

Bredenbury, Wacton and Grendon Bishop Neighbourhood Plan Examination Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Group Parish Council and HC

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information. Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

1. Please confirm the dates of the consultation with statutory consultees on the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report of April 2018.

The environmental scoping report was sent to statutory consultees on 23rd April, the consultation period ran from the 23rd April 2018 to 29th May 2018.

2. Please could HC confirm that the proportional housing growth target of 24 homes is correct? Have any other dwellings been permitted or constructed? What is the figure now?

Bredenbury has a population of 62. The proportionate growth target figure for Bredenbury is 9. The growth figure Bredenbury and District Group when including Bredenbury, Wacton and Grandon Bishop is 24. Bredenbury has a population 62, Wacton has a population 49 and Grandon Bishop has a population 46.

From 2011 to April 2019 there have been 2 completions and 2 commitments. This leaves a residual figure of 20.

3. The area of woodland to the east of St Andrews Close (known as Area B in consultation stages) has been included in the settlement boundary. Given it is woodland and a priority habitat, I consider this might be unwise and may consider its removal from the boundary as part of my recommended modifications. Do you have any comments on this?

The NPSG recognise the concerns raised by the Examiner in relation to the inclusion of this area within the settlement boundary. Our position is set out in the Consultation Statement and we have no additional comments to make on this issue.

4. Proposed site allocations Sites 1 and 2, North and South of Brockington House respectively, have tree preservation orders on them according to the Settlement Boundary and Call for Sites Report. What work has been carried out to ascertain whether the sites can be developed (delivered) in the manner envisaged in relation to housing capacity, the provision of a car park and with regard to the trees and also the access onto the A44? Please do not send or direct me to evidence which is not already publicly available.

The site promoter has been engaged in pre-application discussions with Herefordshire Council for both sites from Spring 2017. A range of technical studies have been completed including an Ecology study, Speed Survey, Assessment of Access Study and Tree Survey. The pre-application submission included a detailed layout and had regard to the constraints associated with the trees and access onto A44. The layout was consistent with the scale of development proposed in the Plan and the Council did not raise any 'in-principle' concerns. The site promoter is currently preparing the planning application for submission to Herefordshire Council.

5. Site 5 the Garage Field site is proposed for development. Yet the Characterisation Study identifies two key views over this site which Policy BW&GB 10 seeks to protect. Is there a conflict and if so, how might this be reconciled?

The Settlement Boundary and Call for Sites Report (January 2019) recognises that this site is in a highly sensitive location on the western edge of the main part of the settlement. The original call for sites submission proposed development on a site of 1ha which would have a significant and inappropriate impact on the character of the settlement having regard to the findings of the Neighbourhood Plan Characterisation Study. The Neighbourhood Plan allocation addresses these concerns and the impact of development can be mitigated by:

- limiting the size of the development to around five homes;
 - aligning buildings with the A44 so the development is physically and functionally related to the existing built form of the main part of the settlement;
 - the detailed layout could also consider providing visual gaps between the dwellings or blocks of dwellings to retain views through the site;
 - the provision of a replacement hedgerow on the southern boundary (to the A44) and by new landscaping on the northern and western boundaries.
6. Policy BW&GB 6 refers to the “main dwelling”; should this be “original dwelling” to tie in with paragraph 4.2.18 of the supporting text or does the text need to be amended in some way and if so, how?

We agree that Policy BW&GB6 should refer to the ‘original’ dwelling to ensure consistency with para 4.2.18.

7. How might Policy BW&GB 11 be revised in relation to non-designated heritage assets given the representation from HC?

If the Examiner is minded to amend this Policy then we suggest that an alternative form of wording to address the representation could state:

‘A balanced judgement will be required about the effects of any development proposal on or close to non-designated heritage assets (including those listed in Appendix 1) having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

8. Policy BW&GB 18 refers to parking facilities on land next to St Andrews Church.
- a. The area of land is shown on a map on page 42 of the Plan. However, the area shown on the Bredenbury settlement Policies Map seems to differ. Please confirm the correct area and/or provide a map at a larger scale which shows the area in question.
 - b. Please point me to the justification or background information that shows that the car park can be delivered; for instance has any technical work being done on the access, trees or effect on the Church? Please ensure that any evidence sent is already within the public domain.
 - c. The Characterisation Study identifies a key view from this area. Is there any conflict between Policies BW&GB 10 and 18? If so, how might this be resolved?

Full planning permission (P184612/F) was granted for this proposal in May 2019. The correct boundary for the proposal is that shown on the map on page 42 on the Neighbourhood Plan. The impact of the proposals on the character of the

surrounding area and the setting of the adjacent Church in particular was assessed by Herefordshire Council through the determination of this planning application. The Council's conservation officer was satisfied that the impact of the development could be sufficiently mitigated by the replanting of some trees and the strengthening of the hedge. The NPSG is satisfied that these measures will address the requirements of Neighbourhood Plan Policy BW&GB10.

The NPSG have been in discussion with Bredenbury Parochial Church Council (PCC) who are the applicants for this development. The PCC have embarked on a fund raising programme and their intention is to raise sufficient funds which would allow them to start the work on the car park on 2021.

9. Please provide me with further information about, and update me on the status of, the planning application referred to on page 43 of the Plan. It would be helpful to know the application number, proposal and any decision as well as a site plan etc.

See response to question 8 above. A reserved matters application (P194278/XA2) was submitted on 11th December 2019 and this is awaiting determination by Herefordshire Council. Target determination date for this application is Friday 7 February 2020.

10. Policy BW&GB 19 refers to "assets".

- a. Is it the intention that this policy refers to Assets of Community Value which are discussed in the supporting text or is the word used in general terms? If it is the latter, does the supporting text need to be amended and if so, how?

The word 'assets' is used to indicate those community facilities which are highly valued by the local community. The references to Assets of Community Value (ACV) are by way of context and if the Examiner is minded to recommend that the supporting text is updated to avoid confusion with the ACV legislation then it may be appropriate to delete paras 4.7.7-4.7.11 and to replace para 4.7.6 with the following text:

'The Community Survey highlighted the importance of the protection and enhancement of key community assets, in particular the Village Hall, Barneby Inn and Primary School. This Policy addresses the requirements of the NPPF in relation to planning positively for the provision and use of those community facilities and other local services which enhance the sustainability of communities. This Policy is in addition to protection provided through the Assets of Community Value legislation.'

- b. Please point me to the justification or evidence regarding the inclusion of the Primary School and the Barneby Inn in this policy. Have the owners and relevant authorities been consulted on this policy?

See response to question (a) in terms of the justification for this Policy. The findings of the Community Survey are summarised in Table 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and we confirm that the owners of the Barneby Inn and the education authority have been consulted throughout the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination

progresses.

These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination.

Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

With many thanks.

Ann Skippers

22 January 2020