ensure that the public sewerage system only accommodates foul-only flows, thereby capacity is not taken up by surface water.

We hope that the above information will assist you as you continue to progress the Neighbourhood Plan. In the meantime, should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us at Forward.Plans@dwcymru.com or via telephone on 0800 917 2652.

Yours faithfully.

Ryan Norman
Forward Plans Officer
Developer Services

Herefordshire Council
Neighbourhood Planning
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Our ref: SV/2018/109876/OR-
27/PO1-L01

Your ref:

Date: 28 February 2019

F.A.O: Mr. James Latham

Dear Sir

DILWYN REGULATION 16 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

I refer to your email of the 25 January 2019 in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plan (NP) consultation. We have reviewed the submitted document and would offer the following comments at this time.

As part of the adopted Herefordshire Council Core Strategy updates were made to both the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Strategy (WCS). This evidence base ensured that the proposed development in Hereford City, and other strategic sites (Market Towns), was viable and achievable. The updated evidence base did not extend to Rural Parishes at the NP level so it is important that these subsequent plans offer robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth for the duration of the plan period.

We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment at this time. You are advised to utilise the Environment Agency guidance and pro-forma which should assist you moving forward with your Plan.

However, it should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of 'fluvial' flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with your drainage team as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

I trust the above is of assistance at this time. Please can you also copy in any future correspondence to my team email address at SHWGPlanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

Yours faithfully

Environment Agency
Hafren House, Welshpool Road, Shelton, Shropshire, Shrewsbury, SY3 8BB.
Customer services line: 03708 506 506
www.gov.uk/environment-agency

Cont/d..

Mr. Graeme Irwin
Senior Planning Advisor
Direct dial: 02030 251624
Direct e-mail: graeme.irwin@environment-agency.gov.uk

Neighbourhood Planning Team

From: Chadha, Adrian <Adrian.Chadha@highwaysengland.co.uk>
Sent: 31 January 2019 09:36
To: Neighbourhood Planning Team; Latham, James
Cc: Sansoy, Priya
Subject: RE: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation

Dear James,

Good morning and thank you for contacting Highways England concerning the above referenced Neighbourhood Development plan.

There is no requirement to consult Highways England where it is unlikely to have impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

For this reason we have no comments to make.

Kind regards,

Adrian Chadha

Assistant Asset Manager

Shropshire, Telford & Herefordshire - Operations Directorate

Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN

T: +44 (0) 300 470 8148 M: +44 (0) 7522 219 535

W: www.highwaysengland.co.uk

From: Neighbourhood Planning Team [mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk]

Sent: 25 January 2019 10:57

Subject: Dilwyn Regulation 16 submission neighbourhood development plan consultation

Dear Consultee,

Dilwyn Parish Council have resubmitted their Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) to Herefordshire Council for consultation.

The plan can be viewed at the following link:

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/directory_record/3050/dilwyn_neighbourhood_development_plan

Once adopted, this NDP will become a Statutory Development Plan Document the same as the Core Strategy.

The consultation runs from 25 January 2019 to 8 March 2019.

If you wish to make any comments on this Plan, please do so by e-mailing:

neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk, or sending representations to the address below.



Historic England

WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

Mr James Latham
Herefordshire Council
Neighbourhood Planning & Strategic Planning
Planning Services, PO Box 230, Blueschool House
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB

Direct Dial: 0121 625 6887

Our ref: PL00067909

21 December 2018

Dear Mr Latham

DILWYN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION- FURTHER INFORMATION SUPPLIED IN A HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT.

I am writing again in relation to the concerns expressed in our earlier Regulation 14 consultation letter of 22nd October 2018, that is:

“Historic England does, however, have concerns with reference to the proposed housing allocation for land to the south-west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound (Policies DW3 and DW4). Despite the well-intentioned mitigation proposed in Policy DW4 we are not convinced at this stage that no harm would be caused to the setting of the moated mound scheduled ancient monument. Equally, we would wish to be convinced that development would not impact upon any buried archaeological remains that might potentially be associated with the extant earthworks including within its wider environs”.

In this context please treat this letter as an addendum to our original consultation response.

Thank you for the subsequent provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment in relation to the above site allocation prepared by your planning consultant Bill Bloxsome. Having carefully considered this a visit to the site was recently undertaken by a colleague from our Development Management Team, Bill Klemperer who is Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments. This was in order to more fully assess the implications of your proposal for housing development on this site and the impact that could have on the significance of the Scheduled Ancient Monument, Castle Mound and its environs. I set out below the observations of my colleague, with which I fully concur:

“I have read the Heritage Impact Assessment for Dilwyn NP and remain concerned that the proposal to include the land south of the motte castle for housing is not sufficiently supported. The Lidar data appears to show earthworks in the area to the south of the motte, and although the land drainage pattern indicates modern improvements within the land parcel the archaeological potential is unknown. This is both in terms of buried archaeology and in terms of landscape understanding. Was this site actually an outer bailey of the castle? There are traces of platforms and earthworks to the north-east, confirming that archaeological remains are not just confined to the motte itself. The archaeological potential of the proposed land parcel, however, is confirmed as unknown in the HIA (para 4.2). In terms of setting (i.e. The



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Historic England

WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

area in which the motte is experienced) the potential impact seems to me to be potentially significant. Due to the recent development to the west and north of the motte the land to the south offers views of the motte in the context of the village. This is also a principal approach route into the village. This setting could be much altered and the view of the motte largely obscured. The overall impact may be to detach the motte from the village, with which it is strongly associated historically. In particular I do not agree that only 'a small part of the monument's agricultural setting would be affected' (para 4.3), or that the HIA currently can rightly conclude that the 'development should be capable of mitigation' (para 7.4.1). In overall terms I think we should be asking for a more detailed justification/ evidence base, that includes the factors mentioned in the HIA section 6 before we would be able to assess the appropriateness of this proposed allocation".

Our analysis, therefore, leads to the conclusion that Historic England cannot support the allocation of this site for housing development in the Neighbourhood Plan. This would be to accept the principle of development before it has been made clear what the actual impact of development would be on the Scheduled Ancient Monument, Castle Mound and its environs.

This can only be demonstrated by further archaeological work **in advance of any allocation** undertaken by suitably qualified professionals and potentially including physical archaeological evaluation of an appropriate sample of the site deposits. This work could in itself require Scheduled Monument Consent and any strategy arrived at should be discussed in advance with Bill Klemperer.

You will see I am copying Bill Bloxsome, Bill Klemperer and the Herefordshire County Archaeologist into this response.

I hope you find these comments useful.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Boland
Historic Places Advisor
peter.boland@HistoricEngland.org.uk

cc:



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk



WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

Mr James Latham
Herefordshire Council
Neighbourhood Planning & Strategic Planning
Planning Services, PO Box 230, Blueschool House
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB

Direct Dial: 0121 625 6887

Our ref: PL00067909

8 March 2019

Dear Mr Latham

DILWYN REGULATION 16 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan, our previous general comments on the Regulation 14 Plan remain pertinent. Please also see attached to the e-mail accompanying this letter a copy of our second letter in respect of the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan (dated 21st December 2018) in which Historic England's concerns about the proposed housing allocation for land to the south-west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound are made clear. **That is, it is our firm view that further archaeological work is required to provide suitably detailed information in advance of any allocation being made.** This is particularly in order to clarify the significance of any buried deposits identified and whether they may warrant "preservation in situ". Historic England consider that failure to do this would result in an unacceptable risk of harm to archaeological remains of potential national importance.

Unfortunately, since the date of that letter no further discussions have taken place and no further information has been put forward for consideration.

We are now in receipt of the Regulation 16 plan which makes no reference to Historic England but which carries forward the same housing allocation as before. We do note that Historic England's consultation response is referenced within the "Schedule of Representations in response To Draft Plan" that sits alongside the Regulation 16 Plan on the Council's website and that there is an Appendix 1 that sets out information that somewhat augments the information set out in the original *Heritage Impact Assessment*. That information is mainly descriptive and the analysis of impact on significance is weak since it is not based on robust information.

We cannot, therefore, be at all convinced at this stage that no harm would be caused to the setting of the designated heritage asset, Dilwyn Mound. It should be noted in this context that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 194 requires that "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset.....should require clear and convincing justification". We also note footnote 63 and the reference to non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest in the context of the proposed housing allocation within the environs of the scheduled monument and the potential for remains here to also be of national importance.



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk



WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

Paragraph 185 of the NPPF requires Plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This means that the Plan as a whole, including any sites it is putting forward for development allocations, has to set out a framework which is likely to conserve the historic environment of the Plan area.

The Plan puts forward a site which, if developed, would affect the significance of a designated heritage asset in its vicinity in addition to potential non-designated assets as set out in our previous comments. The allocation of a site for development within the Plan is, in effect, establishing that the principle of development in that particular location is acceptable.

However, in the case of this Plan there is currently a lack of detailed analysis of the landscape setting of the scheduled motte and medieval settlement and no meaningful professional archaeological evaluation (possibly including geophysical survey and selective evaluation trenching) of the proposed housing site itself. It is, therefore, not possible to meaningfully assess what impact the development of the area might have on these heritage assets and their setting.

It is also apparent that alternative housing sites have been discounted on the basis that they would not financially support provision of affordable housing, but no viability information has been submitted to support this argument. The absence of any such evidence base and evaluation must bring into question the deliverability of the site and the amount of development it can accommodate.

In the absence of any robust evidence base or meaningful assessment of the degree of harm which the preferred site allocation might cause to the historic environment or, indeed, what measures the Plan might need to put in place in order to ensure that any harm is minimised, at present, the Plan cannot demonstrate that the site it is putting forward for development is compatible with the Council's own policies for the protection of the historic environment.

Moreover, in terms of national policy guidance, the Plan also fails to demonstrate that:-

- The sites that it is putting forward for development will deliver a “positive strategy for the historic environment” as is required by NPPF Paragraph 185.
- The sites that are allocated will be likely to “contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment”. Therefore, it has not shown that it is likely to deliver sustainable development in terms of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 8].



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk



WEST MIDLANDS OFFICE

- The site which it has allocated meets the requirements of NPPF footnote 63.

You will see I am copying Bill Klemperer, the Historic England Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments and the Herefordshire County Archaeologist into this response. I hope you find these comments useful and can confirm that Historic England remain open to further discussions.
Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Boland
Historic Places Advisor
peter.boland@HistoricEngland.org.uk

cc:



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6870
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Neighbourhood Planning Team

From: James Verdin
Sent: 08 March 2019 15:32
To: Neighbourhood Planning Team
Cc:
Subject: Dilwyn Neighbourhood Plan
Attachments: Dilwyn Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Sirs

Just to confirm we would like to commend the Dilwyn Neighbourhood Plan as presented.

For the avoidance of doubt attached is our letter dated 22nd October 2018 to the Dilwyn Parish Council setting out our position which remains the same.

If there is anything else you require from us please let me know.

Yours faithfully

James Verdin
JAMES VERDIN
GARNSTONE FARMS

GARNSTONE FARMS

The Estate Office
Weobley
Hereford
HR48QH

22nd October 2018

Dilwyn Parish Council

By e-mail

Dear Sirs

Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Dilwyn
Article 14 Consultation

On behalf of Gamstone Farms, I would first of all like to thank you for offering us the chance to comment on the Draft Dilwyn Neighbourhood Plan, which we would like to commend, along with the work that has gone into preparing it.

We have two housing sites identified in the Draft Plan and referred to as Policy DW3 and DW4 within it.

We support the inclusion of the sites within the Neighbourhood Plan and intend to make them available for housing development within the period of the plan.

We also confirm that we are agreeable to the principle of the site to the South-West of Orchard Close and Castle Mound being developed in such a way that it provides a mixture of housing sites as proposed in policy DW4.

Yours faithfully

Neighbourhood Planning Team

From: Tansley, Mark
Sent: 29 January 2019 07:41
To: Neighbourhood Planning Team
Cc: Knight, Matthew; Shannon, Hugh
Subject: dilwyn ndp

The housing allocation on the west edge of the village will affect the setting of the sched mon from the main public vantage point.

HBO's better qualified than I to assess the extent of that impact.

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Mark Tansley
Development Manager
Development Management
01432 261815

Economy and Place Directorate
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Neighbourhood Planning Team
Planning Services
PO Box 4
Hereford
HR1 2ZB

Lucy Bartley
Consultant Town Planner

Tel: 01926 439116
n.grid@woodplc.com

Sent by email to:
neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk

06 February 2019

Dear Sir / Madam

Dilwyn Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

About National Grid

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

Specific Comments

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus.

National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Key resources / contacts

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link:

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/>

Gables House
Kenilworth Road
Leamington Spa
Warwickshire CV32 6JX
United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0) 1926 439 000
woodplc.com

Wood Environment
& Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited
Registered office:
Booths Park, Chelford Road, Knutsford,
Cheshire WA16 8QZ
Registered in England.
No. 2190074



Electricity distribution

The electricity distribution operator in Herefordshire Council is Western Power Distribution. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Lucy Bartley
Consultant Town Planner

n.grid@woodplc.com

Wood E&I Solutions UK Ltd
Gables House
Kenilworth Road
Leamington Spa
Warwickshire
CV32 6JX

Spencer Jefferies
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid

box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

National Grid House
Warwick Technology Park
Gallows Hill
Warwick
CV34 6DA

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

[via email]

Lucy Bartley
Consultant Town Planner

cc. Spencer Jefferies, National Grid

Date: 18 February 2019
Our ref: 272664
Your ref: Dilwyn Regulation 16



James Latham
Neighbourhood Planning and Strategic Planning teams
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

neighbourhoodplanning@herefordshire.gov.uk

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mr Latham

Dilwyn Neighbourhood Development Plan - Regulation 16

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 25 January 2019.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made..

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Victoria Kirkham
Consultations Team

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural environment information sources

The [Magic](#)¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: **Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones)**. Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available [here](#)².

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here](#)³. Most of these will be mapped either as **Sites of Special Scientific Interest**, on the Magic website or as **Local Wildlife Sites**. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here](#)⁴.

There may also be a local **landscape character assessment** covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a **National Park** or **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**, the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on **soil types** and **Agricultural Land Classification** is available (under 'landscape') on the [Magic](#)⁵ website and also from the [LandIS website](#)⁶, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Natural environment issues to consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework](#)⁷ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance](#)⁸ sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

Landscape

¹ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

² <http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php>

³ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>

⁵ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁶ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁸ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here](#)⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland](#)¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here](#)¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here](#)¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see our publication [Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land](#)¹³.

Improving your natural environment

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:

- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.
- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

⁹<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

¹¹<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

¹³ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012>

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance on this](#) ¹⁴).
- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).
- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).

¹⁴ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>



Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

BY EMAIL ONLY

1st March 2019

Dear Neighbourhood Planning Team,

Response to the Dilwyn Regulation 16 draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

Tompkins Thomas Planning is instructed by Mr Ian Hudson to produce a response to the Regulation 16 public consultation for the Dilwyn Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

Mr Hudson's family owns land in the village adjacent to Wood Stock Cottage, which was subject of a refused application for the erection of 10 dwellings and associated works – reference 152567.

The purpose of this letter is to draw the Parish Council's attention to the fact that the land remains available for development and is in our view appropriate for inclusion within an amended settlement boundary. We shall outline our justification for this opinion below.

The site

The site lies to the north of the U93209 village road at the eastern edge of Dilwyn, adjacent existing built form. The site comprises part of a gap in the built frontage where Dilwyn gives way to Dilwyn Common, although we consider it highly material that development of four, large detached dwellings has been permitted on the field to the immediate south of the carriageway – LPA ref: 171452 (an amendment to the earlier approved scheme 151755).

The site is down to commercial orchard, although the contract with Bulmers has not been extended. We'd note that in his response to the refused planning application, Herefordshire Council's then ecologist, Dr Rob Widdicombe, considered that this modern orchard was not a constraint to development. This assessment is at odds with that presented in the Meeting Housing Needs & Site Assessment Report V2 on the Parish Council website. We should stress that this judgement as to the

site's suitability for development in ecological terms is very important and that a blanket assessment of orchards and protection for their own sake is not justified in planning policy terms.

The aerial photo below shows the site in context, but with the caveat that the planning permission on the field to the south will alter the relationship between Dilwyn and Dilwyn Common.



The image below is taken from the refused planning application, showing 10 detached dwellings and land in the applicants' ownership extending north-westwards.



The Regulation 16 NDP

At 2.16 the draft NDP describes how residents were happy to accept the outstanding number of new dwellings required to meet the level of proportional housing growth, but that the preference was for the need to be met by small sites accommodating smaller, properties.

2.17 describes the qualitative aspects of new housing development in terms of off-road parking and the mix of properties and their appearance, as well as the impact on adjoining property.

At paragraph 3.3 the factors influencing the approach to housing delivery are listed. A number of these are indicative of a lack of supply historically, resulting in high house prices and a preponderance of larger-dwellings creating a market that is top-heavy with 4+ bed homes.

Paragraph 3.5, with which we agree, alludes to the fact that realising the ambitions around increasing the supply of smaller, affordable homes will be difficult on smaller sites that are not obliged via the Core Strategy to make provision for affordable housing.

The 'Vision' for the parish is introduced at 4.1:

"Dilwyn will be a thriving and prosperous community that retains its peace and tranquillity whilst offering a high quality of life for residents of all ages, a resilient economy, a sustainable use of resources, and an excellent natural environment."

It is intended this Vision will be achieved through 6 objectives. We agree entirely with the Vision and the stated objectives.

The Vision and objectives then feed into the detailed planning policies. We shall look at these in turn and apply them to land adjacent to Wood Stock Cottage.

Policy DW1: Promoting sustainable development

This is a criterion-based policy setting out "high-level priorities that are considered essential" by the local community. Foremost is the requirement that a substantial proportion of new homes will meet the needs of local people, including those unable to compete on the open housing market.

We should stress that the landowners are open-minded in terms of the scale of development that might be brought forward but are acutely aware of the desire to redress the imbalance towards larger properties. To this end we can conceive that although not obligated to, a 10-dwelling scheme might produce a number of houses that we could offer as low-cost market properties.

Other requirements of DW1 include the need to ensure that new development conserves and enhances the natural beauty, amenity and cultural heritage of Dilwyn Parish, including the Conservation Area, within which the site is located.

Criterion c) requires that attention is given to scale and phasing, whereas d) requires development fosters the social and economic wellbeing of the community. We submit that in delivering a scheme that promoted smaller market and low-cost market dwellings, we'd be in concert with d).

It would, of course, be necessary to remove commercial fruit trees to facilitate development of the site but as above, there is no commercial contract with cider producers and the fruit is surplus to requirements. Thus, any conflict with DW1 f) is in our view limited and capable of being compensated for.

Policy DW2: Housing Development in Dilwyn Village

This policy introduces the minimum housing growth target (46), which will be met via sensitive infilling within the settlement boundary and the allocation of sites as per the Village Policies Map. Outside the settlement boundary, including land adjacent to it (such as land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage), development must accord with Core Strategy Policy RA3.

5.2 identifies that Dilwyn Common is now sufficiently built up to render a settlement boundary a necessity. Paragraph 5.3 recognises the limited options for infilling within the core area out of the necessity to preserve its character and appearance. It also considers the gap between Dilwyn and development on Dilwyn Common Lane to be one of the important characteristics that contributes towards the appearance of the Conservation Area and proposals to fill this gap would be “contrary to sustainable development principles.” Reference is then made to application 171452/F which is held up as an example of development responding positively to the context by placing dwellings either side of an orchard, thus maintaining the gap.

We respectfully disagree with that analysis. The development permitted via 171452/F extends development on the comparatively undeveloped south side of Dilwyn Common Lane perpendicular to the highway in a manner that is, in our view, not entirely characteristic of the prevailing settlement pattern. Although we acknowledge the dwellings are set either side of new orchard planting, it cannot be escaped that this development has fundamentally eroded the existing ‘gap’ by introducing built form to the southern side of the highway. Users of this highway will not in future experience the largely undeveloped south-side of the carriageway when travelling this route but will have a view that is dominated by four, large detached dwellings.

From our perspective, we consider that any pretence at maintaining the gap is largely academic. Views from the south towards land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage will now have the development described above to the fore. Views from the north are largely unavailable due to topography. On this basis, we consider that a sensitively conceived development on land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage should not be considered objectionable on a point of principle; particularly when in our view the erosion of the ‘important gap’ is already consented to a significant degree.

Policy DW3: Housing site in Dilwyn village

This policy identifies the two allocated housing sites, by far the largest of which is land south-west of Orchard Close and Castle Mount (3.7ha). The other is land east of Brookside Bungalow on Dilwyn Common Lane (0.3ha).

Policy DW4: Development principles for land to the south-west of Orchard Close and Castle Mount

This policy is, in effect, a design brief for the large proposed housing allocation. At first blush the allocation of such a significant area would appear contrary to the wishes of the local community;

paragraph 2.16 refers to local desire for housing need to be delivered on a number of smaller sites, such as this, rather than predominantly relying on a larger site. We understand, however, the apparent desire to identify a larger site in order to assist with the delivery of other objectives such as affordable housing.

We nonetheless submit that the requirements of this policy in terms of archaeological and heritage input underscore the sensitivity of the location relative to the Scheduled Monument and whilst noting the additional Heritage Impact Assessment, consider that harm to the setting of the Scheduled Monument (a designated heritage asset of the utmost significance), should be avoided if alternatives present themselves. Table 1 sets out very clearly the anticipated minimum yield from the allocated site (30) and whilst this represents a low net density, it would nonetheless represent a significant development in the shadow of the Castle Mound.

Policy DW5: Affordable, including Intermediate Homes

This policy reaffirms Herefordshire Council’s standard clauses in terms of eligibility for affordable housing. In the event that land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage was allocated and provided affordable housing, we would of course be in full support of such housing being the preserve of those with the requisite local connection.

Policy DW6: Conserving the landscape, scenic beauty and natural environment of the parish

In our view this policy rightly places emphasis on features that contribute to the beauty, amenity and visual quality of the parish and more specifically the setting and village-scale of Dilwyn village. This is an objective that nobody could reasonably take issue with.

However, in respect of land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage, we feel that significance has been incorrectly attributed to the hitherto commercial and relatively modern orchard planting on the site. This is not a traditional orchard and although we accept the planting may have some visual appeal, it is not, in our view, a habitat of principal importance and not a constraint on development.

We are confident that development on this site has the ability to accord with other facets of Policy DW6 also. For instance, there are measures that would be undertaken to enhance the ecological network of the area. This would include hedgerow planting with intermittent native species trees, and we’d anticipate any proposal being accompanied by a detailed landscape design.

Policy DW7: Protecting heritage assets

This policy appears aimed at conserving the setting of listed buildings as opposed to the conservation area per se; albeit reference is made to the retention of the overall character of the wider village and its surrounding rural landscape. We note that the refusal of application 152567 was for reason of its alleged adverse impact on the “character and appearance of the wider conservation area” which infers a general dislike for the scheme relative to its surrounds as opposed to direct and specific allegations of harm to any other heritage asset. On this basis, we submit that a sensitively designed resubmission would have the potential to overcome the arguably vague reason for refusal.

Policy DW8: Development within Dilwyn Conservation Area

We understand the imperative that is the preservation or where possible enhancement of the character and appearance of the Dilwyn Conservation Area. To that end, we agree with the requirements of DW8 1.

We have already outlined why we think that retention of the commercial orchard is not crucial to achieving preservation or enhancement of character and appearance and submit a sensitively designed scheme would not be contrary to DW8 2.

We note the protected vistas and serial views as per Map 2. Development of land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage would not offend any of these views; which focus understandably on the historic village centre.

We agree entirely with the provisions of DW8 4. These seek to ensure development that is reflective of the context, which is in our view the correct approach and will inform the design of any proposal to develop this site.

DW8 5. refers to the retention of trees unless they are assessed to be of no value. We have some difficulty with the language used. The term 'no value' is subjective and the requirement to keep all trees unless of "no value" tilts the planning balance in a manner contrary to the Core Strategy and NPPF. Instead we'd suggest the categorisation used in Arboricultural Assessment under BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

Policy DW9: Foul and Storm water drainage and flooding

We understand and have no issue with the provisions of Policy DW9, which appear founded on national guidance and Core Strategy Policies SD3 and SD4 and note that application 152567 was not refused on grounds that relate to foul, flood or storm water.

Policy DW10: Protection of Local Green Space is not offended by development on land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage.

Policy DW11: Design and Appearance

We understand and have no issue with the provisions of Policy DW11.

Policies DW12, 13 and 14 (small and home-based businesses, rural enterprises, diversification and tourism and promotion of high-speed broadband and telecommunications) are not relevant to development on land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage and not considered further.

Policy DW15: Renewable and low carbon energy

We have no issue with the provisions of DW15 but note that the current wording suggests that criteria i) is missing.

Policy DW16: Protection and enhancement of community facilities and services

We support the provisions of DW16 and consider that development on land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage would have no adverse impact on the viability of any of the facilities described. We submit that greater, resident population would only act to support the continued use of these assets.

Policy DW17: Contributions to community facilities

In our view the language employed in this policy as currently drafted is vague and ambiguous. The use of the term ‘could contribute’ infers no fundamental requirement to contribute. Rather it suggests that a developer might mull over the idea of contributing and then decide not to. In accord with Core Strategy policies, we see little option but to refine this policy such that it refers to developments of a certain scale having to contribute to community facilities where there is evidence of need.

Policy DW18: Traffic measures within the parish

We agree with the provisions of DW18, which aims to increase the choice of mode of transport by promoting cycling and walking. We’d remark also that the development of land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage would have the ability to improve forward visibility for vehicles and thus inter-visibility for those travelling in opposing directions. In our view the land at Wood Stock Cottage certainly has no less ability to comply with Policy DW18 than either of the proposed housing allocations.

Policy DW19: Highway design requirements

The requirements of DW19 are noted and acknowledged. It should be noted, however, that application 152567 was not refused on grounds that relate to this Policy.

Policy DW20: Protection and enhancement of the public rights of way network

The development of land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage would not affect any public rights of way.

Meeting Housing Needs & Housing Site Assessment V2

We have also reviewed the above, which appears in draft form on the Parish Council website. Although a lengthy document, the actual site assessments are somewhat perfunctory and although we accept that the site assessment criteria have been defined with NDP steering group input, we have reservations concerning certain of the outputs.

Moreover, there is little evidence that these assessments have been based on appropriate methodology e.g. the Historic England publication ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment’ - Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) December 2017.

We note for instance that in relation to impacts on the built and historic environment land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage (ref 17) is assessed as having an adverse impact and yet the major site at Orchard Close/Castle Mount (ref 18A), is considered to have a neutral impact. We find this difficult to reconcile with the Historic England objection to the Regulation 14 draft plan and their stated concerns in respect of the impact upon the setting of the Scheduled Monument.

Moreover, whereas the potential for compensatory planting is acknowledge in respect of site 18A and the hedgerow loss that would be necessary for access, no such potential is identified for Wood Stock

Cottage and the consequential score is a major adverse. As highlighted above, there is potential for significant compensation for hedgerow and orchard tree removal that is wholly unaccounted for. The development of the site in this context would have the potential to enhance the bio-diversity value of the site.

In summary, we are not convinced that the site assessment has been undertaken on an entirely objective basis and that the outputs of the assessment are not wholly reliable as a consequence.

Summary and conclusions

This letter is to be taken as our representation to the Regulation 16 consultation for the Dilwyn Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Unfortunately, we have significant concerns that the plan as submitted has taken insufficient heed of Historic England's concerns in relation to the large-scale allocation of land south-west of Orchard Close and Castle Mound. We of course acknowledge the inherent difficulty with identifying land that is available and appropriate for development and understand the approach taken is one aimed at delivering much needed smaller market and affordable tenures. However, having read the plan in the round, we are concerned that in other respects the large-scale allocation in particular, would be in conflict with a number of the policies as drafted; specifically, DW6 b) and c), DW7 and DW8 (which references land that borders the Conservation Area).

If Historic England maintains its opposition to this allocation, then the plan does not appear to make adequate provision for the delivery of housing to meet the identified need; it having been expressed elsewhere in the plan that this is an acknowledged objective.

It is on this basis that we promote land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage as having the potential to deliver a high-quality sensitively designed scheme that although within the Conservation Area and subject to the statutory test of preservation, would not affect the setting of any other designated heritage asset. Any application would be accompanied by assessment of the orchard trees to demonstrate what we already know i.e. it is a modern, hitherto commercial orchard with no viable future as such that should not be taken as an automatic constraint to development. Moreover, any development proposal would have the ability to compensate for the loss of orchard trees through new and replacement hedgerow planting of far greater ecological value than the orchard trees themselves.

We have also remarked upon the closure of the gap between Dilwyn and Dilwyn Common Lane that will be brought about by the permission for four, large detached dwellings on the opposite side of the lane. This will fundamentally alter the village-scape and we submit makes the argument that this gap is 'important' less viable. We note also that the gap is not highlighted as an important vista on Map 2.

The client is also entirely open-minded as regards the scale of development that might be brought forward, but is also aware of the requirement for smaller, market and affordable dwellings. Thus, we are proposing that the site is allocated for 11 dwellings with a Core Strategy compliant level of affordable homes. The site has the capacity to accommodate the quantum of development proposed and an amended layout would ensure that the character and appearance of the area is upheld. The

quantum of development has also been deliberately set at 11 so that the site is as small as possible (as per the expressed desires of local people) whilst still ensuring the provision of affordable housing and S106 contributions so that the benefit of the scheme to the village is maximised.

However, if the NDP steering group were to support a smaller development, the land owner would be willing to accept that also. Even in the context of a scheme being brought forward that would not be obliged to deliver affordable housing (by virtue of it being for 10 or fewer dwellings), the client would be very happy to consider offering some low-cost market dwellings in recognition of the local need.

It follows from the above that we would respectfully ask the Parish to reconsider the potential allocation of the land adjacent Wood Stock Cottage irrespective of whether the large allocation is taken forward.

We would be very happy to discuss this letter further with the NDP steering group at the appropriate time.

Yours faithfully,

Tompkins Thomas Planning



T O M P K I N S T H O M A S