

Lyonshall Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses
25th October - 7th December 2018

Table 4 Landowners' and Developers' Comments

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
Gladman (1.1)			LH1	Support	Gladman are generally supportive of policy LH1 which has amended the former UDP settlement boundary to encompass five housing site allocations.	Noted.	No change.
(1.2)			LH1	Comment	<p>To promote positive planning and to ensure conformity with the HCS, we submit the policy requires a further degree of flexibility.</p> <p>Gladman suggest a caveat to the policy, supporting that additional sites adjacent to the settlement boundary should be considered as appropriate to respond to future needs or a change in circumstances in the plan area.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The proposed sites have come forward through a thorough and extensive process of public consultation and their development would support a significant level of growth over the plan period over and above the minimum requirement set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate or necessary to support additional sites outside the</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
						proposed settlement boundary.	
(1.3)			LH3	Comment	<p>Whilst Gladman support such a policy, we still regard it important that the policy recognises that planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area.</p> <p>There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration to various design principles.</p> <p>Gladman therefore suggest more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure high quality residential developments are not compromised by overly restrictive criteria. We suggest regard should be had to paragraph 60 of the previous NPPF which states that; <i>"Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated</i></p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Policy wording has been broadly accepted by Herefordshire Council and some minor changes are proposed in response to residents' and stakeholders comments at Reg 14.</p> <p>The NDP will be submitted after 24th January and so the revised (2018) NPPF will be considered for the purposes of examining the plan against the basic conditions.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<i>requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles"</i>		
(1.4)			LE1	Comment	<p>Draft Policy LE1 seeks to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the parish. As currently drafted criterion (5) of the policy seems to apply to all Heritage Assets and does not distinguish between designated and non-designated assets.</p> <p>Gladman suggest this aspect of the policy is amended to ensure it conforms with the previous Framework. Paragraph 132-134 of the previous Framework relate specifically to designated heritage assets and highlight that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be attached to it.</p> <p>The previous Framework states that if the harm to a designated heritage asset is deemed to be substantial then the proposal needs to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm. If the harm is less than substantial, then the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The policy needs to be clear on the two tests to be applied</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>As above the NDP will be tested against the revised NPPF. Historic England (see Table 2) are fully supportive of the NDP.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>to designated heritage assets. With regards to non-designated heritage assets, the policy should refer explicitly to paragraph 135 of the Framework which states that a balanced judgement should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Moreover, Gladman suggest there is scope for a standalone heritage policy in the LNP. The introduction of a new policy with a focus exclusively on heritage assets would ensure the LNP remains a clear and concise document.</p>		
(1.5)	All			Comment	<p>Conclusions Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further changes to wording may be recommended following the examination process to improve clarity and consistency with local and national planning policies but this will be a matter for the independent examiner.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					the LNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.		