

## Issues and Options presentation comments Jul 2017.

Respondent	Question	Answer	Comment
3	1	Y	Drop word eclectic – odds nothing
3	2	Y	More the merrier within reason, new blood needed in the Parish
3	2b	Y	Need a decent village hall and pavement to the church
3	3	Y	In principle, Yes
3	4	N	Not unless a substantial offer to the parish is forthcoming.
3	5	N	Not unless a substantial offer to the parish is forthcoming.
3	9	Y	Don't understand why not in a dip in the land. Keep industrialised.
3	10	N	Not important
3	11	Y	Should not exclude farms.
3	12	N	Not convinced there is demand and would be worried about traffic consequences.
3	15	Y	If nowhere closer to the George can be found.
3	16	Y	Immediate setting only
3	17		Pavement to church & Holme Marsh
3	A		Additional houses near Kington roundabout to help Kington's housing need
4	4	Y	Need to put something towards Memorial Hall
4	9	Y	Careful thought needs to be given to location to minimise smell in village.
4	17		With more houses will need public transport
5	17		Speed enforcement
6	2b	N	If 56 are completed then I believe this will be enough
6	17		Traffic claming, refuges on Spond lane,
8	2b	N	Hopeful funding to replace Hall will be forthcoming. Ie at Titley smaller village/no development/fab hall/just been extended.
8	3	N	Holme marsh has a lot squeezed in already some development along Bryncurl road.
8	4	N	Don't feel comfortable making this decision.
8	5	Y	Would be better site for village hall
8	6	N	Too many house Not 73!
8	7	Y	Sell hall relocate and sell plot hall should be near playground.
8	11	Y	People need jobs fabulous internet to make them move here.

8	13	Y	plant more trees with planning applications
8	14	Y	There is no green space publically owned other than footpaths, sports field next to new village hall plot B?
8	15		Disagree with no obvious place to build hall. Plot B is obvious. Noise prevention would have to be built in.
8	16		Limited input from Historic England/government
8	17		Consideration to size of access roads to proposed developments. More pavements essential.
9	5	Y	Plot B would be better suited to a new hall
9	7	Y	And village hall site
9	15		New village hall would be good but closer to the centre plot B?
10	1	Y	Okay but. 1. preservation architectural sites -where it doesn't comprise justified future needs. 2. Ensure adequate parking on housing developments to avoid road parking.
10	2a	Y	More 30 if required by demonstrable case to fund village needs and sustain viability of assets
10	4	N	Additional traffic on Nashes Oak lane
10	5	N	Additional traffic on Nashes Oak lane
10	8	Y	Include 1 bed units
10	13	Y	minimise pollution and disruption to adjoining properties
10	14	N	Protect amenities but not necessarily in specific location indefinitely
10	16	Y	Okay but. 1. preservation architectural sites -where it doesn't comprise justified future needs. 2. Ensure adequate parking on housing developments to avoid road parking.
10	17		Surface Drainage, Road capacity, Road safety. Renewable energy.
11	6	Y	planning boundary at Kington should also be considered
11	9		I think sheds are better in a hollow than on higher ground.
11	17		Speed enforcement, sustain buses.
12	2a	Y	Around 100 houses in 15 years, Range of housing and different styles.
12	5	N	Is there any money?
12	12		Perhaps if it doesn't become run down with vacant properties.
12	17		Shop, Pub. Parcel delivery acceptance, local produce.
13	4	Y	Don't think Oakwright are best solution, the company is perivative ?? built on stolen documents and poor quality
13	5	Y	Don't think Oakwright are best solution, the company is perivative ?? built on stolen documents and poor quality
13	6	Y	Don't think Oakwright are best solution, the company is perivative ?? built on stolen documents and poor quality
13	7	Y	Don't think Oakwright are best solution, the company is perivative ?? built on stolen documents and poor quality
13	9		There is no need for any in the village
13	11		Not just for Mr HERN benefit
13	14	Y	Footpath improvement throughout

13	15		What's wrong with current one?
13	17		Speed/width restrictions in village
14	11	Y	But controlled and diverse
14	12	Y	but in a rural environment - limited opportunities/work
14	14	Y	Footpaths should be clear, by Paul avery's Lyonshall Park wood?
14	15	Y	Although not in the village Footpath to the church?
14	16	Y	Castle? Private at moment
14	17		Bus. Bad times at moment will need improving. Pub
15	1	N	Too much Development
15	2a	N	Far too much housing already
15	2b	N	Far too much housing already
15	3	N	Too much housing already this is housing developer paradise I want to live in village not like a housing estate
15	4	N	Too much Housing already, environmental damage and drainage not up to it
15	5	N	Too much Housing already, environmental damage and drainage not up to it
15	6	N	Too much Housing already, environmental damage and drainage not up to it
15	7	N	The DMV site deserves protection not destruction
15	8	N	This question has too many points - I agree with some and not others on balance No.
15	9	N	Too many of these already
15	12	N	Completely inappropriate development in this village unless using brownfield sites.
15	13	Y	More emphasis on wildlife and conservation stop straying around gates, municipal infrastructure, mowing is cheaper. In verge areas allow wildlife. Lower mixes as an offset to building/farming development.
15	15	Y	Better to develop existing site. But does it need changing seems fine as it is.
15	16	Y	Every time. Once you destroy the heritage that's it
15	17		Traffic calming weight/size limit on vehicle through village. Agricultural haulage vehicles are too big to get round hairpins in village.
16	11	Y	Consider traffic management
16	12	N	Is this required?
16	14	Y	Existing footpaths. Stop destroying nature of village
16	17		Reduce traffic in village
17	12	N	Is this required?
17	14	Y	Existing footpaths. Stop destroying nature of village
17	17		Reduce traffic in village
18	2a		Need more information
18	10		This needs to be explained

18	11		This needs to be explained
18	12		This needs to be explained
18	16		Need more information
18	17		Road on A44 on Rosehill
19	4	Y	Less Houses
19	5	Y	Less house too cramped together
19	A		It is important to grow a lovely village like Lyonshallis grown organically as the planning is set out is trying to do.
20	5	Y	Less houses
20	13	Y	Promote sustainable drainage
20	15	Y	Village cannot curvice without a village hall Top priority
20	17		Speed enforcement bicycle routes and safe pavements
22	17		All keys points from questionnaire survey
26	8	Y	Encourage inernal garages that cater for families insize using bedroom conversion
26	10	Y	Encourage use of solar panels on agri buildings. Say no to solar farms.
26	13	Y	The proposed build on Holm Marsh does flood on regular basis. The drainage at Holme Marsh be protected at all cost.
26	17		All weather footpath from holme Marsh to village.
27	2b	Y	Not allowing development simply to get a new village hall
27	9	Y	Location, wind direction should be considered before any new chicken sheds are erected.
27	13	Y	Past flooring in Holm Marsh- all Development should have a robust water management system in place
27	17		Safe path between Holm Marsh and Village
28	17		Footpaths through village
29	3	N	Yes for Lyonshall, Holmes Marsh hasn't the road access to take more houses, or the drainage system. There are no pavements and blind corners
29	5	N	a smaller number of houses would be acceptable
29	9	N	There is already enough noise and smell from local agri business
29	13	Y	Sustainable drainage and protecting wildlife sites
29	17		Pavements both in Lyonshall and between Holme Marsh and village. Road capabilities shoul dbe taken into consideration with all planning
30	2a	Y	Must be affordable
30	4		What will the profile of the village be like in 30 years? These will be expensive homes. Will Lyonshall become a geratric ghetto?
30	7	Y	Why only twp houses who will buy them?
30	9		No to large scale agricultural developments.
30	14	Y	Area around Fishpools would be ideal area for teenagers to play in.

30	16	Y	Finger posts indicating Offas Dyke, Castle.
30	17		White lines on both sides of the road from A44 junction to Holme Marsh to slow traffic. Better bus service/re-establish Kington - Leominster service too.
31	15		Or on Bakers Meadow
31	17		The kink, Smoothing out seems impossible, but should be on the agenda.
32	17		Limit large lorries round George bends. Traffic calming to prevent speeding through village
33	9	Y	Encourage local employment
33	17		Get on with pub, address road bends in centre of village.
34	9	Y	Too many large vehicles and smell in residential area. Damage to roads already in poor condition.
34	11	Y	Pub should be up and running. The biggest asset in the village. Too long it's been a shell of nothing.
34	12	N	Focus on village too big project.
34	16	N	Lyonshall Castle has private sign. If can't see it what's the point of preserving it. Should be maintained by owner.
34	17		Concern of ever increasing HGV travelling through the village. Poor Ahmed in corner house even now it gets hit!
35	9	N	A lot of big vehicles in village already causing damage.
35	16	N	fail to access Lyonshall Castle
35	17		Concern over large vehicle in village and damage to corner house.
36	3	N	Not all of them
36	4	N	Not suitable
36	5	N	Not suitable
36	6	N	Not suitable
36	17		Pavement from village to Lyonshall nurseries would be good.
37	4	N	Not suitable
37	5	N	Not suitable
37	6	N	Not suitable
37	17		Pavement from village to Lyonshall nurseries would be good.
38	15	N	To maximise use of V Hall by all community it should preferably be safely accessible on foot by pushchair etc. There must be space by George somewhere?
38	17		Village gate like Winforton. Speed controls.
39	12	N	Don't like the idea of a possible industrial estate.
40	2b	Y	development to the area of the village hall should be kept to a minimum. All organisations using the hall should pay a fixed charge.
41	2b	Y	development to the area of the village hall should be kept to a minimum. All organisations using the hall should pay a fixed charge.
42	2b	N	Our memorial Hall is good for the purpose
42	5	N	effect view on houses opposite

42	7	N	Good to have some green space in the village.
42	8		How small? We don't want too many houses for a small village.
42	9	N	Air pollution - no Thank you
42	10	Y	if they don't have a negative effect on the village
42	13	Y	Old buildings grasslands and fields.
42	17		Traffic is already a problem & needs urgent consideration. We have two dangerous 90 degree corners and larger vehicles are becoming a problem.
43	3	N	Why are we not exploring he boundary with Kington? They will have a shortage of housing we could exploit.
43	6	?	Seems a big development
43	7	?	Quite a way out of the village
43	9	Y	Disagree with comments aout placing on top of hills. It is harder to landscape.
43	13	N	we have effective organisations already ie CPRE/EA
43	16	N	We already have organisations in place.
43	A		it would be worth exploring the parish boundary at Kington. They may have shortage in future.
44	1	N	This combines 5 items which are divergent that they leave the village open to massive housing development.
44	2a	N	when I left the NDP group they were discussing 2 houses a year. Now we are getting 58. I knew this woul dhappen, would not be associaited with it.
44	2b	N	Although the planned houses are attractive. Too planned. This is nothing to do with community assets. It is only to do with profits from developments.
44	3	N	The village will change beyond recognition and end up like Milton Keynes.
44	4	N	Besides too much developmet already no extra surface drainage for village centre id proposed. It will be flooded.
44	5	N	Besides too much developmet already no extra surface drainage for village centre id proposed. It will be flooded.
44	6	N	Besides too much developmet already no extra surface drainage for village centre id proposed. It will be flooded.
44	7	N	Besides too much developmet already no extra surface drainage for village centre id proposed. It will be flooded.
44	8	N	There are 68 planned already double that the county council target for 2031.
44	9	N	The place already has too much traffic and stinks like hell all year round.
44	10	Y	Providing it is not an excuse to build nore units
44	11	Y	Plot D will put house straight on top of the deserted mediieval village site which has so far been ignored.
44	12	Y	The place needs more business
44	13	N	Although very good in outline several wildlife relevant sites have already been lost to new housing. What is needed is an additional storm drain system to protect the village centre properly.
44	15	N	The existing one is satisfactory. The funds for a new one can only come from too much extra building.
44	16	Y	why are you lookingto build on the deserted medievil village site?

44	17		AS bus service reinstated to Leominster.
45	3	N	1) The Holme must not be included within the development boundary, which should finish at the boundary of the existing permission of 8 houses (against the wishes of the residents of Holme Marsh) "2) As regards the existing permission no new application to be approved that increases the number 2) As regards the existing permission no new application to be approved that increases the number of house permitted.
45	7		Beginnings of in-fill which would eventually join Holme Marsh to the village and destroy the complete nature of the hamlet of Holme Marsh.
46	2a	N	<p>A. For such an important question, it is very badly presented. I do not believe parishioners have been given sufficient information to see the larger picture:</p> <p>1. The Parish increase in this NDP proposal is 182, and this excludes the other developments that would fall within the expanded development boundary:</p> <p>a. In addition to the 68 committed there are 12 Pending Outline Permission.</p> <p>b. "With 50% favourably considering a further 15 houses"?</p> <p>c. Plus potentially Plot A – 11 houses</p> <p>d. Plus potentially Plot B – 22 + 34 (or 12 – it is not clear?) - 56 houses</p> <p>e. Plus potentially Plot C – 18 houses (is this the 15 above?)</p> <p>f. Plus potentially Plot A – 2 houses</p> <p>2. At 2011, there were 301 houses listed, these 182 houses is an increase of 60% or 9 houses per year.</p> <p>This NDP Proposal does not make clear what this overall total could be.</p> <p>B. For such an important question, and 5 years on from the 2012 questionnaire, we haven't been provided with the results of a report to help us answer the question of what would "be enough to sustain local services, including the Pub, a Shop, the Playgroup, the Memorial Hall, the Playground, Local Schools, Bus routes, Libraries and other local facilities in the wider area"?</p> <p>It would be a great help for example to know that for:</p> <p>+30 we get no village service growth</p> <p>+50 would fund the new memorial hall</p> <p>+75 would give sufficient demand for the Pub to survive</p>
46	2b	N	I do support a limited amount of housing, but the NDP Proposal does not indicate, other than ref. Plot D, what those numbers would need to be to have sufficient funds to develop community assets.

46	3	N	<p>Holme Marsh</p> <p>A. Current Position.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Marsh already has the major development opposite Beech House. The actual number is pending Reserved Matters, the application was for 8 but the actual number withdrawn, so it could be say 5 or 8.</li> <li>2. Plus 2 approved, plus 1 pending.</li> <li>3. The Total is therefore between 8 and 11.</li> <li>4. Holme Marsh started at 30, so already a 27%-37% increase.</li> </ol> <p>B. Boundary Position.</p> <p>It is proposed the development boundary be moved to the north side of The Holme, which raises 2 serious concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following the new NDP, the existing approval opposite Beech House could be resubmitted for a greater number, and be most likely to be approved once within the new development boundary.</li> <li>2. Additional development is then also likely in the field behind the existing approval.</li> </ol> <p>The combined area of these 2 is roughly 1.5 hectares, and with the proposed NDP assuming a housing density of 25houses/hectare, that could result in an additional 38 houses.</p> <p>Such a result would more than double the size of Holme Marsh.</p> <p>C. Sharing the burden</p> <p>If Holme Marsh is expected to contribute equally with the rest of Lyonshall, then we could be “required” to take on a 60% increase (per my answer to question 1) – an additional 18 houses.</p> <p>D. Solution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Holme must not be included within the development boundary, which should finish at the boundary of the existing permission for 8 houses.</li> <li>2. With regards the existing permission and the field, no new application should be approved that attempts to increase the number of houses above 5.</li> <li>3. Any future development should have “individually designed, well-spaced houses distributed across hamlet to maintain the character of Holme Marsh” and be “a range of housing which is sympathetic to the current eclectic mix of housing stock”.</li> </ol> <p>Lyonshall village (excluding Holme Marsh)</p>
----	---	---	---

46	3	N	<p>Cont. E. Unexplained enlargement of Development Boundary.</p> <p>There are a number of significant changes to the development boundary that have not been explained and do not seem to have an obvious logic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The expansion to the east and south of White Lions. The obvious line would be the existing White Lions development boundary, and to not extend east, and certainly not south – which looks an odd extension and would definitely cause traffic conflicts with Burgoyne lorries opposite.</li> <li>2. The expansion opposite the above: north of Burgoynes and south-east of approvals P143832/F and P152330/F. This could open a road access from the above 2 approvals and Plot C, and create an accident risk if many cars turn in and out below Burgoynes. All traffic from the new estates (as above) should go via Spond Road where the traffic is slower and can join at that junction.</li> </ol>
46	4		<p>The Owner has not proposed any benefits for the community.</p> <p>The Plot should stay outside the Development Boundary, and if the Owner wants to put in an application they can make an offer as part of that application.</p> <p>Additionally, it is unclear how the site would access the road.</p>
46	5	N	<p>The Owner has not proposed any benefits for the community.</p> <p>The Plot should stay outside the Development Boundary, and if the Owner wants to put in an application they can make an offer as part of that application.</p>
46	6	N	<p>If your question had added “with Restrictions” I would have probably said Yes. As the question is framed, I could inadvertently be saying yes to 73 homes!</p> <p>I believe £10,000 per plot is a good offer, however:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is unclear whether or how much monies were received for the existing approvals totalling 23 houses: P152329/F, P143830/F, P143832/F and P152330/F. It would be helpful to know this and also how much we need in total for the Memorial Hall redevelopment.</li> <li>2. The traffic needs to go via Spond Lane and not from a new road junction either below or above Burgoynes.</li> </ol>
46	7	N	<p>Again, a badly worded question.</p> <p>I am in favour with the Restriction of 2 plots.</p> <p>I am not in favour of 12 additional homes without being able to see the whole picture</p>

46	8	N	<p>Again, badly worded.</p> <p>Yes the NDP should include such a planning policy, but what's the detail I'm saying yes to!</p> <p>They should be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Away from residential properties, and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Probably half a mile away</li> <li>b. To the east of Lyonshall – so down wind of the prevailing westerlies</li> <li>c. NOT on higher ground – else smells catch the air and travel</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. VERY MINDFUL of SMELLS and FLIES. The latter have been especially noticeable this year.</li> <li>3. VERY MINDFUL of LARGE LORRIES and TRACTORS and their speed. The back road from the George past Bryncurl and Crowfoot up to the A44 is just waiting for an accident to happen!</li> </ol>
46	12	N	<p>The Penrhos suggestion is reasonable, if well concealed.</p> <p>There is also space around Burgoynes, but it should be restricted to at most half the size of the existing Burgoynes site.</p>
46	15	Y	<p>However, consideration needs to be made for improved footpath and cyclepath access, as this is difficult along the road.</p> <p>With the new housing along this stretch, can provision be made for a foot/cycle path along the back to the new memorial hall?</p>
46	17		With the new housing, provision made for a foot/cycle path "spines" on either side of the main road
47	2a	N	The roads are too narrow and cannot accept the extra traffic.
47	2b	N	Doesn't seem like good practice.
47	3	N	The boundary would not keep Holme Marsh separate from Lyonshall.
47	4	N	Too many houses
47	5	N	Too many houses
47	6	N	Only if traffic goes by Spond Lane and not near Burgoynes as this would be too dangerous.
47	7	N	Too many houses
47	9	N	The area is already saturated with chicken sheds and no more should be allowed. Smells would be extremely unpleasant and perhaps contribute to health problems, There is absolutely no room for more large lorries and tractors especially at the corner by the George pub.
47	11	N	This could lead to inappropriate development.
47	12	N	Only acceptable if they are accessible without going through the centre of Lyonshall.
48	1	N	Vision 1. Tourism development should be confined to Kington. 2. Innovation and enterprise should be confined to Kington. 3. 'Creative solutions' is nebulous and not a sufficiently specific objective. Objectives: what does sustainability mean?

48	2a	N	1. This could allow more provision of chicken sheds of which there are far too many already. 2. Lyonshall is much better placed to be a dormitory village for Kington/Leominster/Hereford. 3. Natural and organic growth of the village should be the objective. This has previously suggested at 2 properties per annum. This, I believe, had been generally accepted.
48	2b	N	This is an unhealthy principle which effectively allows wealthy planning applicants to purchase their approval.
48	3	N	Lyonshall: The extension of the boundary in front of Burgoynes is unnatural and would lead to a conflict ( with burgoynes) traffic access onto the main road at a difficult position ( on a hill with a blind corner). Holme Marsh: A more natural boundary for Holme Marsh would be an extension of the boundary behind Greenacres ( bisecting the field recently sold) and up to the village lane. this would provide a plot for one or maybe two houses opposite Beech House. A guiding principle here that provision should remain with the UK for some villages to remain villages and some hamlets to remain hamlets, otherwise such things will be lost to future generations.
48	4	N	Inconsistent with reply to Q2.
48	5	N	Inconsistent with reply to Q2.
48	6	N	Inconsistent with reply to Q2.
48	7	N	Inconsistent with reply to Q2.
48	9	N	The policy should include. 1. No more intensive chicken sheds. 2. No more industrial large-scale buildings. 3. No more industrial units.
48	11	N	This is too impress and a yes here could lead to a horrifically inappropriate development.
48	12	N	Applications should be judged on their own merits. In general these facilities should be provided by Kington. Eg Hatton garden Ind Est which is under utilised.
48	13	Y	Such policies should be subject to Lyonshall parish approval.
48	14	N	This is too broad. Agreed for the play area. Other should be subject to Lyonshall approval.
48	15	N	The existing hall is satisfactory to a routine repair.
48	17		More covered bus shelters. Better footpaths.
49	1	N	Road and water signage are not of good enough standard to support the village as it stands. Road so called improvements does not go far enough. Too many large vehicles using village as a through fare. Safety is very poor cars and people.
49	2a	N	Not right type of housing and houses being built behind existing houses. Where this is happening either now or future no consultation with said houses being informed of further development.
49	2b	N	More consultation with houses being affected by additional houses. Road system through village must be improved!
49	3	N	Less houses to be built as there is no benefit to community financially for greater qty of housing.
49	6	N	Too many houses spoiling view across fields and orchards.
49	7	N	Do we really need this extra land for a memorial hall?
49	8	Y	We need to know what agri business is going to happen and what type ( no more chickens) Keep chicken lorries out of the village. Traffic has increased 100% +

49	11	Y	But we need facilities for villagers first and foremost than tourism. Tourists will only come if we keep our village integrity intact.
49	12	N	We do not want workshops and business units in village centre.
49	13	Y	Looking after local view and improve infrastructure such as drains, water etc. protect our brown field and additional areas. Be more sympathetic to villagers feelings not big business.
49	14	Y	that's a must to encourage young families into the village.
49	15	N	why?
49	16	Y	A must
49	17		support local feelings and get large lorries out of the village centre. Improve pub corner it's a nightmare accident waiting to happen. Wasted 10k on improvement in the early summer.
50	6	N	I live on spond lane and regularly walk along the lane past the land proposed Plot C. With the another developments already approved it seems this area is destined to become a large estate, different from other proposed and out of character with other residential areas in the village. I am concerned this size development will add a lot of traffic to an already busy lane which is not suitable for existing traffic levels. the area outside the village speed limit and speed are unrestricted and unsuitable for residential use. it will increase vehicular and pedestrian traffic both ways and put all users at risk of accident. I appreciate there must be some development, I am concerned that the infrastructure is strained at current levels. we are continually told by NHS is at breaking point and particularly Kington Surgery are having problems recruiting and retaining staff.
50	17		Safe footpaths along village and extending as far as church.
51	6	N	Plot C is adjacent to two plots where planning permission has already been granted and if considered in conjunction with these two plots I believe this will constitute a major housing development within an area not previously developed, which is contrary to the stated principles of identifying settlement boundaries. I consider it to be unacceptable expansion contrary to essential character of the village. Spond lane has been subject to large developments of poultry units which has resulted in increased traffic, particularly large goods vehicles. The proposed plot C will increase traffic further onto a single track lane not suitable for current levels. The proposed development is outside the village speed limit, not on bus route so pedestrian access to the village would be along a narrow lane with limited visibility used by traffic permitted to travel up to 60mph. there is no footpath so pedestrians would be at serious risk.
52	4	N	Unless land owner makes a commitment to benefit the village.
52	5	N	Unless land owner makes a commitment to benefit the village.
52	17		pavement throughout A480. traffic calming measure to slow down traffic especially at George corner.
53	2b	Y	but carefully limited
53	17		Comprehensive pavements and access to footpaths from new developments.

54	2a	Y	<p>Less than 30, on the basis that there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68 committed</li> <li>12 pending approval</li> <li>80 to date</li> <li>18 Plot C for the Memorial Hall build.</li> <li>2 Plot D for the Memorial Hall land</li> <li>20 as further limited development per this Question 2</li> </ul> <p>_____</p> <p>100 total new builds, An increase of 30% or 5 per year over the NDP of 20 years.</p>
54	2b	N	<p>I do support a limited amount of further additional development as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot D offers land for the Memorial Hall in exchange for 2 houses being developed.</li> <li>Plot C offers £180k for the development of the Memorial Hall in exchange for 18 houses being developed.</li> </ul>

54	3	N	<p>Holme Marsh</p> <p>A. Current Position.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Marsh already has the major development opposite Beech House..</li> <li>2. Plus 2 approved, plus 1 pending.</li> <li>3. The Total is therefore between 8 and 11.</li> <li>4. Holme Marsh started at 30, so already a 27%-37% increase.</li> </ol> <p>B. Boundary Position.</p> <p>It is proposed the development boundary be moved to the north side of The Holme.</p> <p>The combined area of these 2 is roughly 1.5 hectares, and with the proposed NDP assuming a housing density of 25houses/hectare, that could result in an additional 38 houses.</p> <p>Such a result would more than double the size of Holme Marsh.</p> <p>C. Solution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Holme must not be included within the development boundary, which should finish at the boundary of the existing permission for up to 8 houses.</li> <li>2. With regards the existing major development and the field, no new application should be approved that attempts to increase the number of houses above 5.</li> <li>3. Any future development should have “individually designed, well-spaced houses distributed across hamlet to maintain the character of Holme Marsh” and be “a range of housing which is sympathetic to the current eclectic mix of housing stock”.yonshall village (excluding Holme Marsh)</li> </ol> <p>There is no need for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The expansion to the east and south of White Lions.</li> </ol> <p>The obvious line would be the existing White Lions development boundary, and to not extend east, and certainly not south – which looks an odd extension and would definitely cause traffic conflicts with Burgoyne lorries opposite.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The expansion opposite the above: north of Burgoynes and south-east of approvals P143832/F and P152330/F.</li> </ol> <p>This could open a road access from the above 2 approvals and Plot C, and create an accident risk if many cars turn in and out below Burgoynes.</p> <p>All traffic from the new estates (as above) should go via Spond Road where the traffic is slower and can join at that junction.</p>
54	4	N	<p>The Owner has not proposed any benefits for the community.</p> <p>The Plot should stay outside the Development Boundary, and if the Owner wants to put in an application they can make an offer as part of that application.</p> <p>Additionally, it is unclear how the site would access the road.</p>

54	5	N	The Owner has not proposed any benefits for the community. The Plot should stay outside the Development Boundary, and if the Owner wants to put in an application they can make an offer as part of that application.
54	6	N	Only with the restriction mentioned, ie 18 houses in exchange for £180k for the Memorial Hall development. The traffic needs to go via Spond Lane and not from a new road junction either below or above Burgoynes
54	7	N	Only with the restriction mentioned. i.e 2 plots in exchange for land for the Memorial Hall.
54	9	N	Yes the NDP should include such a planning policy for chicken sheds and intensive farming that ensures: They are: 1. Half a mile from residential properties 2. To the east of Lyonshall – so down wind of the prevailing westerlies 3. NOT on higher ground – else smells catch the air and travel. 4. NOT causing unpleasant smells and flies. 5. Restricting large lorries and tractors and their speed, to avoid accidents.
54	12	N	However, the Penrhos suggestion is reasonable, if well concealed.
54	15	Y	However, consideration needs to be made for improved footpath and cyclepath access, as this is difficult along the road. With the new housing along this stretch, provision should be made for a foot/cycle path along the back to the new memorial hall?
54	17		With the new housing, provision should be made for foot/cycle paths on either side of the main road or along the back of the houses.
56	1		As long as the need to retain the character of the village and surroundings is kept at forefront.
56	2a		Don't understand what this means in terms of total development
56	3	Y	As the boundary goes all the way up the A480 on the west side, I would like to see land on east included. Development here would be in keeping with general objectives for the development envisaged for the other sites and is on a bus route.
56	4	Y	As long as density of housing does not increase and principles are kept to.
56	7	Y	As long as density of housing does not increase and principles are kept to.
56	8	Y	As long as stated principles in key issue 3 are kept to.
56	9	Y	If this means large scale agricultural building development will be limited. The principles stated under Key issue 4 are good as long as developments are adequately screened and sited for visual impact noise and smell.
56	12	Y	as long as as impact on residential amenities are minimised.

56	14	Y	depending on what other areas are included
56	15	Y	But have concerns about impact about local residents
56	17		Improvement to pavements between village sites and provision for cycling, but this may not be feasible.
57	1	Y	Housing sympathetic to existing stock is a must - no suburbia
57	2a	Y	Is there to be a new memorial hall?
57	2b	Y	depends on whether there is to be a new hall?
57	9	N	Herefordshire is already shown as the factory farm capital of Britain. At least don't have chicken sheds on the skyline!
57	15		Is there a proposal to build a new memorial hall adjacent to the existing one?
57	17		restoration of Kington/Leominster bus services and evening journeys to Hereford.
58	1		No mention of agriculture, specifically what type would be appropriate to the parish and relevant to the overall vision. Given that it is a major component of the the parish, it ought to be here as well as mentioned later in the presentation.
58	2a		I assume this relates to additional housing number? If s I don't understand how it related to numbers given on p6 of the presentation ( ie further 56 houses between 2011-2031)
58	2b		It depend on the nature of the development. If it involved housing estates ) commercial or housing association/affordable) intensive agriculture, industrial units and so on then No. without seeing figures on (a) how much the already foreseen developments (ie 56 houses) will provide for the parish and (b) how much extra might be needed.. difficult to answer.
58	3		Include northern boundary opposite the memorial hall. Allow for sensitive housing development as outlined in the vision, individually designed properties spaced out and an additional resource for the memorial hall.. Already on bus route.
58	11	Y	It would be good to see parish support for Offa dyke section and the castle area with signposts and interpretation boards/panels/booklets. Appealing for tourists/ visitors to the area.
58	12		It depends on scale of industrial estate and the nature of the industry and the exact location.
58	13	Y	Key views: from A480 leading down into the village from the church and beyond. Any view of the church from any road leading out of the village.
58	14	Y	The church and field below it.
58	17		Full pavement between pub and memorial hall. New pavement from memorial Hall to church. Offas Dyke. Castle area.
59	9	N	There are enough ILU in Lyonshall already.
59	17		Safe pavements speed enforcement
60	2a	N	68 houses is sufficient expansion for the village over said period
60	2b	N	funding to secure community assets should not be on the back of giving planning permission to local developers. This is corrupt.
60	4	N	spoils and devalue properties with rural aspect in stepstone
60	5	N	Too large for village
60	6	N	£10K is a generous gesture, but if this is how a developer secures planning permission this opens floodgates for all to follow suit. I view this as corrupt. For monetary benefit on the back of a good cause.

60	7	N	Plot D already in settlement boundary
60	8	N	I prefer to see single house squeezed into existing plots and not swallingup our green fields, ie brownfield sites.
60	9	N	I disagree with intensive farming units. There has been considerable growth in the last 4 years. There are enough chicken sheds in Lyonshall.
60	12	N	we have business units in Kington which are under utilised and many empty. I would favor filling these not building more using brownfiled sites.
60	15	Y	I think the existing site shoul dbe kept. I would foavour dramatic improvements and extension of existing hall as a community project. Proposed new facility costs could be prohibitive.
60	17		Pavements and public transport
61	9	N	I think the limit of these typre of developments has been reached already.
61	14	Y	opposite the close opposite Brynfarm.
62	1	N	It appears that much development is occusing ahead of the NDP, I therefore see little point in establishing an NDP.
62	2a	N	Village shop & pub proportional to the growth of the village would be sustainable. The view expressed is one from a local developer.
62	2b	N	Adequate resources within the community to support our community assets if properly executed.
62	3	N	Disagree with area adjacent to burgoynes Lyonshall operating premises.
62	4	N	No road frontage spoil the rural nature of the current properties
62	5	N	As I disagree with the existing development in the village I am not going to agree to an area outside the existing boundary.
62	6	N	As I disagree with the existing development in the village I am not going to agree to an area outside the existing boundary.
62	7	N	As I disagree with the existing development in the village I am not going to agree to an area outside the existing boundary.
62	8	N	discourage small scale deveoplmetn but encourage individual homes.
62	9	N	consideration needs to be given to farming diversity moving away from intensive farming.
62	12		Make full use of existing facilities within and from surrounding areas before building new.
62	14		Yes to play area, no to undescribed greengreen spaces
62	15	N	renovate the existing hall and extend into l shape facility with ne toilets and kitchen. Use existing site within village.
62	17		Maintain existing road network to a higher standard.
63	2b	Y	as outlined in plots d & c
63	3	N	Holme Marsh - Not to include the Holme and land to the north of area with outline consent. Lyonshall not the strip opposite Burgoynes.
63	6	N	Not for 73 houses!
63	9	N	Absolutely no more chicken sheds
63	17		Footpaths
64	2a	Y	Yes as outlined for plot D & C, but not as general rationale for unlimited development.

64	3	N	Holme Marsh - Not to include the Holme and land to the north of area with outline consent. Lyonshall not the strip opposite Burgoynes.
64	4	Y	but it has no access or community benefit.
64	6	N	Certainly not 73 houses only if stated at reduced density.
64	9	Y	policy to restrict any further chicken sheds.
64	15	Y	with encouragement to walk - pavements footpaths.
64	17		Footpaths/cycle/buggy/wheelchair friendly paths.
65	2b	N	Further development wont necessarily secure funding for the community assets.
65	3	Y	needs amending to keep closer to the villag centre
65	9	Y	but no more chicken sheds in Lyonshall Parish.
65	11	N	because poor mixed up question cover to many sections
65	13	N	Lyonshall looks good as it is
65	14	N	Protect play area only
65	15		unable to answer slanted question
65	A		Very badly put together questionairre. Questions slanted to get the answers required.
66	2a	Y	however large the growth, the population may not use the pub or the shop. To sustain either people will have to come form outside the village.
66	2b	N	I don't approve of these tactics - BRIBERY!
66	3	Y	Needs amendment not to spread the village out so much and fill in centre of village.
66	6	N	Outside village area
66	7	N	Outside village area
66	9	N	No more chicken sheds
66	11		Not possible to answer - far too broad a question. I agree with parts but not others.
66	13	N	land owners should have the authority over their land/orchards and ponds.
66	14		Cannot answer - again not specific question definitely protect play area.
66	15	N	moderise and refurbish existing memorial hall.
66	16	N	do not interfere and look for unnecessary matters to meddle in.
66	17		If residents want pavements they should live in a town! In the vision it states " a village which retains its essential rural character" - pavements and traffic calming measure etc willnot do this. Most of the ideas in the previous questions do not supprt rural character - That is most important!
67	3	N	too far out of village needs to be more confined
67	15	N	a new village centre of village
67	17		Desperate for pub to open 3/4 years too long. Major eyesore in the middle of the village.

68	2a	Y	assuming 56 already in pipeline and the period 2031
68	3	N	Majority of development should be around village centre not ribbon development along major road.
68	6	N	Thought there were already plans to build near this area.
68	7	N	Too far from village centre it was proposed to move the hall should it be replaced nearer the village centre.
68	15	N	If a new hall is proposed it should be sited more in the village centre. Too far out is often the reason for attending events.
68	17		Improve roads, any new amenities require good parking facilities.
69	2a	Y	maybe the potential for more later for a purpose and after consultation.
69	2b	Y	depending on consultation
69	5	N	It would make a large development except zoned for including some affordable homes.
69	6	Y	except that it could become a large development contrary to other statements.
69	8	Y	Priority should be given to more affordable homes including for elderly and market affordables ie smaller homes.
69	9	Y	No more chicken sheds in Lyons Hall- we are at saturation level. They would ruin the area rural character as they are industrial units. On the other hand after stating no more it would be prudent to formulate a planning policy for larger scale agricultural buildings as we don't know what will come in the future.
69	10	Y	No problem with solar arrays in open fields but screened. I think the option of a community wind turbine scheme should be kept open.
69	12	Y	light industrial only
69	13	Y	Views: From spond lane towards Holm Marsh ridge and beacons. From Lynhales drive back to village. From church over village. From Lewyswych towards Clee Hill
69	17		1. Footway from Memorial Hall to church. 2. Footway in centre of village between dog legs. 3. Accessible circular route with ramps for wheelchairs and buggies from George to Stepstile to Burgage close to chapel Lane to Spond lane and back. 4. Access improved on footpath between stepstile and windy corner road LZ11
70	2b	Y	I don't think we need a new hall but extra parking and perhaps extending would be adequate.
70	15	N	extending it and car park should be fine. I don't see the point in spending the money unnecessary yet
71	2a	N	build facilities that support themselves on existing population. How can a growth rate be too low to sustain a village shop and pub?
71	2b	N	This is a leading question that implies houses would be needed to improve village assets. I am against too much development.
71	3		Thus development boundary after 2031. no more houses currently proposed and I don't want over current number.
71	4		Limited characterful development 2/3 houses a year not before 2031.
71	5		Limited characterful development 2/3 houses a year not before 2031.
71	6		Limited characterful development 2/3 houses a year not before 2031.
71	7		Limited characterful development 2/3 houses a year not before 2031.
71	8	Y	After 2031 if extra to current plans.
71	9	Y	Policy not to allow further chicken sheds and large scale agricultural buildings.

71	10		Include wind turbines
71	13	Y	views: promotion of wildlife and more information on existing areas to encourage interest.
71	17		Better maintained footpaths, pavement all the way to memorial hall, improved bus services.
72	1	Y	I agree with vision and objectives but the number of houses proposed for the village is excessive. There needs to be a balance, therefore I do not think the boundaries should be extended.
72	2a	N	Not at present - NDP needs to reflect core strategy. Housing development is well in excess of proposed development rate.
72	2b	N	Need to question, do we really need a new village hall? How much is it used? Will the pub be the centre of the village? Why are we always told we need to build houses to support community assets? Why not consider rural grants, national lottery fund? community fund raising? can this be explored?
72	3		But the proposed housing development to this area is sufficient
72	4	N	Not at present - NDP needs to reflect core strategy. Housing development is well in excess of proposed development rate.
72	5	N	Not at present - NDP needs to reflect core strategy. Housing development is well in excess of proposed development rate.
72	6	N	Not at present - NDP needs to reflect core strategy. Housing development is well in excess of proposed development rate.
72	7	N	Not at present - NDP needs to reflect core strategy. Housing development is well in excess of proposed development rate.
72	8		What is meant by small scale? Do not think we should support any further housing development until all the proposed housing is built. Then the situation needs to be reviewed in terms of sustainability, environmental issues such as drainage, road safety. Important to protect the rural character of the village.
72	9	N	this would increase the volume of large vehicles on small rural roads posing more risks.
72	15		More work to be carried out to find out what the village really wants for a village hall.
72	17		safe pavements. Good public footpaths, green spaces for wildlife and help with drainage issues. Plant more trees.
73	2a	N	Parish questionnaires have shown the preferred growth rate as 2 houses per year. This is already exceeded. People who live in Lyonshall have chosen to live in a small rural village. If development happens too fast we would become more like a town or overpopulated village.
73	2b	N	Housing should be according to need and appropriate positioning. It should not be given to those who offer incentives. That would be blackmail?
73	3	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	4	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	5	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	6	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	7	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	8	N	yes only after 2031 then with limited development of 2-3 houses per year for all of parish.
73	9		Planning policy should be we don't need any more chicken sheds.
73	17		Safe pavements to village hall

74	2a	N	This is nearly double the number required by the core strategy and therefore more than enough. This is a village not a town and after 2031 this can be reviewed.
74	2b	N	This strategy amounts to an elaborate bribe or blackmail. There are numerous charitable outlets and traditional fundraising that can be utilised for a new hall.
74	3	N	1. As per Q2 there is sufficient property already in planning, so further land not required until after 2031. 2. If this were to be the boundary, it is largely appropriate but the land south of the village up A480 hill is not suitable as long as there remains an active business.
74	4	N	After 2031
74	5	N	After 2031
74	6	N	After 2031
74	7	N	After 2031
74	8	N	Sufficient planning already approved.
74	9	Y	But no further chicken sheds. There are enough already.
74	10	Y	No solar panels allowed in fields which must be used for agriculture. Wind power generation must be reviewed.
74	12	N	Only if on existing farm/buildings. There are enough vacant business units in nearby villages and Kington. The grade 1/2 land must be used for agriculture.
74	13	Y	Only development that is already approved and there are few brownfield sites because the agriculture land is grade 1/2. Views From Moorcourt lane, Penrhos, The church, whittern, Rodds farm.
74	14	Y	All agricultural land, coppices, forests/woods, offas dyke. Castle, church
74	15	N	This question is biased. Why was it once considered appropriate to site the hall in the village centre but not any longer? The village hall should be sited with easy access to the majority of villagers in the centre.
74	16	Y	Nice aspiration but most of the assets are privately owned, so I don't see how this is actually possible.
74	17		Traffic calming, increased speed restrictions, weight/length restrictions, footpath/walking to the church. Grass-crete parking to encourage visitors for walking/cycling.
75	1	Y	needs to mention agriculture specifically as a separate item which is to be supported.
75	9	Y	Every proposal will have its unique challenges. Please remember that farming needs to improve productivity and output each year to remain competitive and will need local support for it to survive into the future.
75	10	Y	This area is continually innovating and I would suggest support renewables assuming no direct adverse impacts. I would not support policy in this area which is not flexible enough to allow the local area to take up on new schemes.
75	12	Y	Where is the proposed area behind Penrhos?
75	13	Y	The church in the day and lit up at night.
75	15	Y	Please try to include the opportunity to expand the new proposals and try to get as much amenity space as possible and parking.
75	17		Improvement to road set up around the pub.

76	9	Y	Uk agriculture needs support to survive. Public need explanation of details re imports.
76	13	Y	to and from the church. Woodland and orchard areas.
76	17		Improvement on pub corner. Suggest traffic lights. Building need protecting
77	17		Off road parking
78	2a	Y	More than 30 create a viable community and more employment in services etc.
78	9	Y	Agriculture must expand to survive. More Uk production needed to save importing too much unregulated food.
80	2a	Y	Need more houses to make pub development viable.
80	3	N	I think small parcels outside the boundary but within the parish would be totally acceptable
80	4	N	too many houses on this plot.
80	5	N	too many houses on this plot.
80	6	Y	landowner agreed to restrict number of houses - should be eco sound.
80	8	Y	possibility of workssops to provide people with employment.
80	11	Y	better broadband essential for rural enterprise
80	12	Y	Need employment to build sustainable villages.
80	16	Y	The castle is no longer accessible to the public.
80	17		Pavement to garden centre and up to the stile on the main road where the bus stops.
81	2a	N	Houses need to be built to encourage young people and families to move to the village that are in their price range. The current houses are out of that price range so further character development would bring in more retired people.
81	8	N	I agree there should be a mix of housing, but not necessarily individual designs as this increases the costs. I think the village needs more 3 bed semis that young people can afford, not shared ownership!
81	17		Safe Pavements
82	17		Pavements where possible to protect mothers with pushchair and to enable elderly and disabled
83	1	Y	Agree in principle but believe that some of the objectives contradict the vision such as building on green land thus destroying the landscape.
83	2a	N	The 2012 parish questionnaire showed a preferred growth reate of 2 houses a year. Since 2012 only 50% favourably considered a second phase of 15 houses. A total of 68 houses are already committed for the plan period. This would laready mean a growth rate of over 3% for the period 2011-2031
83	2b	N	The parish has already supported the development of 68 huses, the majority of which wil have only been supported because of the need for a pub. Why do we need to fund another development when we will have the pub as a village cnetre?
83	3	N	If the settlement boundaries are extended as proposed, there is the potential for a least a further 100 new homes to be built. At least one of the plots proposed would be a major development of possibly 73 houses.
83	4	N	I believe that the 68 houses already planned is sufficient to sustain the local services and is in line with parishioner wishes.

83	5	N	I believe that the 68 houses already planned is sufficient to sustain the local services and is in line with parishioner wishes. The core strategy and parish questionnaire both outlined a preferred growth rate of 2 or 3% for 2011-2031
83	6	N	Very definitely no. This would be a large scale development, possibly 73 homes. The money provided for the parish in return is in my view not needed.
83	7	N	I do not feel that we need another memorial hall. The parish questionairre outlined a need for a village centre- this will be the pub
83	8	N	I do not agree with any further small scale development as there are already 68 houses planned for 2011-2031. What is small scale? I would consider it to be 5-6 houses.
83	9	N	Large scale agri building like chicken sheds will cause more pollution, more traffic, more noise, so I do not agree with this in the parish.
83	10	Y	I totally agree with the installation of solar panels and other similar low carbon energy schemes.
83	13	Y	Views: protecting wildlife and landscape is very important so why are we proposing to build new houses on green land?
83	14	Y	Instead of building and developing on green land, why not convert to allotments for people with small gardens?
83	15	N	Once finsihed the pub will offer all the servicces required byth eparish. We do not need a refurbished village hall.
83	17		Safe pavements, Cycle rooutes, restrcit HGV traffic through village
84	1	Y	But does Herefordshire County council care?
84	2b	N	The war memorial hall is just that. A war memorial! Build your own parish hall.
84	3	N	Herefordshire HC have already said they see Lyonshall village and Holme Marsh as "one" entity.
84	4	N	No access
84	7	N	No access, No pavement, fast and dangerous stretch of road.
84	8	N	who sets the policy- HCC?
84	9	N	Farming economics should decide
84	10	N	we are a small parish low carbon energy id decided at national level.
84	11	Y	essential to the growth of our village and parish
84	12	Y	essential to the growth of our village and parish
84	13	Y	Quality of life that way we live longer!
84	14	Y	Meadow and park land. You can enjoy and play on these.
84	15	N	it should be central and have parking and easy access.
84	16	Y	if not what is the point?
84	17		Shop, electronic charging point for cars, Pub, youth club, play areas, restful walks.
84	A		May I suggest your planning committee asks Kington CPC what notice Herfordshire county planning department paid there NDP? The answer is likely to be "NOT A LOT" Some of their town counpillors are considering resigning as it has been a fatuous waste of their time and energy.

85	2b	N	I think that the memorial hall is adequate for the need of the village and that once the pub has been reopened that will also be a suitable and pleasant venue for meetings etc.
85	3	Y	In principle, Yes
85	5	N	Would impact on the view from houses opposite negatively. The lane is one of the entrances into the village and would be a shame to spoil this view.
85	7	N	This will impact on the village that we moved to. Especially as there isn't a village green or central green.
85	8		Nor sure how to answer it depends what is meant by small scale. I agree there should be a mix of houses to fit in with the look of the village. It would reflect how the village has evolved over the centuries.
85	9	N	against intensive farming methods and the effect it has on local environment. We regularly experience an overwhelming unpleasant aroma emanating from the buildings that lingers for a long time.
85	13	Y	the outlying countryside down the lanes.
85	15	Y	I don't think any major refurbishment is required besides general redecoration. Renovation rather than rebuild.
85	17		the volume, size, weight of large vehicles in centre of village is a concern for safety. Size restrictions may help. Pathways, walkways into town would encourage walking. Cycling- safety issues.
86	2a	N	it will spoil the village - 68 is a lot of houses.
86	2b	N	you would need a lot of plots to fund a memorial hall.
86	3	Y	But 1/5 acre plots is a little large pushing up prices. Local people will have to move to Hereford where it is cheaper.
86	8	Y	but smaller houses for local people ie semi detached.
87	5	N	too big area when taken together with other half of baer meadow which is already in the proposed settlement boundary
87	13	N	council council level already- if you include this type of policy it will offer disingenuous people an excuse to oppose/delay other important developments for the village under guise of " environment concerns" when they may actually be NIMBY driven.
87	16	N	Covered adequately by planning law anyway.
87	17		Active slow down signs, BROADBAND, pavements to link parts of village cut off by A44 for pedestrians. Could even cover walks across fields where there are established footways.
88	4	Y	Possible cul de sac
88	5	N	would open up opportunity for a large housing estate.
88	13	N	Covered in core strategy
88	16	N	Covered by planning law
88	17		Pavements to memorial hall even garden centre. Speed awareness
89	13	Y	Down the hills
89	15	N	Just refurbish the existing one!
89	17		pavements bus timetable concern with HGVs

90	1	Y	But implications of objective 5 need to be considered in more detail in light of a) above average elderly population and b) two A roads central to village.
90	2		The figures are presented under key issue 1 are confusing. Does 30 refer to KHS proposal in addition to 68 houses already built/committed? What sort of houses? See additional comments
90	2a	N	On basis of simplistic numbers only have to say no although strongly in favour of developing Memorial Hall. This is a loaded question.
90	3	Y	yes with provisos
90	9	N	Surely HCC already has such a policy, which Lyonshall could support. Not a good idea to risk setting PC at odds with local farmers. Traffic is a wider problem.
90	10	Y	A community energy scheme should be seriously considered. All new houses to have maximum insulation, renewable energy sources where possible.
90	11	Y	Tourism is vital to the success of the pub and the economy of the village in general. All other enterprises desirable.
90	12	Y	But not at Penrhos! Needs to be nearer village centre, preferably within walking distance. People at Penrhos don't even know they live in Lyonshall!
90	13	Y	Definitely, notes attached.
90	14	Y	Within settlement area need to actively protect fishpond meadow as ancient wildflower wildlife meadow. Also field opposite the close. Still rejected for development as SHLAA. Outside settlement are the wharf land below church, upper fishponds and other notes*
90	15	Y	This should remain a memorial hall run by trustees in respect to its founders and purpose. Also option of charitable funding.
90	16	Y	Protect, promote access and signpost (in agreement with private owners)
90	17		Pavement from memorial hall to A44 and church drive. Pavement from Stepstile A480 to pub. Bypass!!

90	A	<p>General Comments</p> <p>GC: 1 As I said on July 20th, I think this method of “consultation” was badly flawed. The presentation panels had a great deal of content, often too much to be absorbed quickly and all needing thought. Some later panels introduced issues which also had a bearing on previous panels, so if one had answered each question as you came to it, you might find yourself giving conflicting answers – or having to go back to the beginning and start again! And the method encouraged “knee jerk” reactions, which are not a good basis for a consultation of this kind. (You may have noticed on July 20th that “consultees” divided into 3 categories – those dashing round to complete their questionnaires as quickly as possible, those staring at the presentations trying to work out what they should say and those standing in front of the presentations chatting about unrelated matters!) Please next time -- if there is a next time -- could every adult in the parish have a hard copy of all the issues together with the questionnaire in advance? With a phone number and e-mail address to contact if clarification is needed? Do a presentation of this kind AS WELL, if you wish, but not INSTEAD. That way you should get a response from people who can’t attend the presentation (including holidaymakers, the sick and those with other commitments), people who like more time to think (such as myself) and people who are not regular computer users. If I were Hereford CC I would want at least a 51% of all Lyonshall adults to this “consultation” before I would consider it valid. That’s about 250 people if you discount the residents of Lynhales....</p> <p>GC: 2 I was disappointed that the document you kindly loaned me did not include supporting documents such as the HCC maps, parish maps and – for example – a list of the “18 Local Wildlife Sites” mentioned under Key Issue 7 (I’ve been here for 10 years and have no idea where they are!)</p> <p>GC: 3 I was also disappointed not to see any reference to the Housing Survey done in January this year. I note from the NDP and Parish Council Minutes in February that there was a 27% response and “some interesting comments”; surely, even at only 27%, these should have some relevance which we need to know about – or are you hiding something?</p> <p>GC: 4 Some of the statements made were inaccurate (e.g. the original NDP didn’t “prefer” 2 houses per annum, we were told it was non-negotiable), some of the questions were loaded and some simply don’t lend themselves to a straight Yes/No answer – which will make the job of analysing the response much more difficult.</p> <p>GC: 5 I can’t see a “Return By” date on the questionnaire. That may mean some people will put it on one side until they deem it too late to return it or forget about it altogether!</p>
----	---	--

90	A	<p>The Big Omission!</p> <p>BO: 1 This presentation talks a lot about buildings and quite a lot about places. What it doesn't mention is PEOPLE! We MUST think about the people we have already got in Lyonshall and the people we want/expect to come to Lyonshall if the NDP is to be meaningful and realistic!</p> <p>BO: 2 A house, per se, is of no benefit to the community or to the pub until it is BUILT, SOLD and OCCUPIED. While many of us recognised two or three years ago that ownership of building plots with planning permission was at least in part related to Kinsey Hern's financing of the pub purchase and development and while 75% of us had/have no objection to that, this reason for owning plots with planning permission does not apply to anyone else in this community. If the landowners or developers do not intend to BUILD and SELL within the near future, this is purely "landbanking" which is of no benefit to Lyonshall. Just digging a hole in the ground and claiming to have begun development is not enough. How many of the 56 houses (not including Kinsey's, I assume) will ever be BUILT, SOLD and OCCUPIED? It is obvious that the NDP steering group have some doubts on this issue (Key Issue 1, page 2). Why? What are we not being told?</p> <p>BO: 3 There are a number of reasons why building the new houses may be delayed – some good, some not-so-good. Most of those are issues for the developers and I won't elaborate here. However SELLING and OCCUPYING are critical and relate back to the questions about PEOPLE mentioned in BO: 1 above. Lyonshall is not London; we do not have people so desperate to live here that they will instantly purchase, rent or occupy any house available. Houses here can stay on the market for between two and five years. So our first requirement is to identify WHO might be persuaded to choose Lyonshall and then to identify what sort of house they might want to live in and can afford. It's no use the NDP saying "We want a mix of sizes and styles" if there are no potential purchasers! And that is not just the developers' problem. Key Issue 1 talks about sustaining local services but there's a downside to this. For example, you won't sell "family homes" unless there are school places available. Half a dozen extra children might be found places at schools in the area but if most of the 86 houses currently proposed but not yet built under Key Issue 1 page 1 are to be "family homes" that could easily put between 100 and 200 children in need of school places in Kington, Weobley or Wigmore. Finding those places is not within Lyonshall NDP's control (Any talk of setting aside a plot for a Free School?) but it will influence the decision to purchase a house here...</p>
----	---	---

90	A	<p>BO: 4 Or the NDP and developers could opt for houses for retirees and people who work from home, very like the present resident population. These two groups can live anywhere in the UK – what is Lyonshall going to do to make them want to live here? (Consider some special amenities in Lyonshall for older people?). Again, if we were talking about building just a few houses (or even just the further 24 required by Hereford CC within the next 14 years) purchasers/occupants might be found. But we’re talking about 86 houses, increasing the current housing stock by about 27% -- and that’s before any of the “further additional development” of 65 homes has been approved, not to mention any other developments which may slip through the net before (or even after) this NDP comes into force in 2019.</p> <p>BO: 5 So the NDP needs to take a long hard look at what sort of people we can hope to attract to Lyonshall as residents, what is special enough to persuade them to come here and whether we have the facilities to support this large influx before the 86 houses already planned are built. And then the landowners/property developers must be persuaded to build and sell them as quickly as possible so that they are occupied. Only when all 86 are BUILT, SOLD and OCCUPIED should we even think about allowing a further 65 houses. (In total, all these houses (12 + 86 + 65 = 163) would increase the housing stock of the entire parish by 50% -- that’s not a housing growth to be treated lightly and it has huge implications for infrastructure, amenities and Lyonshall as a community. PEOPLE must come first in determining Lyonshall’s future.</p>
----	---	---

90	A	<p>Timing</p> <p>TM: 1 The NDP presentation says virtually nothing about how the implementation of the plan is expected to pan out over time. It is certainly complex but has to be addressed. The key dates as I see them are:</p> <p>2017 (Remainder) -- Plan to be revised and developed but with particular reference to the people/infrastructure/facilities mentioned above so that when those with planning permission already start building Lyonshall can be fairly certain that a) nothing worth preserving is being destroyed and b) there is a very strong likelihood that the houses will sell.</p> <p>2018 - About 25% of the houses currently approved (including some of Kinsey's 30) to be built and put on the market. Protected areas/visitor attractions/heritage sites to be identified and access negotiated with owners where applicable. Map and guide to attractions etc. drawn up and distributed.</p> <p>2018 (End of) – Pub re-opens.</p> <p>2018 (End of) - NDP ratified. NB It is very important that absolutely no further planning permissions for new builds in Lyonshall, within or outside the “settlement area”, will be granted during this time – see below.</p> <p>2019 – Houses put on the market in 2018 will hopefully be sold and occupied. Sales to be monitored (and new Lyonshall residents welcomed!). Effect on pub and take-up of other facilities to be noted. Another 25% of currently-approved houses to be built if there is evidence of demand.</p> <p>2020 – Houses built in 2019 put on the market and hopefully sold and occupied. Planning permission to be withdrawn from sites where no development has taken place unless there is good reason (which might include sewage treatment options – see below)</p> <p>2020 - Lyonshall Sewage Treatment Works to be modernised which might facilitate further building.</p> <p>2021 – If Sewage Treatment Works modernised, remaining houses currently approved to be built and put on the market.</p> <p>2022 - Remaining houses as above to be sold and occupied.</p> <p>2023 - Thorough review of NDP to date, notably housing growth and impact on Lyonshall and surrounding area, to be conducted by Parish Council and NDP Steering Group, preferably with public input. This will determine whether there is a need for Lyonshall NDP(Phase 2) including – for example – the “further additional development” already mentioned, more work on conservation/heritage etc, new amenities or facilities and any major changes to infrastructure which has a bearing on Lyonshall, e.g. a planned bypass. Negotiations with HCC if necessary.</p> <p>2024 – 31 – NDP Phase 2 to be implemented if required. Further housing development to be subject to same criteria as previously i.e. if houses not built and sold within the period, planning permission will be withdrawn.</p> <p>2031 - No doubt some sort of review will be required nationally.</p>
----	---	---

90	A	<p>Visitors, Attractions and Resident Incentives</p> <p>VAR: 1 - With the exception of farming and the local businesses mentioned under Key Issue 6, almost every enterprise in the parish of Lyonshall is heavily reliant on attracting visitors/tourists – holiday lets in the village and at Sherriffs, The Whittern, Penrhos etc. These in turn require the pub for food, drink and socialising. And the pub requires them! Every rural pub in England relies on tourists/visitors/travellers to be profitable; trade from the immediately local community will merely keep it ticking over during the winter months. Lyonshall cannot build, build, build to keep the pub going even if we only sold new houses to heavy drinkers! We therefore need both day and longer-stay visitors to keep the local economy and its community heart going.</p> <p>VAR: 2 The other danger with “build, build, build” is that Lyonshall will lose the very qualities that make it attractive to visitors, residents and potential residents. These are not solely or mainly the “local attractions” mentioned under Key Issue 6; our church has a good site but is otherwise nothing special, our castle is unknown, insignificant and not open to the public, our Offa’s Dyke spur is almost equally unknown. None of the above is signposted, let alone promoted! What Lyonshall DOES have are unique and exceptional environmental and heritage sites which deserve both protection and promotion. In addition to Offa’s Dyke the most significant of these are Lyonshall Park Wood, the Tram Way and its Wharf, the Upper Fishpool, the Tramway Pool and the Fishpool Meadow (ancient uncultivated land). All of these are on private land. Nevertheless they need to be actively protected and conserved by the NDP. (Unfortunately HCC does not have a good reputation in this regard since both the Fishpool Meadow and “the land opposite The Close” were and remain protected under the SHLAA of 2009. The Fishpool Meadow was/is merely “subject to constraints” which did not prevent planning permission being granted for the Fishpool housing estate; the “land opposite the Close” was/is more severely a “rejected site” for development because of its wildlife but seems to have been approved by HCC despite this and despite persistent significant local opposition!)</p> <p>VAR: 3 Following active protection and conservation of the above sites and others, the NDP/Parish Council needs to negotiate reasonable public access with the site owners and thereafter signposting and promotion of these attractions to potential visitors and residents alike. So what if all visitors to Lyonshall and all new residents are “ecology nuts” or “heritage freaks”! Lyonshall’s natural history and setting are what make it attractive -- let’s advertise these qualities, not expect people to somehow guess them! And certainly let’s not bury them in concrete!</p>
----	---	--

90	A		<p>The Memorial Hall</p> <p>MH: 1 The presentation repeatedly suggests that Lyonshall should “consider further additional development” to fund the improvement of the Memorial Hall on its existing site. I entirely agree that it needs improvement and that its existing site, or very close by, is suitable. I applaud Mr Hutton’s proposal to give land for this and his request to possibly build two houses to support this is entirely reasonable and would have no significant additional impact on the village over and above the “86 houses” already approved.</p> <p>MH: 2 However I am not convinced that the proposed “further additional development” of 65 houses is either necessary or desirable. Mr Hern has offered a payment of £10K per house on the 18 “further additional” homes he is proposing. Why cannot this levy of £10K per house be imposed on ALL the new houses currently approved or near approved i.e. the 86 mentioned previously? To be paid when the house is first sold, of course, so the developer simply adds it to his selling price and it costs him nothing (the difference in affordability between a £400K house and a £410K house is negligible). That would put £860K into the Memorial Hall building fund which, together with a free site, should put the project well on the way to fruition!</p> <p>MH: 3 It would be appropriate, too, because the Memorial Hall is a local facility of interest only to residents.</p> <p>MH: 4 It would also be appropriate because the Memorial Hall is “what it says on the tin” – a memorial. From the basis of a free site and £860K in the bank I have no doubt that additional money could be raised for the Hall’s replacement/improvement from appropriate charities or similar sources if necessary.</p> <p>The above are the main points arising from the NDP presentation of July 20th to be read in conjunction with my returned questionnaire. I hope other Lyonshall residents will have given the “consultation” similar attention, whether they agree with my views or not. If you require clarification on any of the above points, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to seeing the Revised Plan when available.</p>
91	13	N	Covered in core strategy
91	17		Only items PC can influence
92	17		pavements towards church
93	17		Traffic calming