




Consultation Statement

Stoke Lacy Parish Council

May 2022

Map 1 Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Area and Parish



@Crown copyright [2022] Ordnance Survey 100055940 on behalf of Stoke Lacy Parish Council
100061610

Contents

1.0	Introduction and Background.....	4
2.0	Call for Sites, Summer 2020.....	6
3.0	Issues and Options Consultation, November 2020	7
4.0	Consultation on Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021	9
5.0	Regulation 14 Public Consultation, Monday 17 th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7 th March 2022.....	11
	Appendix 1 – Early Publicity for the NDP 2019 – 2020 and Parish Council Minutes	14
	Appendix 2 - Call for Sites Publicity, Summer 2020	62
	Appendix 3 – Issues and Options, November 2020	72
	Appendix 4 - Copy of Issues and Options Summary and Questionnaire delivered to all Households.....	76
	Appendix 5 – Issues and Options Public Consultation Report	84
	Appendix 6 – Publicity for the Consultation on the Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021	107
	Appendix 7 – Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021 - Summary Document and Questionnaire for Households.....	110
	Appendix 8 – Consultation Responses to Emerging Draft Plan and Possible Site Allocations.....	121
	Appendix 9 – Regulation 14 Consultation Publicity	152
	Appendix 10 - Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations	165
	Appendix 11 – Response Forms	168
	Appendix 12 – Village Hall Displays.....	173
	Appendix 13 - Regulation 14 Consultation Response Tables	189

Prepared by Stoke Lacy Parish Council

with the assistance of



1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) (as amended). Part 5 Regulation 15 (1)¹ sets out that 'Where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal or a modification proposal to the local planning authority, it must include ... (b) a consultation statement.'
- 1.2 A 'consultation statement' is defined in Regulation 15 (2): 'In this regulation "consultation statement" means a document which—
- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified;
 - (b) explains how they were consulted;
 - (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.'
- 1.3 National Planning Practice Guidance² provides further advice:
- 'What is the role of the wider community in neighbourhood planning?**
- A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan or Order and ensure that the wider community:
- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
 - is able to make their views known throughout the process
 - has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan or Order
 - is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan or Order.
- Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 41-047-20140306
Revision date: 06 03 2014
- 1.4 The Parish Council has been highly committed to fully engaging with local residents, landowners and stakeholders throughout the NDP process.
- 1.5 At an early stage the Parish Council held two public meetings to publicise and discuss the proposed NDP.
- 1.6 The Parish Council invited all residents to a public meeting on 6th October 2019 (**see Appendix 1**) to establish whether there was local support for preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. An officer from Herefordshire Council introduced the subject and provided information about NDPs. After a discussion a vote was held amongst the members of the public attending, and it was agreed that a Steering Group should

¹ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/regulation/15>

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

be formed to progress the Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish. The Steering Group was formed 30th October 2019.

- 1.7 The Neighbourhood Area was designated by Herefordshire Council on 8th January 2020 (see Map 1).
- 1.8 A further parish meeting was held on 5th February 2020 and stakeholders were invited to sign up to receive emails about progress on the NDP. A representative from Herefordshire Association of Local Councils (HALC) attended to explain more about the process, together with members of the newly formed Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group. More than 60 local people attended, and the meeting was a first chance to think about the priorities for the Vision of Stoke Lacy's future.
- 1.9 The Steering Group has held working meetings at least once a month and more frequently when required – see **Figure 1**. Details and minutes are provided on the NDP pages of the Parish Council website³. During the Covid-19 pandemic meetings were held online, but members of the public were invited to join by prior arrangement with the Parish Clerk. Face to face meetings were held in the village hall and pub when Covid restrictions allowed.

Figure 1 - Meetings and Timeline

Dates	Activity
30th Oct 2019	NDP SG Village Hall – to approve in principle plans to process with a Stoke Lacy NDP
6th Nov 2019	BM attended Herefordshire County NDP meeting at Shire Hall
17th Nov 2019	Application to designate Neighbourhood area (Herefordshire Council)
4th Dec 2019	NDP SG Plough – Presentations from Ocle Pychard and Bishops Frome NDP's
19th Dec 2019	NDP SG Old Rectory Cottage – Lynda Wilcox Chief Exec of HALC
6th Jan 2020	NDP SG Village Hall – David Nicholson from DJN Planning
8th Jan 2020	NDP SG Village Hall - Meeting with David Nicholson (Planning Consultant)
15th Jan 2020	NDP SG Plough
Mid-January	Advertising of Parish NDP meeting to community (including Ci der Press)
5th Feb 2020	Parish NDP Meeting - Village Hall (first community meeting)
12th Feb 2020	NDP SG Village Hall
4th Mar 2020	NDP SG Village Hall – Sam Banks Neighbourhood Planning Manager, Herefordshire Council
March, April, May lockdown limited NDP progress	
26th Mar 2020	NDP SG - Intro Video call with Louise Kirkup
2nd Apr 2020	NDP SG Recommendations for Planning Consultant distributed to Parish Council
16th Apr 2020	Recommendation of Kirkwells as NDP Planning Consultant approved by Parish Council
30th Apr 2020 NDP	Grant application applied for through Groundworks (Localities)

³ <https://www.stokelacy.co.uk/>

17th May 2020	Offer of grant funds (£7,636) received
3rd Jun 2020	NDP Video call – Louise Kirkup
1st July 2020	NDP SG Video call
July / August	Advertising 'Call for Sites' across Parish (including Cider Press)
15th Jul 2020	Louise Kirkup guided tour of Stoke Lacy Parish (4pm car tour with Jo, Anne and Bill)
15th Jul 2020	NDP SG meeting with Louise and intro to Parish Council
29th Jul 2020	NDP SG Churchyard
12th Aug 2020	NDP SG Churchyard
19th Aug 2020	Closing date for all proposed Stoke Lacy Call for Sites
2nd Sep 2020	NDP SG Village Hall (Socially Distanced)
16th Sep 2020	NDP SG Video Call
16th Sep 2020	Closing date for Herefordshire Call for sites
23rd Sep	2020 AECOM call


2.0 Call for Sites, Summer 2020

- 2.1 The Parish Council, undertook a Call for Sites in summer 2020. Landowners and agents were invited to submit sites which would be considered for site allocation in the NDP.
- 2.2 Copies of publicity are provided in **Appendix 2**.
- 2.3 A total of 13 sites were submitted including one late submission in 2021. The sites were all subjected to a technical site assessment by consultants AECOM through the Locality Technicality Technical Support Programme. The Steering Group also invited Herefordshire Council Highways Department to comment on the options for site allocation and these comments were included in the technical reports.
- 2.4 The final reports ('**Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan Site Options and Assessment Draft Report Stoke Lacy Parish Council February 2021⁴**' and '**Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment and Options - Addendum Stoke Lacy Parish Council November 2021⁵**') were placed on the NDP website and comments invited from residents and landowners (**see Appendix 2**).
- 2.5 The sites considered to be technically suitable or suitable subject to constraints being overcome, were published for informal consultation later in 2021 as part of the consultation on the emerging Draft Plan and Site Options in 2021 (see Section 4).

⁴ <https://www.stokelacy.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/210210-Stoke-Lacy-Neighbourhood-Plan-Site-Options-and-Assessment-Final-Report-1.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.stokelacy.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/211108-Stoke-Lacy-Neighbourhood-Plan-Site-Assessment-Final-Report.pdf>


3.0 Issues and Options Consultation, November 2020



- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group prepared an Issues and Options document for public consultation in November 2020 – **see Appendix 3**. This set out a draft vision and objectives for the NDP and explained the various planning issues the Steering Group had identified, which could be addressed in the NDP through planning policies, and proposals such as site allocations.
- 3.2 The consultation questions invited stakeholders to consider the draft vision and objectives, future housing development and possible settlement boundaries. The consultation took place from 18th October 2020 until 21st November 2020 (although late responses were also accepted).
- 3.3 The complete Issues and Options document was provided on the NDP website.
- 3.4 A summary document and questionnaire was delivered to all households in the Parish – **see Appendix 4**. Printed versions of the complete Issues & Options document were available to borrow on request from the Steering Group.
- 3.5 The consultation process was intended to include two community drop in events on Wednesday 18th November 18:30 to 20:00 and on Saturday 23rd November 10:00 to 12:00 in the village hall. Unfortunately, in the event Covid restrictions meant that the drop in events could not go ahead as proposed and the publicity was updated accordingly to advise that the meetings had been cancelled.
- 3.6 The updated publicity included an email address and telephone number for anyone wishing to talk to a member of the NDP Steering Group by phone or face to face in a socially distanced meeting.
- 3.7 Consultees could respond to the consultation in the following ways:

- By completing the Issues & Options questions and feedback form sent out in October and posting responses through either of the NDP post boxes at the Village Hall or the Church, or by downloading the form from the website and emailing it;
 - By commenting on the NDP Website forum comments@stokelacy.co.uk;
 - By emailing the NDP Lead Coordinator Bill Morgan (morgg@aol.com);
 - By emailing the Parish Clerk (parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk);
 - Or, by telephoning and arranging to talk to a member of the NDP Steering Group (either by phone, Zoom call or socially distanced face to face) 01885 448102.
- 3.8 There was a good response rate with 65 completed response forms returned from 201 households; this included households that responded as a couple, representing a response rate of 40%. Overall there was support for the draft vision and objectives and themes identified and the consultation generated a large number of detailed comments.
- 3.9 The responses to the Issues and Options questionnaire and comments from the community at the Public Meeting on 5th February 2020 were considered carefully and used to inform the policies in the emerging first Draft Plan. (Percentages of responses have been rounded in the NDP.) The vision and objectives were revised in response to some of the detailed comments.
- 3.10 There were also a large number of comments about other parish issues which have been considered by the Parish Council and where appropriate are included as proposed actions in the NDP. The full report of the consultation results (**‘Responses to the Issues and Options Document’**) was published on the NDP website and is reproduced in **Appendix 5**.
- 3.11 The vast majority of responses and comments were thoughtful, constructive and useful and were used to inform the preparation of the Draft Plan. The responses revealed that 93.85% agreed with the proposed objectives of the Plan.

4.0 Consultation on Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021



- 4.1 An emerging first Draft Plan was prepared by the Steering Group and published for informal public consultation in April 2021, alongside possible options for site allocations. The consultation ran over 4 weeks from 5th April until 7th May 2021.
- 4.2 The emerging Draft Plan was not complete at the time as the Steering Group was still working on identifying and justifying possible Local Green Spaces and thinking about the settlement boundaries. Also detailed policies on design had not been prepared as these were dependant on the Design Codes which had yet to be completed by AECOM. However, the Steering Group wanted to reassure concerned local residents and landowners that progress was being made on the Draft Plan and that consultation responses would be used to inform amendments to those policies and proposals that were already in a draft form.
- 4.3 As before, the complete document was placed on the NDP website and hard copies were made available on request from the Steering Group. Covid-19 restrictions continued during this period and so face to face meetings could not take place.
- 4.4 A summary document and short response form were delivered to local households. Consultees were invited to provide feedback by 7th May 2021 by:
- Dropping them into the NDP mailboxes located at the Village Hall or in the Church porch, or
 - Emailing the clerk: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org, or
 - Completing the form online on the NDP website: www.stokelacy.co.uk.
- 4.5 Copies of publicity are provided in **Appendix 6** and the summary document and questionnaire is provided in **Appendix 7**.
- 4.6 There were 65 responses which represented 40% of local households. Overall, there was support for the Draft Vision, Objectives and emerging Draft Policies and a large


number of detailed comments were provided, which were used to inform some amendments to the Draft Plan.

- 4.7 The questionnaire also invited residents to say whether they supported or objected to, each of the 3 possible site allocations considered technically suitable, or suitable subject to constraints being overcome.
- 4.8 The responses to the consultation were summarised and placed on the website, along with transcripts of the comments. The reports (**‘Responses to Settlement Boundaries and Draft Policies’, ‘Responses – Call for Sites Options’** and **‘Public Consultation April 2021 All Comments Taken From Feedback Forms And Collated By Section’**) are provided in **Appendix 8**.
- 4.9 The responses showed that a higher proportion objected to all the possible housing sites than supported them, although a significant number were neutral or did not answer. Comments from a number of residents showed continued support for development on smaller sites and therefore the Steering Group liaised with the landowners to explore options for reducing the proposed size and scale of development. Following discussions with Herefordshire Council the Steering Group recommended the inclusion of one small site allocation for 2 houses within the settlement boundary of Stoke Cross.
- 4.10 The Steering Group considered the responses very carefully and amended some of the Objectives and Draft Policies and proposals in the Draft Plan. The Steering Group also responded to the questions raised asking for more information about various issues and published these responses on the website (see **Appendix 8**).

Local Green Spaces

- 4.11 The landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces were contacted in October 2021 and invited to comment.
- 4.12 An email response was received from the Woodland Trust saying:
‘Netherwood, Woodland Trust
On 8 Nov 2021, at 10:36
Hi bill,
I don’t have any objections to Netherwood being included as a local green space.
The wood is partly inside the Stoke Lacey conservation area, which is a higher level of designation.’
- 4.13 The landowners of the area around the Church responded to a follow up emails with the following (by email):
‘Date: 9 April 2022 at 17:13:08
Dear Bill,
The Stoke Lacy and Moreton Jeffries Parochial Church Council have agreed to the inclusion in the Stoke Lacy NDP of the area around the church, as an area of local interest as green space, with the understanding that the only body allowed to permit public or private events therein is the Stoke Lacy and Moreton Jeffries PCC.’

5.0 Regulation 14 Public Consultation, Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022



- 5.1 The public consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Plan was carried out in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Part 5 Pre-submission consultation and publicity, Regulation 14. This states that:

‘Pre-submission consultation and publicity

14. Before submitting a plan proposal or a modification proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must—

(a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area—

(i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan or modification proposal;

(ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan or modification proposal may be inspected;

(iii) details of how to make representations;

(iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised; and

(v) in relation to a modification proposal, a statement setting out whether or not the qualifying body consider that the modifications contained in the modification proposal are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the neighbourhood development plan which the modification proposal would modify, giving reasons for why the qualifying body is of this opinion;

(b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan or modification proposal; and

(c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan or modification proposal to the local planning authority.'

5.2 The Regulation 14 consultation was publicised in the following ways (see **Appendix 9**):

- Flyer delivered to all local households
- Posters
- Notice in the Cider Press local newsletter.

5.3 The Draft Plan was published on the Parish Council's website with a link to the NDP page (see screenshots in **Appendix 9**). At the same time comments were invited on the Design Codes. A flyer was delivered to all households in the Parish (see **Appendix 9**).

5.4 A list of Consultation Bodies was kindly provided by Herefordshire Council and these with other local organisations and all those on the Parish Council's NDP consultation database were emailed prior to the commencement of the consultation period (see **Appendix 10**).

5.5 Consultees were invited to respond using the Response Form provided on the website or as hard copies from members of the Steering Group (see **Appendix 11**). Consultees were also invited to provide feedback using the following:

- The NDP mailboxes located at the Village Hall or in the Church porch, or
- Post to: Stoke Lacy Parish Clerk, 4, Millfield, Canon Frome, Ledbury HR8 2TH; or
- Email: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org, or
- Online on the NDP website: www.stokelacy.co.uk

By: 5pm Monday 7th March 2022.

5.7 The Regulation 14 consultation public meetings with the Parish took place in the Village Hall on the following dates:

- Wednesday 19th January 2022 between 19:00 and 21:00 and
- Saturday 22nd January 2022 between 14:00 and 16:00.

5.8 Copies of the displays are provided in **Appendix 12**. Around 50 – 60 local people attended.

Summary of Consultation Responses

- 5.9 The full responses are set out in a series of Tables in Appendix 13. These are:
- Table 1 Herefordshire Council
 - Table 2 Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations
 - Table 3 Residents
 - Table 4 Landowners and Developers
- 5.10 Herefordshire Council recommended a number of changes to the NDP, the vast majority of which were taken on board in changes to the Submission Plan. Briefly these included:
- Using existing policy wording to create a single policy to refer to the River Wye catchment SAC and the protection of water quality;
 - Amending former Policy SL4 on design which was too lengthy and complex and reformatting it so that several distinct policies are provided, closely referenced to the design codes and providing the design codes in an appendix;
 - Identifying Wye Valley Brewery and business park as 'employment land' within the settlement boundary of the Policies Map (Map 3B) and providing a new policy linked to the Core Strategy;
 - Providing new policies on renewable energy and agricultural buildings to support and guide rural diversification and development of large farm buildings in the countryside;
 - Providing a new policy identifying local community facilities; and
 - Making other minor changes to policy wording to improve clarity, including several changes related to promoting more sustainable transport alternatives.
- 5.11 Responses from the Consultation Bodies included standard responses from National Highways, Coal Authority and National Grid. CPRE suggested the NDP should include a renewable energy policy and wording to control light pollution, both of which were included in the Submission Plan. Brief responses were also received from the National Trust and Herefordshire and Worcestershire CCG but these did not result in any changes to the Plan.
- 5.12 There were responses from 35 residents / households, most of which were very supportive of the Plan. There were a number of very detailed comments, particularly around the settlement boundaries, and these resulted in the steering group reviewing the boundaries again, applying a more consistent approach and making some changes. Objections to the former site allocation for employment use at Hopton Court Farm (SL7/1) led to the allocation being deleted.
- 5.13 A representation / objection was submitted by Zesta Planning, on behalf of Lantar Developments Ltd. The response included objections to Objective 7 which have resulted in a minor change to wording, and objections to housing policies, the site selection process and identified important views. The developer also promoted a housing site as a site allocation outside the settlement boundary and to the north east of Stoke Cross. The steering group and parish council considered it would not be appropriate at this late stage to include a site for major development outside the 5.14 settlement boundary and particularly one that was recently refused planning consent.
- 5.14 Overall therefore the responses to the Regulation 14 consultation resulted in a number of changes to the Vision, Objectives, Planning Policies and supporting text of the submission version of the Modified Plan.

Appendix 1 – Early Publicity for the NDP 2019 – 2020 and Parish Council Minutes

Cider Press Article

One reason why I believe we need a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

We were fortunate enough to move to Stoke Lacy a couple of years ago from a small village called Grazeley about 4 miles outside Reading. Grazeley has 25 houses, a primary school, a village hall, a church and a pub. (Both of the later now converted into houses!) It is surrounded by fields, mostly arable farming and runs parallel to the busy A33 to Basingstoke. It is a pleasant semi-rural place and ideal to escape the nightmare that is the overcrowded South of England but which was convenient for working in large Corporations in London and along the M4 corridor.

A few years before we moved, just as we were starting to make our plans, we heard rumours that Berkshire Council were going to build more new houses in the area. No surprise there. If you've been down to southern England recently you will have seen the mass of housing developments springing up everywhere and they had already built several huge developments locally. It was only when a local resident was given a leaked document that it became clear exactly what the Council had in mind for the village.

Comprehensive plans had been drafted in secret for a development of more than 15,000 houses! Yes 15,000 houses over a period of about 15 years! The leaked document outlined the various stages and extent of the development which would be serviced by the M4 and A33, so ideal for commuters and families moving to the area. It would also be given the catchy name of 'Grazeley Garden Town'! As you can imagine, the local residents are not at all happy with this news and the government has just released money for a feasibility study, so it is gathering momentum.

See this latest article:

<https://www.getreading.co.uk/news/property/huge-housing-development-grazeley-inches-16027683>

Although it's unlikely that Stoke Lacy Parish will ever get swamped by new housing developments of this size, unless we at least try and get prepared, get some basic ideas and plans together and appear as if we care, Herefordshire Planning could potentially run roughshod over the Parish and impose their ideas just as Berkshire Council is doing to

Grazeley. Another aspect is that if the Hereford bypass doesn't get approved, housing areas will need to be found in surrounding Parishes.

Yes, it could be a tedious and bureaucratic exercise. Having an NDP doesn't stop building happening and the easiest option would be to do nothing, but if you take a look at the map you can see we are in the minority of Herefordshire Parishes that haven't either prepared or at least started preparing an NDP. (The white areas show parishes that have not prepared an NDP). Our lack of action could result in other Parishes being better advantaged. Worth thinking about?

Parish Council Minutes 9th Oct 2019

21st November 2019 by Bill Morgan

STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 9th October 2019 in Stoke Lacy Village Hall at 7.30pm

Present:

Councillors Janet Ivison (Chairman), Anne Reece, Helen Bufton, Bill Morgan and John Westwood.

In attendance

Mrs Alma Westwood (Clerk); Ward Councillor Jonathan Lester (arrived at 7.40 pm); 17 members of the public

19.96 To receive and accept APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Ian Arundel

19.97 To receive DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR PERSONAL INTEREST on Agenda items

None declared

19.98 To receive a presentation on Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP) from Ms Sam Banks, Neighbourhood Planning Team leader (to include questions from the public)

Ms Banks explained that NDPs form the shape of the place where communities live, shaping and forming development in conformity with Herefordshire Council's Core Strategy. Plans would establish settlement boundaries, open spaces and site allocations; this last was very important. Ms Banks then went into further detail. She continued by setting out how to start a plan, by setting up a Steering Group of no fewer than 6 and no more than 12; hiring a planning consultant if desired; deciding who should be on the Steering Group; development timetable; and various ways the Steering Group could get assistance. She recommended it be completed in under 18 months as Herefordshire Council was reviewing its Core Strategy in the next two years and the NDP should be finalised before that took place. Officers from the NDP team would come out and give technical advice and support. Once an NDP was adopted it became part of the Core Strategy. Steering Groups must report back to the Parish Council, who owned the Plan.

After further explanation and some questions from Councillors and members of the public

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

The Chairman asked the public to vote on whether they were interested in pursuing setting up an NDP. 11 out of 17 were in favour of looking into it further and a meeting was set up for Wednesday 30th October at 7.30pm in the Village Hall.

There was to be an NDP workshop on 4th November at the Shirehall

The Chairman thanked Ms Banks for her comprehensive presentation.

Ms Banks and 11 members of the public left the meeting at 8.40pm.

19.99 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS PARISH COUNCIL MEETING held on Wednesday 11th September 2019

The minutes were approved and signed

19.100 WARD COUNCILLOR'S AND POLICE REPORTS

19.100 i Ward Councillor Lester reported on Herefordshire Council matters, including the proposed by-pass, now on hold. He recommended that Councillors read the agenda for the next Herefordshire Council meeting on 11th October.

19.100 ii No Police report

19.101 Public Participation

There was no further public participation

19.102 FINANCE

Current Account balance as at 1st October 2019: £7857.35

19.102 i Draft accounts from 1st September to 30th September 2019 as distributed:

APPROVED.

19.102 ii The following payments were approved:

- HALC: website hosting Jan/Dec 2019 £66.00
- Stoke Lacy Village Hall 4 bookings: £96
- Cllr Bill Morgan: gavel – expenses: £12.50

19.102 iii To discuss the Precept for 2020/21: the Clerk gave Councillors a draft budget for the year for follow-up at November's meeting

19.103 Update on Newlands and Orchard Developments and 106 matters

Newlands: One house had been sold. Update requested and date for the Show House viewing. Orchard development: Now sold again s.t.c. 106 monies: the Clerk had received details

No planning applications had been received this month. Councillors and members of the public were advised to check Herefordshire Council's Planning website regularly

19.104 TRO: A465 Cricks Green and other A465 matters

Councillors agreed with the TRO plans which they had received; public consultation available until 18th October at 12 noon. Councillors discussed the recent accident at Crick's Green; Clerk requested to contact BB regarding this, the hidden dip sign and double white lines

19.105 To discuss possible joint VE Celebration with Village Hall: 8th May 2020

Agreed in principle; for further discussion at November's meeting

19.106 To discuss new format for The Newsletter and Parish Council's response

Councillor Reece gave a report on the meeting on 25th September about the future of The Newsletter. With a re-designed size and layout cost had been reduced from £800 p.a. to £450 p.a. Costings being further looked at to see if the Parish Council could take part again.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Councillors confirmed that for the time being they wished to continue supporting The Cider Press only. Clerk to request the minutes of the meeting

19.107 TO NOTE INFORMATION SHEET and Clerk's Report

19.107 i As already emailed: Correspondence, HALC courses, etc.

19.107 ii Future presentations at PC meetings: 12th Feb 2020 Recycling. Send out invitations

19.107 iii PC website: the Clerk was going to start to publish it, with help

19.108 ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR NEXT AGENDA

19.108 i Set Precept

19.108 ii SmartWater roll-out and funding

19.108 iii Order grit bins and road marking posts, damaged due to verge trimming

19.108 iv Change times of winter meetings of Council to 7pm?

DATES FOR FUTURE PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS to May 2020

(all Wednesdays in Village Hall): 13th Nov (set precept); 7.30pm

2020: 8th Jan; 12th Feb (recycling presentation) 11th Mar; 8th April

Annual Meetings:

2020: Parish Meeting format, date and time to be arranged;

13th May 2020: Annual Parish Council Meeting at 8pm

The meeting closed at 10.10pm.

Signed..... Date.....M

30 October 2019 - Meeting Minutes

Draft/

STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting to decide on setting up an NDP for Stoke Lacy, held on Wednesday 30th October 2019 in Stoke Lacy Village Hall at 7.30pm

Present: Councillor Janet Ivison (Chairman); Councillor Anne Reece; Councillor Bill Morgan; 9 members of the public: Averelle Nicklin; Hugh Nicklin; Carole Sandhu; Phil Platt; Meg Warren; Marcel Carrier; Joanne Davies; John Davies; James Wilson

In attendance: Alma Westwood, Clerk

19.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

19.2 Apologies were received from: Ward Councillor Jonathan Lester; Councillor Helen Bufton; Councillor John Westwood; Ian Arundale; Chris McNaught

19.3 To discuss setting up a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Stoke Lacy

The Chairman commenced by saying she thought the 18-month timescale for completing this NDP as proposed by Ms Sam Banks, head of NDP team for Herefordshire Council, was unrealistic. Other Parish Councils had taken between 2 and 6 years to complete theirs. She stressed there was a lot of work and commitment of time to complete an NDP. Ms Banks had recommended this timescale as a new Core Strategy was being drawn up, for implementation in two years' time.

The Steering Group should ideally consist of no fewer than 6 and no more than 12, with other volunteers contributing as necessary on an ad hoc basis. It was vital that the whole population was consulted at all times and that every NDP meeting was open to the public. A successful NDP did not mean that it could not be over-ruled, but it did provide some control over development. Ward Councillor Lester thought that Stoke Lacy should produce an NDP. These had to be refreshed every 2 years. Funding of £9000 was available from central government till 2020 for setting up NDPs.

Questions arose amongst other matters as to what an NDP was; risk if there was none; agreed it would establish where the parish wished development to be placed.

The Chairman then brought discussion to a close by asking whether people were prepared to commit the time and work necessary to produce an NDP. She said it was the third time whilst she had been Chairman that it had come before the Parish Council and that whilst she was still Chairman she was not prepared to bring it back again.

19.4 To vote on whether to proceed with an NDP

The Chairman then made the following proposal

That an NDP be set up for Stoke Lacy

For: 6 ; against: 0; abstained: 6

Motion CARRIED

19.5 To set up a Steering Group made up of a Parish Councillor nominated by the Parish Council and a cross-section of the community

Volunteered: Councillor Bill Morgan; Phil Platt; Joanne Davies; 2 MORE - NOT SURE WHO OTHERS WERE, SORRY.

It was noted that others not necessarily present at this meeting could come forward at future meetings

19.6 To Elect a Chairman of the Steering Group

After discussion it was AGREED that this be held over for the first meeting of the NDP Steering Group

19.7. To set a date for the Steering Group's first meeting

Wednesday 13th November in the Village Hall at 6pm.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

This meeting is open to all Stoke Lacy parishioners (residents who vote in elections)

The meeting was closed at 8.35pm

Signed..... Date.....

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Meeting at 6pm 4th December – The Plough Inn

Notes

Attendees: Bill Morgan, Jo Davies, James Wilson, Phil Platt, Meg Warren, Carole Leonard, Marcel Carrier

Apologies: Alma Westwood

Guests: Richard Leach and Simon Harmsworth from Ocle Pychard Group NDP Steering Group.

Dave Preece from Bishops Frome NDP Steering Group.

Agenda.

Ocle Pychard NDP.

a. Recommended use of a planning consultant to oversee the process -Dr David Nicholson from Westhild. (2 other tenders were sought) Cost – Fixed price of c.£7.5k. The consultant organized the questionnaire, drafted documents, advised on stages and processes. Invaluable resource to the steering group ensuring compliance with core strategy and timetable.

b. Other advisors Stephanie Keto from Herefordshire Council NDP department and Lynda Wilcox of HALC.

c. OP's steering group consisted of a core of three people (RC (chair) and SH – both parish councilors) and a paid (£9.43 p/h) administrator to take minutes of meetings, update website etc. Outside this core group c. 10 others assisted at various stages.

d. Public consultation – An initial open meeting to introduce the NDP to the community with an attendance of 70 people (c. 25% of population), also questionnaires (a 20% questionnaire response), subsequent public meetings including interactive open day, 'Call for sites' stage (for landowners to suggest development sites).

e. All decision making by Parish Council, steering group advisory. Important to co-ordinate SG meetings with P/C meetings to make efficient progress. All finances approved via PC. SH/Treasurer applied for grant funding for SG NDP finances.

f. RL and SH conclusions:

Appoint a planning consultant at an early stage.

Important to engage the whole community: residents, but also landowners and businesses.

The NDP had already proved it 'had teeth' in at least 2 planning applications where the criteria of the NDP prevented development.

The Parish Council had learned a considerable amount about planning matters over the process.

Expect negativity from some quarters at various stages. Important to keep a record of publicity about meetings and the various stages of the process for those who may only engage with the process at a late stage.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Establish 'Terms of Reference' between the P/C and the Steering Group.

Bishops Frome NDP.

DP explained he had only joined the BP steering group at a late stage as their planning adviser. This meant that the public questionnaire wasn't as helpful as it could be in developing the NDP. DP advised appointing a planning consultant at an early stage.

Actions from previous meeting.

All points addressed except clarification of software for the website and shared area and software for project management.

JW recommended Zephyr a plug in for WordPress, for which he has already circulated login access. Discussion as to whether to adopt the full version of Zephyr with Project Management capability and an app. (Budget implications as free version only basic). Agreed at this stage to re-circulate access log in details for the whole SG for shared area.

PP suggested use of Microsoft Project for pm function.

JW suggested acquisition of domain name stokelacy.co.uk – cost annual fee of £4.

Communications for Cider Press

JD had circulated by email the December issue of CP with NDP article and date of public meeting 22nd Jan 2020, hard copy to go out by w/e of 7th/8th. It was agreed regular updates to be included in each edition plus in the Community Newsletter, Bromyard Info, Hereford Times. Heritage Facebook page and Stoke Lacy Parish Council website. A record to be kept of all publicity.

Preparations for Public Meeting

To be discussed at next meeting.

Hereford Times articles on NDPS – Content noted.

IT shared are and support – See above plus JW to give some training.

Paperless agenda & notes – An aspiration and possible if meeting in the Plough Inn with internet access.

GDPR – BM to produce GDPR compliance forms for SG to complete and sign.

Any Other Business

a. Jonathan Lester to attend public meeting on 22nd.

b. Copy of 2004 Parish Plan for Stoke Lacy circulated – could form the basis of some of the history/narrative of the NDP.

c. SG members to consider a possible administrator to relieve the burden from the Parish Clerk.

d. James Wilson was adopted as acting Vice Chair of the steering group.

The Meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Future Meeting Dates

Wednesday 15th January

Wednesday 22nd January

Wednesday 5th February

Wednesday 4th March

Wednesday 1st April

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Meeting at 6pm 19th December – The Plough Inn

Notes

Attendees: Bill Morgan, Jo Davies, James Wilson, Phil Platt, Meg Warren, Carole Leonard, Marcel Carrier

Apologies: Alma Westwood

Member of the public in attendance: Ruth Hickmott.

Agenda.

Update on outstanding actions from meeting of 4th December:

- 1) ~~Contact David Nicholson, Consultant – BM~~
- 2) ~~Contact Lynda Wilcox – BM (Confirm attendance at 5th February Public meeting)~~
- 3) Prepare GDPR document – BM (Still outstanding)
- 4) ~~Contact Jonathan Lester – BM (Re-scheduled public meeting to 5th February)~~

BM confirmed that Lynda Wilcox will attend the planning meeting on 6th January as well as the public meeting on 5th February.

MC and BM to meet with AW when she is available to discuss finance application for funding the project.

The proposed terms of reference (ToR) were discussed. MW suggested some amendments in line with the ToR she found for Cornwall. She believes them to be more structured in relation to limits on membership of the steering group and decision making. MW will circulate a link to the Cornish ToR, the steering group to consider at the meeting on 6th January. MW also raised the issue of quoracy and this too would be discussed and decided upon on 6th.

It was decided that a ‘comments by the general public’ item should be included as an agenda item for each meeting.

IT Shared area, user training and support – James Wilson

JW and PP briefly demonstrated the Open Project community edition which is free but needs to be run on a Unix server. JW currently had it running from his home server but it could be used on his business server instead. All members of steering group should email PP with a password so that they may explore the application over the holidays and a decision would be made at the meeting of 6th January as to whether to adopt it for the NDP steering group project.

A decision whether to buy the domain name stokelacy.co.uk would be made at the next parish council meeting.

Preparations for public meeting 5th February

A general discussion took place about whether or not the parish council had a vision for the direction of travel for the NDP, or whether that might come as a result of the public meeting.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

No conclusions were reached but some topics for discussion such as homelessness, empty properties, environmental factors were highlighted.

It was decided that more specific details concerning the format of the public meeting would be finalised following the meeting with Lynda Wilcox on 6th January.

JD agreed to contact the PCC about borrowing their projector for the presentation on 5th February

Meetings Schedule

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Mon 6 th Jan	18:00	Jo's House	NDP Public Meeting Planning Session with Lynda Wilcox	
Wed 8 th Jan	18:00	Village Hall	Meeting with David Nicholson (Consultant)	Wed 8 th Jan 19:30
Wed 15 th Jan	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	
Wed 5 th Feb	18:00 18:30 Public	Village Hall	Public Meeting	
Wed 12 th Feb	18:00	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 12 th Feb 19:30
Wed 4 th Mar	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30

Any Other Business

PP suggested looking at NDP Plans on the Hereford Council website with regard to strict timetables of the stages required.

CL, MW and JD will liaise over a series of flyers to be distributed at The Plough Inn and elsewhere from the beginning of January to publicise the public meeting on 5th February.

Comments from the public

Ruth Hickmott had no comment other than that she does not want to join the steering group as secretary as she does not feel it is within her skillset. She will, however, attend the public meeting.

The meeting closed at 7.45pm.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Meeting at 6pm 6th January 2020 – Old Rectory Cottage

Notes

Attendees: Bill Morgan, Jo Davies, James Wilson, Phil Platt, Meg Warren, Carole Leonard,

Apologies: Marcel Carrier, Alma Westwood

In attendance: Lynda Wilcox. Chief Executive of Herefordshire Association of Local Councils (HALC)

Lynda Wilcox presentation and discussion regarding Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stoke Lacy Parish.

Main points: -

LW emphasised the importance that the parish clerk, as the legal officer of the parish council, be closely involved with the NDP steering group. She agreed that it was acceptable for someone else to prepare notes of the meetings but that the clerk should have oversight of the notes and, if possible, attend all meetings. The clerk of the parish council should also apply for all grants (£9k per annum is available for NDPs) and expenditure must be approved by the parish council.

Once notes are prepared, they should be submitted for approval and endorsement by the parish council. The steering group is a working party of the parish council and can only make recommendations to the parish council. It has no decision-making authority.

Consultation with the public should be open and flexible with parishioners able to attend all meetings. Acceptable for steering group meetings to be held in the pub as long as accessibility is open. No requirement to adopt terms of reference.

LW approved the idea of engaging an experienced planning consultant such as David Nicholson or Kirkwells. Once appointed by the parish council they will lead and advise on the entire process.

Parishioners engagement is key to a successful NDP outcome and the inspector will need evidence of this engagement. A questionnaire is one method of engaging opinion but this can be a lengthy and inefficient process. LW would strongly recommend that a series of parish meetings to consult about ideas for development, tourism, environment and infrastructure projects be undertaken. After which the consultant can produce a skeleton plan for distribution to parishioners followed by further consultation at a parish meeting.

Meeting of 5th February should be called a 'Parish Meeting' not a Public Meeting. That way the parish council retains autonomy. The meeting should be chaired by the chair or vice-chair of the Parish Council. LW will then do a presentation on NDP and take questions from the public. Afterwards, whilst refreshments are being offered, LW will collect a list of names, email addresses and telephone numbers of those interested in participating. This list will then be handed to the parish clerk. This list together with existing core volunteers will form the basis of the NDP steering group.

The role of the parish council and steering group in the run-up to the meeting on 5th February should be :- Effective publicity warning of the dangers of not preparing a NDP (Costs of printing and distribution can be taken from the grant budget). LW suggested flyers to all

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

households in the parish (check with the parish clerk about exact boundaries from the electoral register), posters, and other forms of communication through local newspapers, magazines etc. The parish council should also provide free refreshments at all parish meetings. LW will need a flip chart for the meeting.

LW suggested the annual parish public meeting (taking place between March and May each year) would be a good time for a second open parish meeting to gather ideas about development etc. After which the consultant could prepare a skeleton plan with a further public meeting in September.

LW recommended Ann Skipper of AKON (an independent planning consultancy) for the inspection stage of the NDP.

LW pointed out that approval of the appointment of the planning consultant should be made by the parish council at their February 12th meeting. LW undertook to contact the parish clerk about wording of the NDP agenda item on each parish council agenda and to advise her on the importance of the clerk's role in the NDP process.

Meetings Schedule

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Wed 8 th Jan	18:00	Village Hall	Meeting with David Nicholson (Consultant)	Wed 8 th Jan 19:30
Wed 15 th Jan	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	
Wed 5 th Feb	18:00 18:30 Public	Village Hall	Parish Meeting	
Wed 12 th Feb	18:00	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 12 th Feb 19:30
Wed 4 th Mar	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30

The meeting closed at 8pm.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Meeting at 6pm 8th January 2020 – Stoke Lacy Village Hall

Notes

Attendees: Bill Morgan, Jo Davies, Phil Platt, Meg Warren, Carole Leonard, Marcel Carrier

Apologies: James Wilson, Alma Westwood (AW joined the meeting at point 1.i)

In attendance: David Nicholson, planning consultant of DJN Planning Limited.

David Nicholson presentation and discussion regarding Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stoke Lacy Parish.

Main points: -

DN's Background. DW ex Herefordshire Council, he led Unitary Development Plan and worked on the Herefordshire Core Strategy. He left the council in 2012 as Head of Economic Development and Strategic Planning. He has run a planning consultancy practice since 2013. He has completed at least seven NDPs in Herefordshire, with some still in process, as well as several in the Tess Valley and in Worcestershire. Most locally he has been the planning consultant for Ocle Pychard, Bosbury and Brockhampton.

If appointed, or asked to provide a proposal, there will be three phases of work: 1. Evidence gathering, 2. Writing a draft plan and 3. Consultation of the draft plan

In evidence gathering the NDP must demonstrate that everyone has been consulted, a questionnaire is one method of ensuring that but the same can be achieved through a series of parish meetings. After the February meeting form working groups to gather evidence relating to the three main areas to be addressed in the NDP: Society and culture, economy and the environment. Always include something about the NDP in each issue of the Cider Press.

DN would write the draft plan in consultation with the NDP steering group and approved by the parish council. The plan must comply Herefordshire Council's local plan and core strategy.

The draft plan would be submitted to Herefordshire Council for an environmental report. Once the draft plan is finalised it would then go out to the public for further consultation through a further public meeting. After an independent inspection the plan will be put to a referendum of the parish.

DN advised that a further stage 'A call for sites' would not be necessary in Stoke Lacy's case since the parish had already more than met its allocation of housing development at this stage.

As part of the basic process the NDP would need to re-define the outline of the settlement boundaries of the settlements at Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy. These are very restricted in rural areas in line with Hereford's core strategy.

ND suggested that the shortest time for completion of the project would be c. 2 years at the end of 2021.

ND confirmed that his fees would include attendance at steering group meetings and public meetings and anything outside the contract would be charged at an hourly rate of £60 p/h.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

BM asked DN to send a formal proposal for stages of work by email as soon as possible.

David Nicholson left the meeting at 7pm

Following a short discussion, the steering group agreed that, subject to receipt of a satisfactory proposal and costs, it would recommend the parish council adopt DN as the consultant for the NDP.

Publicity. CL, MW and JD proposed to meet at 10am on 9th January 2020 at CL's home to finalise the publicity for the forthcoming parish meeting on 5th February. Final signage, flyers, leaflets and costs would be circulated to BM and the wider steering group.

The consultation period for the establishment of the neighbourhood area for the Stoke Lacy NDP ended today (8th of January) so the clerk could expect notification shortly from Herefordshire Council that the NDP could move to the next stages.

Meetings Schedule

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Wed 15 th Jan	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	
Wed 5 th Feb	18:00 18:30 Public	Village Hall	Parish Meeting	
Wed 12 th Feb	18:00	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 12 th Feb 19:30
Wed 4 th Mar	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30

The meeting closed at 7.15 pm.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Meeting at 6pm 15th January 2020 – The Plough Inn

Notes

Attendees: Bill Morgan, Jo Davies, Phil Platt, Meg Warren, Carole Leonard, Marcel Carrier, James Wilson.

Apologies: Alma Westwood

Update on outstanding actions – all.

A discussion took place about whether David Nicholson should attend the parish meeting on 5th February. His costs of £180 cannot be taken from the NDP grant and so would have to be paid by the parish council. It was agreed that BM will seek Lynda Wilcox's advice as to whether necessary. Otherwise it would be recommended that DN not be engaged for the 5th.

NDP website and shared areas – James

JW has acquired the domain name stokelacy.co.uk, as instructed by the parish council. This site will be linked to the main parish council website.

He is in the early stages of developing it, but it will have public facing pages with a calendar of events, meetings, and a forum for members of the public who will be able to log in and make comments which will be moderated.

There will be further 'behind the scenes' pages accessible by the steering group to be used as a filing cabinet to access files and documents. JW will distribute log in emails and passwords to the steering group.

Update on project plan and actions – Phil

PP will use the project planning application for his own monitoring purposes for managing the project. He will prompt others at appropriate stages if and when necessary to carry out tasks in a timely manner.

Preparations for public meeting 5th February 2020 Logistics – all

Advertising/communicating with community. CL showed the group the banner posters to be displayed along the village hall railings and on the Rectory gate at the bottom of the village. Map posters to be displayed in the Plough, Village Hall and church. Also some A5 laminated flyers which Nardia and Simon Lewis agreed to display on their tables. BM agreed to ask the Three Horse Shoes if they would do the same. The Cider Press will be distributed well in time for the February meeting. JD to include the 'map poster' as a wrap around on the front page.

Food & Drink – Discussions took place about what type of refreshments and how much budget would be required to fund it. It was agreed that wine, orange juice, tea, coffee, biscuits and crisps/nibbles would be provided. BM to ask Ocle Pychard how many attended their public meetings to assess what budget to allow for refreshments. All Steering group to be at village Hall at 5.30pm on 5th to set up.

Flip Chart. BM to borrow flip chart from the Conquest Theatre. CL to provide paper.

Community Engagement – It was agreed that all members of the steering group should read guidance note 12 regarding community engagement in preparation for the parish meeting.

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3703/guidance_note_12_best_practice_community_engagement_techniques.pdf .

Stoke Lacy Parish Council Service Level Agreement – Since the Neighbourhood Development area is now approved by Herefordshire Council the SLA is ready to be signed by the Parish Council. Janet Ivison , chair of the parish council, will sign the agreement tonight, AW will then scan and email it back to Herefordshire Council.

Meetings Schedule

Below is the current meetings schedule as agreed. BM will suggest further meeting dates through to September and re-schedule the March 4th meeting and circulate amongst the steering group.

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Wed 5 th Feb	18:00 18:30 Public	Village Hall	Parish Meeting	
Wed 12 th Feb	18:00	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 12 th Feb 19:30
Wed 4 th Mar	To be re- scheduled		NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30

Any Other Business

Finance – A discussion took place about the timing of the NDP grant application. BM clarified that it must be done immediately and that he had discussed this with AW, as it must be submitted by the parish clerk. MC to meet with AW on Friday 17th January to progress the matter. BM to clarify exact contingency in parish council budget for NDP.

Maps. A discussion took place about the provision of maps for the project and where they can be obtained. They are available from Herefordshire Council at a cost (to be established) but also available for use in NDP documents via villagesonline at a subscription cost of £50 p/a. It was agreed BM to clarify the situation with David Nicholson or Samantha Kitto.

BM to arrange meeting with Samantha Kitto (Herefordshire Council NDP liaison allocated to Stoke Lacy)

Concern amongst steering group about how Lynda Wilcox will manage the parish meeting on 5th February. Concern the steering group not committed to anything it cannot deliver and about lack of control of the agenda. BM to contact LW for clarification and guidance.

BM to contact Helen Bufton about liaison with farming community.

Liaison with other businesses to take place after the public meeting.

BM to establish whether Withington has a NDP.

The meeting closed at 7.30 pm.

Minutes – 8th January 2020

7th February 2020 by Bill Morgan

STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL

-

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 8th January 2020 in Stoke Lacy Village Hall at 7.30pm

Present:

Councillors Janet Ivison (Chairman), Anne Reece, Helen Bufton, Bill Morgan

In attendance: Mrs Alma Westwood (Clerk); Ward Councillor Jonathan Lester (arrived at 7.40pm); PC Alice Bennett and PCSO Susan Berrett; 6 members of the public

The meeting commenced at 7.35pm

19.125 To receive and accept APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Councillor John Westwood; accepted

19.126 To receive DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR PERSONAL INTEREST On Agenda items

None declared

19.127 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING held on 13th November 2019 and the EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING held on 27th November 2019

Both sets of Minutes were approved and signed

The Chairman then proposed that Items 19.129ii and 19.129ibe brought forward. Agreed

19.129 WARD COUNCILLOR'S AND POLICE REPORTS

19.129 ii CSO Susan Berrett introduced PC Alice Bennett, who had recently joined Bromyard Police in place of PC John Meek, who had been moved to other duties within North Herefordshire police. PC Bennett introduced herself and gave a resume of her past experience. A meeting of the Police Crime Commission (PCC) was to be held on Friday 31st January in Bromyard Public Hall between 2-3.30pm to which the public was invited. The attempted break-in at the Village Hall was discussed. PC Bennett asked that all unusual incidents be reported to Bromyard police.

19.129 i Ward Councillor Jonathan Lester gave a report on his recent meeting with the Police Crime Commissioner, recent budget proposals and other Herefordshire Council matters, including the proposed southern link road, children's services, adult social care,

homelessness and rough sleeping. Phosphates in the Lugg were an important issue which could potentially stop development in the Lugg Valley area (North Herefordshire). Ward Councillor Lester agreed this was a pressing issue, to be dealt with urgently by Herefordshire Council

PC Bennett, PCSO Berrett and Ward Councillor Lester left the meeting at 8.25.pm

The Agenda order was then resumed

19.128 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NDP)

Councillor Morgan and Mrs Jo Davies gave an update on the four informal meetings held by the NDP group. A meeting was to be held on Wednesday 5th February 2020 in the Village Hall to formally launch the NDP, to which all Parish Councillors were requested to attend and all parishioners were invited and at which the NDP would be formally launched. Formal approval for the appointment of the NDP Consultant would be sought and the Grant application made at February's Parish Council meeting.

19.130 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A resident next to the Newlands development expressed grave concerns regarding a high earth bank abutting his property which he thought should have a retaining wall and the positioning of a drainage pipe which it appeared would discharge on to his property. The Clerk was asked to contact the Newlands developers urgently.

19.131 FINANCE: Current Account balance as at 1st January 2020:: £7480.45

19.131 i Draft accounts from 1st November 2019 to 1st January 2020 as distributed: APPROVED.

19.131 ii The following payments were approved:

Stoke Lacy Village Hall: 4 bookings £120;

Eyelid Productions, annual website support for 2019: £100

19.132 PLANNING APPLICATIONS/PERMISSIONS

193982: Stokes Hill: retrospective permission for retention of barn for use as a cinema and gymn and retention of stables for use as ancillary residential annex, both in association with the dwellinghouse (including change of use)

After discussion, the Parish Council AGREED it had no objection to the change of use for the barn and retention of the stables as ancillary accommodation provided it was not for commercial gain and as long as they were accessed only via the original road. This Parish Council had twice objected strongly to the new driveway from the A465.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Noted: that the retrospective planning application for the driveway to Stoke Hill was still valid

Update on Newlands and Orchard Developments

No report

The Chairman noted that a hedge along Bredenbury Lane had been cut right down but should re-grow, but that this should be monitored

The Clerk was asked to follow up the Parish Council's request for a restrictions notice for Woodend Lane

Car park at factory unit: the weather had held up progress but the contractors were due to proceed on 13th

2 members of the public left the meeting at 9.07pm

19.133 HIGHWAY ISSUES

19.133 i: Speed calming measures at Crick's Green & 106 matters

The Clerk was asked to arrange a meeting between Parish Councillors, Christian Meanwell and Paul Hunter

19.133 ii Managing verges for bio-diversity: After discussion Councillors AGREED to request retention of the two/three annual cuts

19.134/135 TO SET DATE FOR SMARTWATER ROLL-OUT AND ANNUAL PARISHIONERS' MEETING

The date for the Annual Parishioners' meeting was set for 29th or 22nd April at 7.30pm, to incorporate the SmartWater roll-out and NDP update plus refreshments

19.136 TO NOTE INFORMATION SHEET and Clerk's Report

19.136 i As already emailed: Correspondence, HALC courses, etc.

19.136 ii Agreed that James Wilson run the Stoke Lacy village website; h558/e would purchase the domain name

19.136 iii Distribution of the Community Newsletter to be revised and a call for new distributors to be put in the Cider Press

19.136 iv Future presentations at PC meetings: 12th Feb 2020 Recycling. Invitations

19.137 ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR NEXT AGENDA

19.137 i Joint VE Celebrations with Village Hall

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

19.137 ii John Thomson's Footpaths Report

DATES FOR FUTURE PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS to May 2020

(all Wednesdays in Village Hall at 7.30pm):

2020: 12thFeb (recycling presentation) 11thMar; 8thApril

Annual Meetings: 29thor 22ndApril plus 2 presentations: Parishioners' Meeting at 7.30pm; 13thMay 2020: Annual Parish Council Meeting at 8pm



The meeting closed at 10.15pm

Signed..... Date.....Mionutes

Public Meeting 5th February 2020 - Publicity



Posters & Flyers distributed
Village Hall
Plough Inn
Church
January 2019



5 days to go



Banner

Why have a neighbourhood Plan?
You can find out **more**
& have your **say**

Copies of Flyers



**STOKE LACY
PARISH**
Neighbourhood
Development
Plan

YOU can find out **MORE**
& have your **SAY**

PARISH MEETING +REFRESHMENTS
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL 6.30pm WED. **5th.FEB**

Why?
If we don't
it'll be done for us



STOKE LACY PARISH
Neighbourhood Development Plan

Your neighbourhood
Your plan

PARISH MEETING +REFRESHMENTS
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL 6.30pm WED. 5th.FEB



STOKE LACY PARISH
Neighbourhood Development Plan

YOU can find out **MORE**
& have your **SAY**

PARISH MEETING +REFRESHMENTS
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL 6.30pm WED. 5th.FEB



STOKE LACY PARISH
Neighbourhood Development Plan

Why? If we don't
it'll be done for us

PARISH MEETING +REFRESHMENTS
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL 6.30pm WED. 5th.FEB

Copy of Handout



The Parish Council has set up a steering group to collect the views of the community for a Neighbourhood Development Plan. This document will have to be considered by Hereford Council when making planning decisions in future.

It is your neighbourhood
please help by sharing your thoughts

ways to make contact

PARISH MEETING
+ REFRESHMENTS
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL
6.30pm. Wed. 5th.Feb.



TONIGHT

Post Box Label



Parish Meeting + refreshments
STOKE LACY VILLAGE HALL 6.30pm. Wed. **5th. Feb**

Developers are targeting parishes
without a neighborhood plan

We're **vulnerable**




Have your say
It's **your neighbourhood**

UR vulnerable

PARISH MEETING
+ REFRESHMENTS STOKE LACY VILLAGE
6.30pm. Wed. 5th. Feb.

Display Material



Stoke Lacy Parish – NDP Parish Meeting at 6.30 pm 5th February 2020 – Stoke Lacy Village Hall

Notes

Attendees: Chair of the meeting, Janet Ivison (Parish Council chairman) and 60 members of the public. Jonathan Lester (Ward County Councillor) joined the meeting at 6.50pm after item 1.

Guest: Lynda Wilcox (Chief Executive of Herefordshire Association of Local Councils).

1. LW explanation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan process

- a. An NDP enables parishioners to work to ensure future development happens where they want it to be not where developers want it to be.
- b. It is the first time a parish council can compile a legal document that the planning authorities must consider when making decisions. Although there is no guarantee that the planning authorities will not contradict the terms of a parish NDP in their decision, it is the only ‘ammunition’ available to parishes in the planning process.
- c. It is the role of residents to identify the type of development they want to see and to define where it should and should not be.
- d. The parish council can apply to central government for a grant of up to £9k p/a. This enables the engagement of a planning consultant, which is essential. The consultant can frame the document in the appropriate format and language to comply with the core strategy of Hereford Council.
- e. Stoke Lacy parish council has already decided to go ahead with an NDP and some parishioners have already volunteered to take part in a steering group (SG). The SG is an informal sub-committee of the parish council. It is up to the parish council via the clerk to notify the parish of when steering group meetings take place. Meetings must be held in public and anyone can attend. Notes and schedules of meetings will be published on the p/c website.
- f. Once the planning consultant is appointed, they will advise the SG and PC as to the best process. Some parishes opt for a questionnaire approach for consultation, others opt for a streamlined approach whereby a draft plan is produced first which goes out for public consultation. Following which amendments are agreed by the parish council, a defined NDP is produced by the consultant. This stage is known as Regulation 14 and the document is circulated along with an environmental report to all parishioners as well as other outside bodies, e.g. neighbouring parishes, Welsh Water, the Highways Agency etc.
- g. Once comments have been received amendments are made and the consultant makes a revised plan. This takes the process to Regulation 16, where the plan is submitted for inspection to Herefordshire Council. The PC can choose an inspector, who may advise some changes to the plan before the NDP is submitted to a parish referendum. Once the referendum is passed the NDP is ‘made’ and has legal weight.
- h. Throughout the NDP process of about 18 months the PC will hold 2 or 3 public consultations, in addition to regular steering group meetings, where views will be canvassed. The public may suggest development opportunities and express their views. Sub-committees may be formed to assess a variety of issues such as environment, business, roads etc but all will report back to the SG and every step must be approved by the PC.

- i. Stoke Lacy is one of a handful of Herefordshire parishes which have not yet made their NDP.
- j. LW asked for a show of hands amongst the meeting as to whether they agreed that an NDP should go ahead. The majority agreed.

2. Responses to questions and comments from the public

- Currently NDPs are valid until 2031, although they must comply with Hereford Council's core strategy and so current NDP's are revised every two years. Hereford Council is reviewing its core strategy so changes may be made which will have to be complied with by NDPs.
- An NDP defines where development should or should not take place it cannot say there is to be no development. Most NDPs exceed the target of houses set by Hereford council for the parish. Stephanie Kito, Herefordshire Council's designated officer for the Stoke Lacy NDP project, will advise exactly what the target for the parish is.
- Settlement areas will be defined by the NDP, they do not give developers carte blanche to develop. Developers will want to develop why not use the NDP to protect most of the parish?
- The NDP is about defining development not stopping it. Herefordshire Council is very supportive of NDPs. It is best to start sooner rather than later as developers start to look where no NDP exists.
- Smaller areas for development of a few houses can be specified rather than larger scale development.
- It would still be possible for some small granny annex development to be included as a policy.
- Traffic measures and transport infrastructure can be taken into account in an NDP – suggest this is handled by a sub-group within the NDP SG.
- Possible to say that although the target for housing has been met but to define further development in particular areas. Herefordshire is playing a local part in the national planning system and the NDP allows the parish to look ahead and plan for future development.
- It is possible for the NDP to have input into the type of housing: low cost/affordable. Building materials, style of building. Also, larger developers need to contribute Section 106 funds which will help with infrastructure projects. Traffic calming, signage, schools, etc.

- It is possible to define specific facilities like a shop, but it must be sustainable i.e. there would need to be someone to run it. Often these are run as community enterprises.
- It is possible that had the parish undertaken an NDP earlier it may have had more influence on number, type of housing in the new housing developments in the village etc. But the NDP only has weight once it has been made. It cannot affect developments that have already passed the planning stage.
- The process should be one of discussion not dictatorship.
- The NDP is a legal document which planners must consider when making a decision. There are many examples where NDPs have been used effectively to fight planning applications.
- There is no specific definition of rural in this context it is something defined within the context of any planning decision.

3. Other Comments and Questions

- Comment: It is important that new development includes genuinely affordable housing for young people. The current new development has insufficient provision.
 - Comment: Some of the questions and comments made this evening could be seen as being unwelcoming towards member(s) of the public who have moved or are about to move into the Newlands Estate.
 - Comment: None of the comments are meant to offend new parishioners it is the developers and the 'system' which has caused problems.
 - Comment: As a newcomer to the village this person found some comments upsetting but the Newlands development had given him the opportunity to move from Birmingham into this rural area.
 - Comment: The steering group has set up a specific website which is linked to the parish council website. The new site: stokelacy.co.uk is under development but will include all notes and details of meeting and have a forum element in which comments and discussions can take place.
 - Comment: The details of the new website and details of progress of the NDP will be published in the Cider Press.
 - Comment: As far as housing development is concerned the NDP will define the settlement boundaries around existing main settlement areas. Stoke Lacy will remain a largely rural area with small pockets of development.
4. At the beginning of the NDP process community engagement can be facilitated through a questionnaire or a more streamlined process. Could there be a show of hands as to preference between the two options?

The meeting showed a majority in favour of a streamlined process.

5. Comments by Jonathan Lester

- **Comment by JL:** The NDP process is to help make planning policy NOT planning decisions. It is not the community which will make the decisions. The NDP is making a part of the policy framework which a planning officer, the planning committee or after appeal a planning inspector will use to make their decision on a particular planning application.
- **Comment from Jonathan Lester:** Although he is pleased that Stoke Lacy is undertaking the NDP, it is a very challenging process which involves a lot of work for the SG. He encouraged those attending and the wider community to support the SG in its work. Done well the NDP can be something very positive for the community for old neighbours and new.
- **Comment by JL:** Planning decisions are not black and white. The key is that planning decisions are judgements based on the facts of the case in the context of the planning policies.

6. Questions to Janet Ivison

- **When are the 30mph speed restriction signs being extended to the Bromyard side of the Newlands estate?**

Jl: The Section 106 funds from Sanctuary Housing (for the Newlands development) have only just been paid to the council, so the changes can now be implemented. But there is no specific timetable as yet.

- **How many houses need to be developed on a site to trigger Section 106 funding?**

Jl: Anything over 12 properties in any one development.

- **Question: How many houses need to be developed on a site to trigger Section 106 funding?**

Jl: Anything over 12 properties in any one development

7. LW asked members of the public to identify any areas where further development should be avoided or what factors should be taken into consideration when deciding on development for the NDP – Schedule below taken from LW's notes.

Areas for protection:

- Protect vicinity of the Church
- Protect Netherwood

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

- Wood end Lane not to be considered due to access problems

Housing considerations:

- No more housing in Newlands Area
- No more 'Town Houses'
- Suggest timber framed houses
- Suggest eco housing
- Affordable housing for young people
- Annexes, garden developments and bungalows to be supported by Parish Council even outside the NDP Settlement Boundary

General Neighbourhood considerations:

- Maintain character of the area
- Trees – re-wooding
- Bus service improvements
- Speed on main road is a problem – should we have humps and SIDS?
- More footpaths on side of road
- Protecting the night sky from light pollution

NDP process specific:

- No questionnaire (Only 1 vote)
- Dedicated website
- Ensure discussions are held with landowners

Others:

- Tourism
- Considerations for an aging population

8. At the end of the meeting LW circulated to gather contact details of those interested in participation in the NDP. Contact details to be passed to the clerk for use in the distribution list.
9. The next meeting of the NDP steering Group is Wednesday 12th February at 6pm at the village hall.

The formal part of the meeting closed at 7.45pm.

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Wed 12 th Feb	18:00	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 12 th Feb 19:30
Wed 4 th Mar	To be re- scheduled		NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:00	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Further ahead NDP Steering Group dates: 6th May, 3rd June, 1st July, 5th August, 3rd September, 7th October, 4th November and 2nd December.

Parish Council Minutes – 12th Feb 2020

11th March 2020 by Bill Morgan

STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL

-

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 12th February 2020 in Stoke Lacy Village Hall at 7.30pm

Present:

Councillors Janet Ivison (Chairman), Anne Reece, Helen Bufton, Bill Morgan and John Westwood

In attendance: Mrs Alma Westwood (Clerk); PCSO Susan Berrett; 15 members of the public

The meeting commenced at 7.35pm

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Craig Cornish and Alastair Lewis from Herefordshire Council who were to give the presentation on Recycling

19.138 To receive and accept APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Ward Councillor Jonathan Lester; accepted

19.139 To receive DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR PERSONAL INTEREST on Agenda items
None declared

19.140 To receive a PRESENTATION ON RECYCLING

Craig and Alastair gave a talk on what could and could not be recycled in the green household recycling bin and the kinds of materials which could be recycled but must be taken to the Household Waste Site for this purpose. Their main message was 'Do not produce waste if avoidable: recycle by donating to charities etc; recover; landfill.' They explained that most non-recyclable rubbish was burned for energy and metals etc. recovered from the ash and In response to a query, the meeting was told this country does not send its rubbish abroad for disposal any more. The Government was aiming for a more consistent service across the whole country and to have 65% recyclable by 2035 as opposed to the 40% recycled as of 2020.

At the end of their presentation, everyone was encouraged to contact Herefordshire Council's waste management website for more information.

The Chairman thanked Messrs Cornish and Lewis for their most interesting and informative presentation.

Messrs Cornish and Lewis and 11 members of the public left the meeting at 8.50pm.

19.141 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING held on 8th January 2020. These were approved and signed

The Chairman then moved that item 19.143 i and ii be brought forward; **AGREED**

19.143 WARD COUNCILLOR'S AND POLICE REPORTS

19.143 i The Clerk gave Ward Councillor Lester's verbal report that at the forthcoming Herefordshire Council meeting on 10th February he would be urging the Council to deal with the potholes in the area

19.143 ii CSO Susan Berrett spoke about rural theft and the forthcoming SmartWater roll-out to take place on 29th April at 7pm. The new 'We Alert' service via an app would be brought to the next parish Council meeting in March. People could sign up to the Rural Watch and Community Messaging services

The Chairman requested a speed check in the village, preferably by the village hall; CSO Berrett to organise; Councillor Morgan to contact Ian Conolly regarding 'Operation Snap' signs and a possible speed camera van for Crick's Green

CSO Berrett left the meeting at 9.10pm

The Agenda order was then resumed

19.142 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NDP)

19.142 i The notes from the NDP meeting held on 5th February would be presented at March's Parish council meeting. These notes had not been forwarded to all Councillors for their attention. The Chairman thanked the Steering Group for their work and Jo Davies for taking the notes.

19.142 ii The approval of the appointment of Mr David Nicholson as NDP Planning Consultant was held over to March's Parish Council meeting; Steering Group was still working with him

19.142 iii Approval of the Grant application: held over till March's Parish Council meeting

19.142 iv A report on the Public Meeting held on Wednesday 5th February 2020 was delivered. At this meeting Mrs Lynda Wilcox from HALC explained what an NDP was and what it entailed. 62 members of the public were present and it was **AGREED** that an NDP for Stoke

Lacy Parish be made. 15 people gave their email contact details to Mrs Wilcox when she asked for volunteers to help the Steering Group as and when required, these details to be held by Mrs Wilcox and the Clerk as per GDPR. A briefing would be sent out to volunteers via the clerk. The Village Hall Big Breakfast would be a good event for community engagement. Clerk to send Service Level Agreement to NDP team at Hereford for signing
Next NDP Public Meeting: Wednesday 4th March 2020 at 6.30pm in the village hall

19.144 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – None

.19.145 FINANCE: Current Account balance as at 1st January 2020: **£7280.45**

19.145 i Draft accounts from 1st January to 1st February 2020 as distributed: **APPROVED.**

19.145 ii The following payments were approved:

HALC annual subs **£406.46**; replacement cheque for Cider Press **£400** (Nov chq mislaid)

19.145 iii Payment of expenses for NDP public meeting 5.2.2020 held over

19.145 iv Ownership of new Village website: James Wilson currently hosted and the NDP Steering Group would be invoiced for the £40 annual fee

A move to on-line banking was discussed; agreed to stay as at present for the time being

19.146 PLANNING APPLICATIONS & on-going developments

193982: Stokes Hill: retrospective permission for retention of barn for use as a cinema and gymn and retention of stables for use as ancillary residential annex, both in association with the dwellinghouse (including change of use): valid. Retrospective planning application for the driveway to Stoke Hill: valid; retrospective permission for fishing lakes etc at Moreton Jeffries: valid

Update on Newlands and Orchard Developments

Earth bank and pipe at Newlands: Clerk was requested to contact Herefordshire Council Planning Dept. as there had been no update from the Newlands developers. A query was raised on the public open spaces on Newlands; these were on their plans

19.147 HIGHWAY ISSUES

19.147 i Speed calming measures at Crick's Green & 106 matters: too expensive to have a SID at Crick's Green; a double line would suffice. Other issues see 19.143ii above

The Clerk was asked to make an appointment with Paul Hunter, 2nd or 9th March, 10am

19.147 ii Woodend Lane signage: clerk to pursue

19.147 iii Footpaths Report: John Thomson was thanked for his comprehensive report. It was agreed that the give a full report to Council twice a year, at the Annual Meeting in May

and in September, with updates regularly to the Clerk for information. Responsibility: stiles were landowners' and bridges were BalfourBeatties'. Mr Thomson suggested a working party be formed to sort out the 'pushed' bridge on Little Cowarne footpath. (For CP) Thanks to Councillor Morgan for attending the Highways course and notes thereon. Paul Hunter to be notified of flooding outside Crossways on A465.

19.148 VE 75th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS Saturday 9th May @ 3pm

It was AGREED that some of the £522.81 remaining in Parish Council funds from the Diamond Jubilee celebrations be used to fund this event, to be held jointly with the church,

Parish Council and Village Hall. Food to be purchased, and prepared at the village hall

19.149 ROTA FOR CLEANING BUS SHELTER

March/April: Anne; May/June: Bill; July/August: John; Sept/Oct: Bill; Nov/Dec: Alma; Jan/Feb: Janet etc for 2021. It was noted Christian Meanwell confirmed that this Parish Council owns the bus shelter

19.150 TO NOTE INFORMATION SHEET and Clerk's Report

19.150 i As already emailed: Correspondence, HALC courses, etc.

19.150 ii The Clerk was requested to contact the Community Newsletter with a request for new deliverers for the magazine in Stoke Lacy.

19.150 iii The Cider Press is looking for a new treasurer and distribution co-ordinator

19.151 ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR NEXT AGENDA

Community Resilience Plan; notes etc. from NDP Steering group; possible part funding of repairs to car park near the church

The Chairman then read out a letter of resignation from Councillor John Westwood, who would be stepping down at the end of this meeting. He was thanked for his work at a Parish Councillor over the last 6 years. The Clerk would contact the Elections Office at Hereford to enquire how to proceed to fill this casual vacancy.

DATES FOR FUTURE PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS to May 2020

(all Wednesdays in Village Hall at 7.30pm):

2020: 11th March with Ian Baker, manager of Health, Safety & Resilience Team;
8th April

Annual Meetings: 29th April Parishioners' Meeting at 7.00pm with NDP & SmartWater
presentations; 13th May 2020: Annual Parish Council Meeting at 8pm

Signed..... Date..... Parish
Council M

HALC

Publicity in the Cider Press

NDP information
go to website

stokelacy.co.uk

NDP Steering Group meetings are open
for the parishioner to have their say
check website for details

Copy of Letter to Residents – Post public meeting



On behalf of the Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group

Hello,

Thank you for attending the parish meeting on 5th of February and for signing up to receive emails about progress of Stoke Lacy's Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). We hope you agree that it was an informative evening, with more than 60 people attending, and with a first chance to gather some thoughts on what the parish feels are important priorities for the vision of Stoke Lacy's future. We are developing plans to hold another open meeting in July, or sooner if we can manage it and, in the meantime, there will be an opportunity to share your views at the Village Breakfast on 18th April.

Hopefully you may feel that you want to participate in the process by joining us at our NDP meetings or if you have the time, becoming a volunteer to help with some of the activities that will emerge as we develop the draft NDP.

Our most recent steering group meeting was on 12th and we're sorry if you weren't able to attend.

We did have some public participation in the meeting and it gave the current steering group members an opportunity to explain what we've been doing over the past three months since the parish council decided to embark on the NDP. Some of you may remember past attempts at driving an NDP so this is the parish council's 4th attempt and only now has there been sufficient voluntary help to get the ball rolling. Since November we have started to digest the extensive range of guidance from Herefordshire Council and to liaise with Lynda Wilcox, who you all met at the parish meeting, as well as beginning the process of finding a planning consultant to guide us through the detailed process ahead.

We also had a chance to introduce ourselves and the roles we are currently playing on the steering group. Our members are: -

- Bill Morgan – Lead Coordinator (Temporary)
- Alma Westwood – Clerk
- James Wilson – Deputy Lead Coordinator and IT Support
- Jo Davies – Communication Coordinator
- Carole Leonard – Graphics & design
- Meg Warren – Volunteer Coordinator
- Marcel Carrier – Financial Controller

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

- Phil Platt – Project Planning and Technical

The steering group members live across the whole parish, in Cricks Green, Stokes Lane, Woodend Lane, Stoke Cross and by the church. Our major role is as a sub-committee of the parish council, we have no decision-making powers, we merely make recommendations to the parish council who are the final decision makers.

As we move forward through a process which should take 18 months to 2 years, we will be making every effort to engage the whole community through a series of public meetings, a questionnaire and other opportunities such as village breakfasts, coffee mornings and, of course, our steering group meetings.

In yesterday's steering group meeting in the village hall, one member of the public said how disappointed they were in the provision of affordable housing for young families that the Newlands development has provided. Although some local young people have been able to buy a home there, many would like to remain close to their existing families but cannot afford to buy.

It was also mentioned that there is little or no public outside space for children and that a playground would be a good addition to the community. On a similar theme they are keen to see the public rights of way maintained and perhaps improved for dog walkers through new style dog-friendly stiles.

This is one area which the parish council is already trying to improve with the new footpaths officer having reviewed all the parish's footpaths with a view to gathering a volunteer working party under the supervision of Balfour Beatty.

We welcome more public participation at future meetings; indeed, it is essential as we begin to formulate the NDP with the village.

Bill Morgan, current lead coordinator, expressed the wish that the NDP brings the community together in a more cohesive way as well as providing some armour to help us shape future developments taking place in the parish. Otherwise Hereford Council and building developers will have the upper hand over decisions that affect our community.

We hope to see you again soon and welcome your thoughts and comments.

Many thanks and please do not hesitate to contact us.

Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group.

<https://www.stokelacy.co.uk/> <https://stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk/>

Our future meetings for the next few months are as follows: -

Wednesday 4th March 18:30 – NDP Steering Group at the village hall

Wednesday 1st April 18:30 – NDP Steering Group at Plough

Wednesday 6th May 18:30 – NDP Steering Group at Plough

Wednesday 3rd June 18:30 – NDP Steering Group at Plough

Wednesday 1st July 18:30 – NDP Steering Group at Plough

Some useful resources:

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200140/planning_and_building_control/541/neighbourhood_planning

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/downloads/download/491/neighbourhood_development_or_der_documents

NDP Meetings				Parish Council Mtgs For info.
Date	Time	Location	Meeting details	
Wed 4 th Mar	18:30	Village Hall	NDP Steering Group Meeting	Wed 11 th Mar 19:30
Wed 1 st Apr	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Apr 19:30
Wed 6 th May	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 13 th May 19:30 Annual Parish Mtg
Sat 18 th Apr	09:30	Village Hall	Village Breakfast and NDP display	
Wed 3 rd Jun	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 10 th Jun 19:30
Wed 1 st Jul	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 8 th Jul 19:30
Wed 5 th Aug	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 12 th Aug 19:30
Wed 2 nd Sep	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 9 th Sep 19:30
Wed 7 th Oct	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 14 th Oct 19:30
Wed 4 th Nov	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 11 th Nov 19:30
Wed 2 nd Dec	18:30	Plough	NDP Steering Group	Wed 9 th Dec 19:30

Appendix 2 - Call for Sites Publicity, Summer 2020

Poster



**STOKE
LACY** Neighbourhood
PARISH Development
Plan

Call for Sites


Proposed sites will be assessed by independent planning consultants (AECOM) and then submitted to the community for final decision at a public meeting later this year. Community approved sites will then be included in the NDP. If a site is approved it will still need to go through the Herefordshire Council planning process.

close date
19th. August

information and submission form
go to website
stokelacy.co.uk

NDP Steering Group meetings are open
for parishioners to have their say
check website for details

Church Notice Boards



Other Notices



Poster publicity
'Call for Sites'

Stoke Cross
- Village Hall

Stoke Lacy
- Church

July/August 2020



Parish Notice Board



Village Gate



Local Publicity for Submitted Sites



**STOKE
LACY
PARISH**
Neighbourhood
Development Plan

**All submitted sites for
potential development
and the AECOM report
now on the website**

**making
progress
in these
difficult
times**

Have a look
we need to know
what **YOU** think

www.stokelacy.co.uk

Latest News (Cider Press)

**Call for
Sites**

close date
19th. August 2020

Copy of Email / Letter to Landowners

Thank you for taking the time to submit your site option following our Call for Sites as part of the ongoing development of our Neighbourhood Plan. Despite the constraints of Covid-19 regulations, the Steering Group continues to work on the development of the NDP. As a small group of volunteers who are all part of the community and struggling like everyone else with the many challenges we have faced for the last year, including home schooling and work commitments etc, processes have taken longer so we can only apologise if you feel that you are receiving this report later than expected.

The Steering Group has considerable professional expertise at hand to support the development of this plan. For the Call for Sites process we are supported by AECOM one of the world's top engineering and design groups providing planning, consulting, architectural and engineering design services. AECOM has assessed the suitability of all the sites regarding access, flood risk, drainage etc together with environmental and heritage considerations and it should be stressed that this assessment is not a recommendation for development.

The AECOM report is attached and has been sent to you prior to public release when it will be available on the NDP website.

The report will also be included in a summary consultation document about policies and sites due to be circulated to the community in early April.

Kind regards
Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group

Copy of Letter / Email to Parishioners

DATE.....

Dear Parishioner.

Despite the constraints of Covid-19 regulations, the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Steering Group, under the direction of the Parish Council, continues to work on the development of our Neighbourhood Plan. We are a small group of volunteers who are all part of the community and struggling like everyone else with the many challenges we have faced for the last year including home schooling and work commitments. Despite this we are encouraged that we have been able to maintain progress and, although face to face meetings have been impossible, we have done all we can using permitted and remote options to keep the project on track and you informed.

Creating an NDP is a prescriptive process with national guidelines. Part of the process can include what is called a 'Call for Sites' whereby the community and stakeholders are asked if they wish to submit any land for potential development in the future that, if approved, could be included in the NDP. The Steering Group has considerable professional expertise at hand to support the development of this plan and for this process we are supported by AECOM one of the world's top engineering and design groups providing planning, consulting, architectural and engineering design services.

AECOM has assessed the suitability of all the sites regarding access, flood risk, drainage etc together with environmental and heritage considerations and it should be stressed that **this assessment is not a recommendation for development.**

The AECOM report is available here (LINK) and we now need you to review it and let us have your thought about which, if any, should be included in the NDP

You can comment by:

email at comments@stokelacy.co.uk

phone.

collection boxes situated at

Understanding the Process of Developing a Neighbourhood Plan

Insert You Tube link

Thank you for your time

Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group

NDP Communications August 2020

As you may know, as part of the NDP we are performing a 'Call for Sites' across Stoke Lacy Parish in order to assess whether we have any suitable areas for small developments. Even though we have met our housing targets, it is to our advantage to understand if we have any further capacity and we can then, as part of the NDP, design policies around what housing we would prefer.

By coincidence, on Monday 3rd August Herefordshire Council asked all landowners and developers across Herefordshire (with an NDP or without) to submit any potential sites.

***Herefordshire Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)
2020- Call for Sites***

'The Council's Strategic Planning Team are preparing a 'call for sites', whereby landowners, agents or developers are invited to submit sites in order for them to be assessed on their potential to accommodate future development.'

Although it's not clear exactly why Herefordshire Planning have requested sites at this time, it could be for a number of reasons:

- Possible shortfall in development in the current core strategy to 2031
- Delays in Hereford By Pass putting pressure on surrounding areas
- Increase in housing demand across Herefordshire due to Covid 19 'working from home' and more people leaving the cities for a better way of life
- Pressure from government to boost the economy through building projects

Either way it makes it even more important that we deliver our NDP and get some control and say in what is built in our Parish.

As if to emphasise this point, Munderfield do not have an NDP. There are currently 3 separate sites that are for sale with potential developments on each which could total an additional 18 houses if they are all sold and built. Having spoken with a Munderfield resident, they are not happy with the amount of building but are resigned to accepting that it will probably happen and they have little say in what these developments will look like.

If they had an NDP, they would at least have some policies in place and would have more of a say in what is designed and built.

Bill Morgan

Stoke Lacy NDP update October 2020

Stoke Lacy NDP and Herefordshire Council have now completed their 'Call for Sites' and in total, we received 12 proposed sites for development within the Stoke Lacy Parish. These are of varying sizes and are located in Stoke Lacy, Stoke Cross and several in more rural areas.

The next steps are:

- An independent technical review by AECOM (planning consultants) of the 12 sites – now in progress
- Parish Council review and approval of community communications (Issues & Options document with questions and comments) – 14th October
- Distribution of community communications to all Stoke Lacy residents – commences 15th October
- Village Hall open NDP session – Wednesday 18th November 18:30 to 20:00
- Village Hall open NDP session – Saturday 23rd November 10:00 to 12:00
- Individual phone NDP session – phone 0800 XXX XXX to book a call (if unable to attend Village Hall)
- All responses to Issues & Options questions to be returned by 15th November

From the responses gained from the community, we will draft the final NDP document which will be presented to the Parish Council early 2021 and a Stoke Lacy NDP referendum on the final NDP outcomes scheduled.

Please note, the final technical review of the proposed sites for development from AECOM will not be available until December after which these sites will be reviewed by the Parish Council and submitted to the community for approval/rejection and comments.

If you have any questions in the meantime, please contact me.



Bill Morgan

Email: morgg@aol.com

Appendix 3 – Issues and Options, November 2020

Publicity

Screenshots of Parish Council Website



Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Re: Issues & Options summary

Stoke Lacy NDP – NDP Website

+

← → ↻ stokelacy.co.uk

This is your Parish.....your plan.....so have your say.

Here is a summary version of the Issues & Options with questions and feedback delivered to all Parishoners [Issues & Options – Summary and Questions](#) (click to open)

Here is a copy of the full Issues and Options document developed by the NDP Steering Group [Issues & Options – full document](#) (click to open)

Here are the responses to the call for sites in August [Call for Sites – Proposed sites for development \(locations\)](#) (click to open)

Here are the proposals for Settlement Boundaries [Settlement Boundaries options](#) (click to open)

[Word copy of Questions and Comments](#) (Instructions: open Word document, download onto your local drive, complete form and save. Send a copy to comments@stokelacy.co.uk)

[PDF Copy of Questions and Comments](#) (Instructions: open PDF document, print a copy, complete form in black ink, scan into your computer. Send a copy to comments@stokelacy.co.uk)

If you experience any problems, please either email comments@stokelacy.co.uk or phone **01885 448102**

2020 6:30

[Proposed sites for development](#)

[Agenda 30th September](#)

Recent Comments

jameswilson on [Proposed sites for development](#)

caroleleonard on [Proposed sites for development](#)

Re: Issues & Options summary

Stoke Lacy NDP – NDP Website

+

← → ↻ stokelacy.co.uk

If you experience any problems, please either email comments@stokelacy.co.uk or phone **01885 448102**

Your chance to shape Stoke Lacy's future

What are the benefits of producing a Neighbourhood Development Plan?

A Neighbourhood Development Plan can help the community play a greater role in shaping the future of their area. It can bring together local residents, businesses, community groups, landowners and developers to share ideas and build consensus about what development needs to be implemented and what is beneficial for the local community. It can also help build relationships between the local community and service providers. A neighbourhood development plan (NDP) offers communities the only real opportunity to set the priorities and design principles for planning within their area. Without one, a neighbourhood can be exposed to whatever development the local council and developers deem necessary.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan entails considerable work and community involvement and engagement will be essential if the project is to be successful. An NDP Steering Group has been set up under the responsibility of the Parish Council who are working actively on behalf of the community.

Background to NDP project 2019 – 2020

Following an invitation to all Stoke Lacy residents from the parish council, a public meeting was held on the 6th October

Re: Issues & Options summary

Stoke Lacy NDP – NDP Website

+

← → ↻ stokelacy.co.uk

Background to NDP project 2019 – 2020

Following an invitation to all Stoke Lacy residents from the parish council, a public meeting was held on the 6th October 2019 to establish whether there was interest in developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stoke Lacy. At that meeting a representative from Herefordshire council introduced the subject and provided information about NDPs. After a discussion, a vote was held amongst the members of the public attending and it was agreed that a steering group should be formed to move forward with a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the parish.

Everyone from the Parish was invited to an initial launch of the NDP project on Wednesday 5th February 2020 at Stoke Lacy Village Hall to start sharing a vision for our community. Around 60 members of the community attended and HALC (Herefordshire Association of Local Councils) hosted the meeting to describe and outline the requirements of the NDP and how important it is for Parishes to have an input to local planning decisions.

For more detailed information on NDP's please visit Herefordshire Council website [here](#)

Or you can contact the clerk of the Stoke Lacy Parish Council, Alma Westwood 01885 490286 parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk

[SG Login](#)

© 2020 Stoke Lacy NDP • Built with GeneratePress



Everyone
have *your* say
it's *your* NDP

www.stokelacy.co.uk
phone.01885 448102




The next NDP Meeting is:

Wednesday 3rd November

7pm in the Plough Inn.

Email contact@stokelacy.co.uk for more information.

Appendix 4 - Copy of Issues and Options Summary and Questionnaire delivered to all Households



Introduction

Stoke Lacy Parish Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) to guide future development in the Parish up to 2031. An NDP is a planning policy document and once finished, Stoke Lacy NDP will be used to help Herefordshire Council determine planning applications in the Parish. The NDP has to sit within the strategic planning framework of Herefordshire Council (set out in the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031) and the National Planning Policy Framework or NPPF. The process also has to follow a set of legal regulations.

A Steering Group of local people and parish councillors has been meeting regularly since late 2019 to progress work on the Stoke Lacy NDP. As a first step, an Issues and Options document has been prepared for public consultation.

This is a summary of the full Issues and Options document. Also included is a short questionnaire with a number of key questions and boxes for comments. We would like to know what you think about the draft vision, objectives and key planning themes we have identified so far.

Public Consultation

WEDNESDAY 18th. & SATURDAY 21st. NOVEMBER

This consultation is an important opportunity for you to find out more and have your say at an early stage. There will be several more public consultations on the NDP over the coming months (including on possible housing sites) and at each stage we will consider all responses very carefully and use them to shape the Plan's policies and proposals. We are committed to keeping everyone informed at all stages and making sure all points of view are listened to. At the very end of the process there will be a local referendum and everyone on the electoral register will be invited to vote on whether the NDP should be used to determine planning applications.

Stoke Lacy Parish

The two villages of Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy are the main settlements and new development such as housing and employment will continue to be concentrated here. The parish population is around 340 and it has an ageing profile. The wider parish has a very rural character of scattered farms, hamlets and individual houses set within an attractive undulating landscape of pasture, woodland and orchards. There are numerous listed buildings, a conservation area and a range of habitats including ancient woodland which support diverse wildlife. The parish has a strong sense of community and social activities are focussed on the village hall, church and pub. The NDP provides an opportunity to describe the distinctive character of the parish and to protect those features and facilities which are important to local people, whilst accommodating some sympathetic change.

Draft Vision for Stoke Lacy NDP

Stoke Lacy is a rural community which wishes to retain its distinctive character of historic and heritage assets while allowing the community to flourish and develop. By 2031, residents of Stoke Lacy will continue to enjoy a high quality of life with good access to local facilities and to the exceptional countryside around the parish.

Draft Objectives for Stoke Lacy NDP

Objective 1: To ensure that there is sufficient housing of mixed types to meet the needs of the local people.

Objective 2: To protect and enhance the natural environment of the parish including local landscape character, important public views, wildlife habitats and biodiversity and to protect the smaller surrounding hamlets and open countryside from inappropriate development.

Objective 3: To ensure all new buildings are designed to be sensitive to local character, whilst promoting sustainability and resource efficiency.

Objective 4: To develop a greater sense of community and identity in the several separate communities that make up Stoke Lacy Parish, whilst ensuring new residents are welcome, and everyone feels safe and valued.

Objective 5: To support and enhance existing local facilities including the Village Hall, Church and Pub, and to actively encourage community involvement and engagement in Parish activities.

Objective 6: To provide a supportive framework for appropriate local economic development including tourism related facilities.

Objective 7: To improve accessibility for all so that roads and footpaths, and particularly the A465 will be safer, well maintained and have good signage.

Housing

The NDP is required to plan positively for growth, and although the minimum housing target set out in the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (15% growth or 24 new houses) has been achieved, the NDP provides an opportunity for local people to have more say in future housing. A Call for Sites has been undertaken and the 12 submitted sites will be subjected to a technical assessment and then consulted upon shortly. The Steering Group would like to understand the scale of new development which would be supported by local residents up to 2031, and residents' preferred house types and sizes.

Settlement Boundaries

Settlement boundaries are used to set out where new development is acceptable in principle. New development outside the settlement boundaries of Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross will be guided by rural area policies which only support development in a very limited range of circumstances. The Issues and Options document includes the following options for settlement boundaries as shown below. If housing sites are included in the NDP these will be within the settlement boundaries.

Stoke Cross

Option A

This provides a relatively 'tight' settlement boundary and opportunities for new development would be more limited.



Option B

This provides a more 'loose' settlement boundary and therefore there would be more opportunities for new development.



Stoke Lacy

Option A

This provides a relatively 'tight' settlement boundary and opportunities for new development would be more limited.



Option B

This provides a more 'loose' settlement boundary and therefore there would be more opportunities for new development.



The Natural Environment

Stoke Lacy parish has a distinctive rural landscape character, with cattle, sheep and arable farming as well as hops and orchards. The majority of fields are enclosed by ancient hedges: some of these have been removed to enlarge the fields, leaving individual trees. The rolling terrain provides small pockets of wild spaces and wooded corners where wildlife flourishes. There are two areas of ancient woodland at Hopton Dingle and Huddle Wood and other woodlands include Netherwood and Huddle Mill. Several streams and waterways flow within the area and the stream from Hopton Dingle flows through the village to the River Lodon. Local wildlife includes frogs, toads, newts and owls. The Red Kite once extinct in Britain is now making a comeback in our area. Streams that flow through the village to the River Lodon support kingfishers.

Key Public Views

The Steering Group have identified the following important local views:

View 1: From Stoke Cross down onto Stoke Lacy;

View 2: From Little Cowarne Road down to Stoke Lacy church and conservation area;

View 3: From Newlands down towards the Bredenbury road taking in Hall Place and the Hop Kiln and across the valley towards Pencombe; and

View 4: Of the Loddon Valley looking down towards Stoke Lacy from Woodend Lane.

Built Character

Buildings in the parish are of a mix of materials and styles. Important built heritage includes the parish church of St Peter & St Paul and Stoke Lacy Conservation Area which is located in the centre of the settlement around the church and includes buildings linked to the Morgan family. Stoke Lacy parish has 33 Grade II Listed Buildings including the church, houses, farm houses, barns, hop kilns, a wall and a churchyard cross.

Community Facilities

The village hall and the recently improved church provide a focus for community activities in the parish. The Plough Inn at Stoke Cross is a popular family run pub with an extensive menu, a bar, lounge, restaurant and function room for weddings and parties. There are no schools or nurseries in Stoke Lacy and the parish currently lacks public open space such as a play / recreation area / informal seating area for residents. The NDP could identify Local Green Spaces for protection which are of particular significance to residents.

Business and Tourism

There are several major employers in the area including Wye Valley Brewery and West Country Marketing as well as a wide range of other smaller businesses. An increasing number of people work from home. Whilst some traditional farming practices have declined, there has been diversification into more modern farming methods, renewable energy schemes and tourism.

Improving Accessibility for All

The parish has an extensive network of footpaths. The A465 connects the two main settlements. There is a limited bus service and many residents rely on private cars. The NDP could encourage development to support more sustainable transport and to link to existing walking and cycling networks.

This is **your** parish and **your** plan so have **your** say

Everyone over the age of 18 living in the parish can have their say.

Please fill in a questionnaire and return it to the boxes
in the entrance of the Village Hall or the Church Porch.

(There you will find extra copies of the questionnaire should you need them)

The questionnaire is on the NDP website which you can fill in and email to
comments@stokelacy.co.uk

This is a short summary of the first draft of Stoke Lacy's NDP for more information
go to website www.stokelacy.co.uk

The NDP boxes will be available for questionnaires and comments until the end of November.

Community Consultation

Wednesday 18th November 18.30 to 20.00
& Saturday 21st November 10.00 to 12.00
in the Village Hall

*Please note that due to the Covid-19 Pandemic and current Government restrictions on social gatherings, a maximum number of 20 people will be allowed in the hall at any one time.
Numbers entering and Corona Virus rules will be controlled at the entrance.*

You can respond to this consultation in any of the following ways:

- By completing the Issues & Options questions and feedback form and posting your responses through either of the NDP post boxes at the Village Hall or the Church Porch
- By attending the community meetings in the Village Hall (details above)
- By commenting on the NDP Website forum (comments@stokelacy.co.uk)
- By emailing the NDP Lead Coordinator Bill Morgan (morgg@aol.com)
- By emailing the Parish Clerk Alma Westwood (parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk)
- Or, by telephoning **01885 448102** and arranging to talk to a member of the NDP Steering Group (either by phone, Zoom call or socially distanced face to face)

Issues and Options Questionnaire

Questions		Comments											
Question 1: Do you support the NDP Draft Vision and Objectives? (Please tick) ✓	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No												
Question 2: Which of the options for settlement boundaries do you support? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Stoke Lacy</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> or B</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Stoke Cross</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> or B</td> </tr> </table>	Stoke Lacy	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> or B	Stoke Cross	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> or B						
Stoke Lacy	<input type="checkbox"/> A												
	<input type="checkbox"/> or B												
Stoke Cross	<input type="checkbox"/> A												
	<input type="checkbox"/> or B												
Question 3: How many new houses do you think should be provided in the parish up to 2031? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 11 - 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 16 - 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> 20 +</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 - 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 - 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 +							
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 5													
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10													
<input type="checkbox"/> 11 - 15													
<input type="checkbox"/> 16 - 20													
<input type="checkbox"/> 20 +													
Question 4: Which house types and sizes do you think are needed in Stoke Lacy Parish? (Please tick all that apply) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Family houses</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Starter homes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing for Older people</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable homes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (Please explain)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Family houses	<input type="checkbox"/>	Starter homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Housing for Older people	<input type="checkbox"/>	Affordable homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please explain)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Family houses	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Starter homes	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Housing for Older people	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Affordable homes	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Other (Please explain)	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Question 5: Should the NDP include a policy to protect and enhance local landscape character? (Please tick) ✓	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Which important local landscape features should be protected?											
Question 6: Do you support the key views identified by the Steering Group? (Please tick) ✓	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are there any other important public views? Please explain.											
Question 7: Do you agree that the NDP should include detailed policies on design? (Please tick) ✓	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Which local built character features are important and why?											

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Question 8: Should the NDP support the provision of a new public open space? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	If so, which facilities should be included? (Eg seating, play, provision for teenagers etc)
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Question 9: Should the NDP identify any Local Green Spaces for protection? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, please provide any suggestions and explain why they are so important.
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Question 10: Should the NDP support local business growth and tourism? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, what would you like to see included?
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Question 11: Should the NDP promote more sustainable travel? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please explain.
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Question 12: Are there any local transport and accessibility matters that you would like to see the Parish Council address (in partnership with other bodies such as Herefordshire Council)? (Please tick) ✓	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please explain.
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Question 13: Do you have any other comments about the NDP?						

Name:	
Address:	
Email:	


Note: All personal details will remain strictly confidential and will only be viewed by the NDP Steering Group and will not be distributed or published. All answers to the questions and comments will remain anonymous in any analysis of the completed results. Your contact details will be kept until 3 months after the final NDP referendum after which they will be destroyed.

Return completed questionnaires to the boxes
in the entrance of the Village Hall or the Church Porch.

This is a short summary of the first draft of Stoke Lacy's NDP for more information
go to website www.stokelacy.co.uk

The NDP boxes will be available for questionnaires and comments until the end of November.

Appendix 5 – Issues and Options Public Consultation Report



Question 1:

Do you support the NDP Draft Vision and Objectives?

Yes 61 93.85%

No 4 6.15%

respondents 65

Comments

1. New buildings should be more in keeping with countryside and not town houses like Newlands.
2. Objective 3. Contrast Newlands with stone houses that existed around the site before, therefore not in character. Commercial gain will always sadly overcome rules!
3. This is a significant step for our community's right to influence local development.
4. Mainly. But I think No.3 needs to accept new materials and techniques to achieve better fuel efficiency that may not be 'in character'.
5. We support the main principles.
6. These should be two separate questions. I agree with the Draft Vision however I have issues with the Draft Objectives.
 - i. Obj. 1: who are 'local people'? The parish has an ageing population so one could say housing for the elderly is priority. On the other hand incoming people (currently non-local) would have another view.
 - ii. Obj.3: What does resource efficiency mean?
 - iii. Obj. 4: I realise that COVID has had a major impact on the progress of the NDP but I don't feel that the sense of community so far has been achieved. Just publishing things online and in The Cider Press is not enough.
 - iv. Obj. 5: Again so far the NDP process is failing so far to limited social gatherings.
 - v. Obj. 6: What do the words mean?
7. Objective 1 could be widened to include people moving into the area.
8. The NDP needs to be used to 'protect' the village, not to allow easy agreement later.
9. This is a narrow question as there are 7 objectives to comment upon. There should be 7 separate questions or one strategic objective. I do however agree with the Draft Vision however in relation to the Draft Objectives
 - i. Obj.1 – There is a problematic assumption regarding 'the local people
 - ii. Obj.2 - Agreed
 - iii. Obj.3 – Agreed
 - iv. Obj.4 – Agreed – this is a major challenge for the Parish Council – they can make incomers feel very unwelcome.
 - v. Obj.5 – Agreed

vi. Obj.6 – This needs to (be) balanced in relation to the wider ‘harm’ that some commercial initiatives can create.

vii. Obj.7 – Agreed

Question 2:

Which of the options for settlement boundaries do you support?

Stoke Lacy	(A)	45	69.23%
	(B)	17	26.15%
Neither		3	4.62%
respondents		65	

Stoke Cross	(A)	47	72.31%
	(B)	15	23.08%
Neither		3	4.62%
respondents		65	

Comments

1. Less development or tighter boundaries. With Newlands and proposed development opposite pub I feel we have plenty of new housing. We already have a problem with speeding vehicles. This has to be a priority to be addressed.
2. In both instances of ‘B’ option, this seems to allow too much expansion into farmed and green areas and would appear to permit more development than is envisaged by the NDP.
3. (Stoke Lacy): Neither. Both are far too extensive. Any large-scale development alongside the river is liable to flooding. Only v. limited development should be considered within the conservation area.
4. We are outside the settlement boundary.
5. Stoke Cross A: See attachment.
6. Needs flexibility and some building in more rural areas should be allowed.
7. Stoke Cross: See attached option. The brewery site could become a large housing estate.
8. The maps are difficult to read and it is hard to see what is proposed. It would be better to define the settlement boundaries around the existing built areas and then identify if additional land is required. This can then be reconciled against the Call for Sites responses.
9. For both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross settlements boundaries should be kept tight. We should be protecting our rural identity and avoid urban commuter settlements sprawling into the countryside. We should avoid ribbon developments where homes are built directly along the A465 roadside. In reality no one wants to live too close to a busy road that is only going to get busier in the future. There is a ‘them and us’ feeling between the two settlements and the recent planning applications have damaged the relationship further. If possible, future development should work towards bringing the two settlements closer together and creating a

more cohesive village. Foot access between the two settlements needs to be improved.

10. Stoke Lacy: Neither A nor B. The boundaries are too loose.
11. A & A. However, I do not agree with including the church and graveyard within the boundary. In the event that the church is closed it would be a disaster if this were to lead to it being sold to a developer.
12. SL:A. Avoid the village migrated outwards
SC:A. Keep the compact settlement. Possible issue: Stoke Cross B does encroach on our land & could potentially restrict our view.
13. You are setting people up to have to choose a predetermined area that has been created without effective consultation. This is not an acceptable methodology. What about people that do not want any development? I note – much of the land area covered is affected by the River Lugg catchment area provisions.
14. You are setting people up to have to choose a predetermined area that has been created without effective consultation. This is not an acceptable methodology. What about people that do not want any development? I note – much of the land area covered is affected by the River Lugg catchment area provisions.

Question 3:

How many new houses do you think should be provided in the parish up to 2031?

0 – 5	17	26.15%
6 – 10	17	26.15%
11 – 15	17	26.15%
16 – 20	11	16.92%
20 +	3	4.62%
respondents	65	

Comments

1. At the most 15. The village has already grown considerably. The village will lose its identity with too many new houses. Who's going to buy them? Where is the local industry to support? It will end up being rented housing association which to me de-values the attraction of the village.
2. We already have Newlands and lapsed provision for Neil Symond's land a further 12 houses. Over 10 years 20 more than enough.
3. Really this depends on the housing type, density & quality.
4. Housing seems to be in endless demand nationally. In the context of Covid the demand is tempered by an increasing number of people escaping from London.
5. Preferably in small 1 or 2 groups which do not ruin the character of the village.
6. We must have new homes – but not necessarily on an estate such as Newlands. Over ten years 10-20 homes could easily be scattered over the parish.
7. We already have a new estate of 25 () houses recently built, and I understand there is planning permission for a further 10 or so next to the village hall. All these

houses are in Stoke Cross and to build any more would change the nature of the village. I suggest that any further building should be of separate houses, not exceeding 10, in Stoke Lacy part of the village. These would comprise a mixture of house types, individually built, respecting to the requests of villagers – but NO estate. (also relates to Q.4.)

8. Encourage younger families. Garden in-fills should be encouraged.

9. This is impossible to answer unless the needs of the parish are known. Should this be based on the target set in the Herefordshire Core Strategy or what is actually needed?

10. Stoke Cross – 0-5 homes. There should be no more large developments in Stoke Cross. The 28 homes already built and the 10 additional homes that have been agreed are enough. However, consideration should be given to small infill sites that allow for self-build homes or annexes which allow for families to expand. This would enable multi-generational families to live close and provide support to one another (childcare and help for aging parents).

Stoke Lacy – 20+ homes. There has been no significant development in Stoke Lacy for several years. The Newlands development failed to match the needs of the local people and the outstanding planned development of 10 homes in Stoke Cross will not address this either. Therefore, we may need to consider another large development to address this. There is adequate space to build homes without creating an urban feel. Stoke Lacy has the benefit of the woodland area within easy walking distance for the residents. Most Stoke Cross residents that use the woodland area undertake a car journey to access it.

11. I have ticked 2 boxes because the range 10-20 seems reasonable.

12. Without additional facilities to encourage people to shop/stay local we would lose the welcoming/inclusive feeling that the village currently has.

13. 11-15. My answer is based on new houses being infill. Also what of Simmonds' planning application' for 11 houses which has already been passed? The village has already exceeded its allocation & another estate would not be within objectives.

14. 0-5, maybe 2-3 more if agreeing with comment below. (See Q.4, comment 13)

15. 6-10. The parish has provided more than the number required, increasing by many more limits the 'village' feeling many of us have bought into.

16. 0-5. The Parish has already delivered more than the legally set expectations.

17. 0-5. The Parish has already delivered more than the legally set expectations.

Question 4:

Which house types and sizes do you think are needed in Stoke Lacy Parish?

(Multiple Choices)

Family houses	47	72.31 %
Starter homes	38	58.46 %
Housing for older people	35	53.85 %
Affordable homes	37	56.92 %
Other	18	27.69 %

respondents 65

If other, please explain / Comments

1. Larger detached houses with decent-sized gardens. Not affordable, starter or housing association. Who wants to live next to people who on the whole do not care about their property, surroundings or the environment? Not me! More bungalows for older people is a good thing.
2. Smaller, scattered.
3. Not sure what the difference is between 'starter' and 'affordable'. Whatever the housing purpose, it needs to be high quality and actually attractive & desirable – unlike the ugly, generic recent development in Stoke Cross. Some adherence to a vernacular style would be good for once.
4. It is extremely difficult to be predictive about range and type. We need much more information about needs & requirements.
5. Houses should be considered on their architectural merits but which are sympathetic to local vernacular architecture. Family houses & for younger people should be encouraged to lower the age profile of the current demography.
6. Need good mix.
7. There will always be a demand for every type of home, starters through to downsizing and everything between. (I differentiate between 'starter' and 'downsizing'.)
8. The parish needs the input of more younger families.
9. No more large developments. Differently styled houses with character. Even modern houses can fit into the environment.
10. Again difficult to answer without knowledge of the requirements of the parish or any feedback from the parish.
11. Our community needs family homes that are truly affordable. No more part buy/part rent homes. Affordable homes should be % cap of full marketplace and linked to the village. Equally, we need rented homes that are linked to the village. We must remember that not all individuals can afford or aspire to own their own homes. This should not exclude them from living in our village. With the shift towards more home working and more city dwellers wanting to buy homes in the countryside we are already seeing house prices rising. It is now more important than ever to ensure that our younger generations are not displaced. These homes should have 3 beds to allow for the younger generation to put down roots and have families. Consideration should be made for:- *enclosed safe front gardens where

you can open the front door without the fear of a child escaping onto the highway; allowing children and pets to play safely. Back gardens with enough space for ball games and vegetable plots. * Utility rooms for muddy shoes and dogs. * kitchens that are large enough for families to enjoy meals, whilst **Starter Homes** should be no smaller than two bedrooms.

12. The village should be a mix of all age groups and have appropriate facilities to reflect this, along with a variety of housing.
13. (See Q.3, comment 14) Housing for older people & affordable homes: homes in ones or twos within about 50 metres of a current dwelling.
14. Variety, maybe more individual to allow families to stay in the village. Avoid houses of the same type (such as recent new ones) which are in keeping with the village picture.
15. Locals only.
16. I think the Developments to date more than provide for what the village can manage without significant improvement of the infrastructure in the village, namely the roads and flood management.

Question 5:

Should the NDP include a policy to protect and enhance local landscape character?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

Which important local landscape features should be protected?

1. River and streams
2. Tree cover & views. No visibly prominent developments.
3. Open fields, trees and wooded areas.
4. The open green fields and countryside.
5. Scattered housing amid agricultural landscape.
6. The open green fields and countryside.
7. Woodland, hedgerows & older buildings, preservation of rural/agricultural character.
8. Public views.
9. The graveyard & Netherwood & more trees & wilding planting should be developed.
10. Church, woodland, views of the valley.
11. Public views, ancient hedgerows, the motte.
12. Farms, historic monuments, the lanes and the public footpaths.
13. The motte, the moat, woodlands.

14. Watercourses and woodlands.
15. Open farmland is our local beauty. Supporting farmers, where possible, is vital.
16. Farming makes the landscape, buildings either enhance or spoil it. There must be space for business buildings, farm buildings and homes.
17. The river needs better protection in terms of water quality & therefore wildlife that it can sustain.
18. Netherwood, the church and churchyard. All other areas of woodland. Restricted development of **existing** local industry.
19. Trees and the local environment of listed buildings. The wood on Hall Place land should be preserved.
20. Footpaths, eg. Three Choirs Way. Netherwood should be pleasant, welcoming, tidy and accessible area.
21. The rolling, undulating nature of the local landscape is lost with grouping of houses.
22. Existing trees and hedges. Low-density houses.
23. Trees, hedges, woodland, rivers & streams.
24. The parish is essentially a rural open space and should remain so. Farming land should be protected and some rewilding permitted where farming becomes unattractive. Recognition should be given to changes in farming practices of the next ten years with potential reduction in livestock rearing due to environmental concerns.
25. No street or night-time lighting schemes. Hedgerows to be protected. Avoid excessive use of signage. Improve the appearance of our verges through the built-up areas; this has been proved to slow traffic down.
26. Churchyard, Netherwood.
27. As much as possible. Any development should enhance Stoke Lacy/Stoke Cross, not make it unrecognisable.
28. The ancient woodlands, the view from Stoke Cross out towards Much Cowarne – agree with draft obj. view 4.
29. Ancient woodland and other woodlands. Streams and waterways flow.
30. Variety of countryside. Protection of wildlife. Protect views for residents.
31. Open farmland, woodland, hedgerows, streams & rivers.
32. The open countryside. The area around the church.
33. Millennium Wood. Church surroundings.
34. Stoke Lacy motte.
35. Millennium wood and river.
36. Millennium wood and river.
37. Church.

38. Many Parishioners will expect you to protect from development the areas already identified by consultation. Namely the Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

39. Many Parishioners will expect you to protect from development the areas already identified by consultation. Namely the Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

40. Church.

Question 6:

Do you support the key views identified by the Steering Group?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

Are there any other important public views? Please explain.

1. Those from Pencombe Lane on the north boundary of the parish.
2. Reduce the speed limit, get some speed cameras, plant some trees.
3. Note one of key views spoilt already by white bungalow on Ullingswick /Pencombe road!
4. From various points along Hopton Lane southwards and eastwards.
5. Plus views from footpaths.
6. From S67 south to The Malverns, west to Welsh hills & north west to Pencombe.
7. From the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the most beautiful views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.
8. ????
9. Little Cowarne road to The Malverns.
10. Any views including the wood. Views from Hopton Lane towards the village hall & the brewery. Views from the footpath (village hall/Hopton Lane) down towards the church.
11. From Hopton Lane horizon up towards horizon towards Panks Bridge.
12. From Much Cowarne road looking down onto Stoke Lacy and the area around the church.
13. Views from Westbury east, over to Pencombe and Little Cowarne.
14. Particularly the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the best views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.
15. Particularly the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the best views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.

16. I agree with all, views however are very subjective and individual for a variety of reasons and memories. What they all have in common is the rural setting and the unspoilt nature of the village, which I think should be protected.

Question 7:

Do you agree that the NDP should include detailed policies on design?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Which local built character features are important and why?

1. Designs should be considered on their individual merits in their proposed location.
2. Herefordshire stone, oak framing, thatched roofs. Stop all this red brick town houses. Good for developers, not good for local traditional trades or the environment.
3. Note my comments on stone!
4. Variety of design/emphasis on environmental impact. Avoidance of the 'housing estate' look.
5. Stone built or faced, density appropriate to the housing type.
6. Not too large and fit in with surroundings.
7. Yes, as above with regard to local architecture and stone/slate/tile.
8. Retain local character.
9. But not to stifle innovation. Futuristic can blend with traditional.
10. Local architecture to be taken into account.
11. In character with the village.
12. Grade 2 listing. Sympathetic with local surroundings.
13. If it gives the parish a view on building materials etc.
14. This is our parish, we must be allowed a say. We already have an amazing building plot with a fabulous home planned, BUT GREY brick in our beautiful red clay area.
15. Let's have innovation and tradition. I'm pro a lively mix and new ideas.
16. Trees, hedges, garden space. Local stone & brickwork for building; discreet lighting.
17. The designs of new houses should be in keeping with older houses nearby. (The Newlands development sticks out like a sore thumb.) Any outside lighting should be of low intensity, directed downwards and on a timing switch of 10 minutes maximum.
18. New housing should blend in with the local environment.
19. A mixture of styles and materials (brick, wood, slate), not repetitive housing.

20. Use of timber frame and local stone. All hard-standing areas permeable to rain water. Solar power & heat pumps at design stage.
21. That new build should not stick out as a sore thumb as some new built do.
22. There are several timber-framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if some of the housing could represent this style.
23. Design is essential. Rather than get caught up with 'in keeping' and accepting low quality design that lacks architectural merit we should aim for innovative green homes that enhance our two settlements. Herefordshire villages are being surrounded by bland modern developments which are robbing them of their identity. The Newlands estate is well spaced out, but the houses are generic and unimaginative. It is an urban development on a rural plot. We need to create a cohesive settlement of homes that we are proud of. Currently the UK is building the smallest new homes in Western Europe. We should push for rural homes that allow for families to grow into them. Let's create an environment that we are proud of. Enabling local people to stay whilst embracing new residents.
24. Eaves, Herefordshire red brick.
25. Although we have a wide variety of styles in the village we shouldn't need any more. New developments should include a mix of styles reflecting the wider village styles. Incorporate a range of hedging/tree planting which reflect the countryside – allow the housing to 'melt' into the countryside.
26. Ashperton has new oak-frame buildings, Stoke Lacy should also.
27. Sustainability, resource efficiency and energy efficiency.
28. Exterior to fit in with the locality. Eco houses.
29. Definitely as stated above (Q.5, 30). Variety and in keeping important.
30. We must make sure that new builds are in keeping with the local character bricks, stone, timber, not grey modern builds! that will stick out like a sore thumb.
31. Red brick similar to those from Burley Gate Brickworks, which most buildings in this area are made from.
32. Modern style of some buildings would be out of character.
33. In keeping with local area.
34. In keeping with local area.
35. Yes – Newlands does nothing for the area. There are several timber framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if housing could represent a more traditional style.
36. Yes – Newlands does nothing for the area. There are several timber framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if housing could represent a more traditional style.
37. Agreed, mixture of styles which I feel creates a feature in itself to the historical timeline.

Question 8:

Should the NDP support the provision of a new public open space?

Yes	57	87.69%
No	8	12.31%

respondents 65

If so, which facilities should be included? (Eg seating, play, provision for teenagers etc)

1. Dog walking.
2. Woods, trees, seating. Perhaps a play area or picnic area. Dog walking areas.
3. Already sufficient. Not a town!
4. Provision for children of all ages
5. Provision for children of all ages.
6. For what purpose? It's a rural area.
7. Provision for teenagers & separately for elderly people is needed.
8. Seating.
9. A public open space at Stoke Cross with seating?
10. For children and young to gather.
11. See Q.13.
12. All.
13. Anywhere to help people enjoy the outside. Nothing formal.
14. Just open ground. Maybe grant funded. Free access for children, adults and animals. An area maybe 2/4 acres for the village. No play equipment, just seating.
15. Seating.
16. At Stoke Cross. Facilities for seats, play area for small children, benches & picnic table.
17. Only if it is near village hall. For children playing.
18. Seating and walking.
19. Seating for older people and provision for young children (up to 12 years old).
20. Seating in church grounds and green areas in Stoke Cross.
21. Minimal provision due to maintenance & legal liabilities.
22. A play space somewhere between the two main settlement areas to enhance the cohesion of the parish. A wooded area with green space would be ideal. The existing Millennium Wood is very popular and well used but is remote. Also better access to footpaths would be good.
23. Seating and safe enclosed play/green areas (protected from the busy road) in both settlements will allow residents to meet up informally and should help create a true community feel. They should be easy to walk to, have small noticeboards to keep

residents informed of activities and become a destination place for people to walk to.

24. The old orchard beside Netherwood. The triangle between A465 and the lane to Bodenham.
25. Seating to take advantage of the views. Playing field (small). Skate/bike park. Must be easy/low maintenance.
26. I understand that the Simmonds housing development would include playground – this would be great.
27. Seating. Could seating be put in Netherwood?
28. For children to play. Seats to look at views and in wood.
29. All. But need to consider maintenance and protection of these areas.
30. We already have Netherwood – picnic/dog-walking area. Open space at Newlands. Plenty of footpaths to walk.
31. A play area.
32. Near to church, with provision for adults & children including adequate parking.
33. Cycle paths.
34. Cycle paths.
35. Place to walk dogs.
36. Be very careful however as poorly designed and/or located these can become a hotspot for antisocial behaviour.
37. Be very careful however as poorly designed and/or located these can become a hotspot for antisocial behaviour.
38. No. Would support a nature programme such as Netherwood.

Question 9:

Should the NDP identify any Local Green Spaces for protection?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

If yes, please provide any suggestions and explain why they are so important.

1. Any opportunity to develop waterside walks would be good.
2. Do I really need to spell this out! Bio-diversity, air quality, local wildlife. We moved to the country for a reason, quality of life, less people, less traffic.
3. Stoke Lacy is a countryside village and should remain so.
4. Stoke Lacy is a countryside village and should remain so.
5. All the existing green spaces, except in Stoke Cross adjacent the road, to protect the green, natural and rural environment & character.

6. Netherwood & graveyard.
7. Woodland.
8. But really dependent on whether a public open space (Q.8) is permitted.
9. Clean up Netherwood.
10. NDP has identified local green spaces but no location given.
11. Our dark skies need to be protected.
12. Woodland and footpaths.
13. Mental well-being.
14. Green space around village hall. Extend if possible.
15. Yes, only if the owner and the people who live nearby agree.
16. Especially in Stoke Cross.
17. Netherwood for its peace and tranquility.
18. Those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views.
19. Yes. The traditional standard orchard beyond the village hall should be protected. These orchards offer habitats for a wide range of flora and fauna.
20. Churchyard and Netherwood. The night sky, limit the effect of light on wildlife and views of the sky.
21. As much as possible. We live in a rural part of the country and that should be protected as much as possible, especially the wide range of wildlife that lives here.
22. As above for ancient woodland, plus area along the Lodon towards Little Cowarne.
23. The route of the Lodon throughout.
24. I'm unable to identify the local green spaces that are important to the village (being relatively new) but yes, protect views.
25. All green space needs protection.
26. Wildlife and dog walking.
27. As many as possible, for environmental protection and wellbeing of residents.
28. Netherwood.
29. Place to walk dogs.
30. Enhance & support wildlife & wildflowers/herbs.
31. Enhance & support wildlife & wildflowers/herbs.
32. All those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views and those already identified as sensitive sites.
33. All those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views and those already identified as sensitive sites.
34. Netherwood.

Question 10:

Should the NDP support local business growth and tourism?

Yes 64 98.46%

No 1 1.54%

respondents 65

If yes, what would you like to see included?

1. Coffee shop; swimming pool.
2. It should EXCLUDE any development generating high levels of traffic such as anaerobic digesters.
3. Support our local traders, help them through Coronavirus etc.
4. Traditional rural accommodation.
5. Traditional rural accommodation.
6. Agriculture & support industries. Tourism – no. This is not a tourist area. Extend the availability of high speed broadband and mobile phone signals, otherwise any development is a waste of time.
7. Local business growth is intrinsically bound up to housing, hence employment.
8. Small-scale support for holiday lets, camping, etc.
9. To support local jobs.
10. Both, but not large-scale tourism given narrow lanes. Don't want to become like Devon & Cornwall in the summer!
11. Limited development of small business.
12. Local business growth.
13. Local business growth. No tourism due to lack of infrastructure.
14. Small start-up units. Extend Woodend Lane Business. Encourage young to 'have a go' at a project.
15. Extension, if possible, of Woodend Business site, support business opportunities around the parish.
16. A farm shop for basics, ideally by WV Brewery expanding their beer shop!
17. Shop & post office.
18. Yes, but very carefully monitored. No coaches for example at the church or the brewery.
19. The footpath between Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy re-instated in a proper way for tourists to enjoy pub, church and Morgan interests. A Blue Plaque on The Old Rectory? – Someone in the Morgan factory offered to pay
20. Conversion of existing redundant farm buildings for low-key rural tourism.
21. Dependent upon the possible impact it may have on its location and residents.
22. Business development within or near the existing business areas could be considered. Tourism could be encouraged but it is not clear to whose benefit? One

of the purposes of tourism is to bring income to local businesses but there are few businesses in the parish that would benefit. The main beneficiaries will be private individuals.

23. Without further discussion I cannot comment on this. I am however against introducing caravan parks and static home development into Stoke Cross or Stoke Lacy.
24. Anything beyond basic public transport is uneconomic. Sustainable cars enable continued freedom, flexibility and convenience. Provide electric points in church car park and village hall car park.
25. Small village shop (milk, bread, newspapers). Improve/develop footpaths/history trails.
26. Yes, but not by increasing size of industrial estate or allowing caravan parks.
27. Possibly, but depends on what kind of growth & tourism. No caravan/camping sites please. No big warehouses.
28. Footpaths – clearly marked and safe footbridges. Aim to re-open old routes.
29. Small-scale, only no large companies requiring large buildings & lots of large traffic.
30. Caravan & camp site – 5-10 van site. B&B?
31. Emphasis on walking, wildlife and National Heritage.
32. Encourage local businesses (Wye Valley Brewery, Business Park, farmers) to work together for locality.
33. (for Q's 10, 11 & 12). A decent reliable bus service. Local shop/post office.
34. On a limited and incremental basis. Schemes just to benefit the individual rather than the community as a whole should be avoided.
35. On a limited and incremental basis. Schemes just to benefit the individual rather than the community as a whole should be avoided.
36. Yes, on the condition that it does not detract from the nature (of the) village.

Question 11:

Should the NDP promote more sustainable travel?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Please explain.

1. Bridle paths need to be linked up.
2. Given the rural nature of the parish some version of ring and ride would be desirable.
3. More bus services to encourage people to use public transport. Better maintenance of walkways and public footpath.

4. HMG policy not local.
5. Links between Stoke Lacy & Bromyard & Hereford.
6. Links between Stoke Lacy and Bromyard & Hereford.
7. All new houses to have vehicle charging points and use renewable energy systems. As in many advanced EU countries sustainable travel would lessen use of private cars & help to minimise pollution.
8. This is not possible on a parish scale.
9. Cycling.
10. Affordable, reliable, frequent bus service. Cycle lanes not practical given width of roads.
11. Make sure public footpaths are all open and accessible.
12. Don't fully understand the question. Do you mean make our lanes cycle lane etc.?
13. Due to location and nature of the population any scheme would not be cost effective.
14. Would live to offer advice. However, incredibly difficult in rural areas.
15. Sounds good; in practice very, very difficult when we mostly live away from bus route, electric charge points etc.
16. Village car share? Dunno but couldn't tick 'No'.
17. More public transport.
18. More frequent buses of a smaller size; cycle lanes.
19. Stoke Lacy is NOT a suitable location for more development because of the lack of public transport, a school and a shop. Extra houses should be limited to towns and large villages with a school & shop.
20. Footpaths to enable walking along main roads.
21. All new homes should have e.v. charging points.
22. All developments will need off-road parking & provision for charging electric vehicles.
23. This is a motherhood and apple pie question. Of course and it should in line with government policy. The greater use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the village hall and other locations. Car sharing schemes and shared electric bicycles should also be considered.
24. Whilst sustainable transport should be encouraged this is a difficult project to undertake. The reality is that travelling is a necessity when living rurally. Residents are always going to practice their right to transport children out of the local community to schools that are further away. Workers are going to travel to other areas and people are going to move around to socialise. Cycling is not realistic: the main roads are busy and to install cycle lanes would mean widening roads, taking out hedges and spending a disproportionate amount of money. Even if this

was done few people would utilize them on a regular basis. Cycling to work adds time to the journey and the cyclist risks arriving either wet and cold or hot and sweaty. We can have bike shed added to new development, but they don't reduce commuting. Car sharing could be encouraged. Is there anything currently in place to co-ordinate this? If so, the village could tap into it and help the residents take part in the scheme.

25. Ideally yes, but difficult as cannot guarantee enough passengers for local buses. Need examples of sustainable travel.

26. 1. Support the bus route. 2. Agree with links to cycle networks but A465 is dreadful for bikes!

27. Support and EXPAND bus services. Maintain footpaths for walkers.

28. Smaller buses, more frequent, to reduce car use. (& Q.12)

29. In principle but unsure exactly what is being thought, maybe increased bus services for those that need it.

30. This should come from central government & Herefordshire Council first. Decent public transport for one.

31. Not realistic. Cycling networks?

32. Encourage use of bus service and resist further reduction.

33. Better public transport.

34. Buses.

35. Yes – in line with government policy. The use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the Village Hall and other locations.

36. Yes – in line with government policy. The use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the Village Hall and other locations.

37. Greater links to the greater walking and cycle networks would be good.

Question 12:

Are there any local transport and accessibility matters that you would like to see the Parish Council address (in partnership with other bodies such as Herefordshire Council)?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Please explain.

1. Bridle paths. See above. Could become cycle tracks possibly. The proposals have ??? (several?) omissions, i.e. no access for riders
2. Better maintained & linked bridle paths and footpaths both for residents and visitors.

3. Buses.
4. Footpath between Stoke Cross & Stoke Lacy clearly marked and improved. Accessibility to public footpaths.
5. Bus service, smaller buses, more frequent; would more people use them?
6. Footpath between Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy clearly marked and improved. Accessibility to public footpaths.
7. We need to focus on small but regular buses in order to enhance usage.
8. Does the council not understand emissions? More houses in rural areas mean more cars on roads. If they had any common sense they would build by towns or cities where there are bus services.
9. Possibly more access to footpaths but this is costly & needs to be carefully considered.
10. Cycling.
11. As Q.11. More access for all to public footpaths by upgrading stiles.
12. For the more elderly: transport to shops, transport for days out.
13. Some staff at Wye Valley Brewery have limited bus options when travelling from Hereford.
14. Park & Ride this side of Hereford.
15. I don't feel able to comment on public transport. Having lived in Stoke Lacy for 42 years and never having access to public transport under 1 mile away. However, I see many older people in Pencombe use the 'little' bus once a week which goes to Hereford. In fact it is a life-line to them.
16. Footpath upkeep please.
17. As above. (18)
18. The footpath connecting Stoke Cross with Stoke Lacy is woefully inadequate. We need a wide footpath protected from the main road where people can walk safely and enjoyably from Stoke Cross to Stoke Lacy. It should accommodate, safely, pushchairs, bikes, small children & dogs, thus enabling us all to make the most of our lovely village. Would also encourage people to walk rather than drive when visiting the other part of the village.
19. The present path between Stoke Lacy & Stoke Cross is dangerous. A new path should be provided on the other side of the hedge from the current path.
20. Above. (20). Maintain a good bus service. Drainage on lanes to reduce flooding.
21. Poor public transport (very few buses). Could smaller buses be used? Bridge repairs on footpath routes are not being carried out.
22. Footpath from Stoke Cross to Stoke Lacy would help to bring community together.
23. To encourage relevant agencies to improve road safety on A465 from the approach to Crick's Green west to Stoke Lacy.

24. Increased bus services would be good but I suspect that they would not be economically sustainable. A permanent Speed Indicator would be a good safety feature.
25. We need to ensure that all developments have adequate parking spaces. Despite COVID restricting the number of visitors homes can have the Newlands estate already has cars parked on the pavements in the evening.
26. Increased public transport is not the way forward.
27. Improve the footpath between Stoke Lacy & Stoke Cross – ideally adding a bit between the church and Church Farm. Improve signposting on local footpaths. Try & enforce the 30mph max. limit through the village – not always adhered to!!
28. The lack of a proper pavement between Stoke Cross & Stoke Lacy, i.e. one that allows prams & child cycles is urgent – not to mention wheelchairs.
29. Improve bus service. Maintain footpaths.
30. May not be relevant, but re. parish public footpaths. These do seem to be widely accessible to all but those with larger dogs. Not much to put dog-friendly gates next to styles etc. Since moving here we've found ourselves very limited in the paths we can use which is a shame.
31. More regular bus service.
32. As above (Q11.32) but also work in partnership with any other organisation (e.g. Bromyard Community Transport) to enhanced facilities.
33. Better public transport. Not everyone has own transport.
34. A proper reliable & regular bus service, local shop/post office.
35. Lobby for enhanced bus service.
36. Lobby for enhanced bus service.
37. Safer cycling routes along the 465 to Bromyard and Hereford.

Question 13:

Do you have any other comments about the NDP?

1. Well done for putting it all together.
2. A map of the parish would have been helpful.
3. Appreciate local landowners cashing in. Good luck to them. I suspect most will move away so they don't have to deal with the fallout. Developers see our green spaces as a cash cow. Good for them, not good for locals. Plant more trees, support wildlife & biodiversity. Reduce traffic speed * improve air quality.
4. No.
5. A policy must be included to highlight the importance of light pollution and the fact that we don't want it. The night sky in Stoke Lacy is spectacular and needs protecting.

6. The NDP is supposed to represent the views of the residents not replace the Parish Council. – Delicate balance. How to encourage resident to speak? How to get response from the indifferent? Danger at referendum.
7. Speed camera please.
8. NDP is one of the most positive developments for Stoke Lacy citizens. It will impact on the community for years to come and will enhance democratic participation the planning & provision process. It would localise key issues.
9. Further advice to the planning department Hereford (sic) Council: the new building which was passed down Hall Place Lane shows how the countryside will be ruined by there (sic) disregard to keep rural areas unspoilt (sic). EG: sample that carbuncle they allowed in Little Cowarne.
10. Plant native trees on large verges and wild flower planning on verges, foxgloves, annual seeds etc.
11. A shop would be good to see, maybe volunteer one like in Burley Gate. In the village hall or pub or at Wye Valley?
12. Any open space should include seating. Play provision depends on who would use it (?very few children in village). Any equipment should reflect demography taking into account future development.)
13. We are unfortunately outside the settlement boundary, in Lower Hopton, but notice an official 'call for sites' is a field (10) next to our homes. Could we have more information on this please, and what to do in in the NDP?
14. Whilst I support some limited amount of new housing development in our village, I don't think it would be wise to increase by very much. Without a village school or shop, any new residents would have to travel by car.
15. Communities, villages, have always grown and this must continue to happen and NOT all homes must look alike (Our home is an odd-looking place). Growth, either business premises or housing need access to enough WATER, HEALTHCARE (drs' surgery bursting), SEWAGE – not such a problem as can be dealt with on site with BIODISCS etc.
16. Every village needs to grow and to thrive. However, there has to be enough infrastructure to sustain this growth. Water, sewage, doctors, schools. With regards to open space, in the light of criticism of difficulty over stiles on footpaths, purchase of an open field would be a way forward. Properly fenced, for children and dogs, it would require little in the way of maintenance, would be easily accessed and available for all ages and abilities.
17. Pleased that the NDP is acting in our best interests.
18. The settlement boundaries appear to have been drawn without any justification for the proposed options B.
19. Development on country lanes should be carefully monitored as single track lanes frequented by farm traffic make them unsuitable for heavy domestic traffic flow. Any development needs safe access with visibility not hampered by acute angle bends.

20. Encourage charging points on all new houses for electric vehicles, air source/ground source heating, solar panels.

21. It is a great shame that the SG has had to resort to a Questionnaire to try to get engagement when it was clearly agreed at the initial NDP parish meeting that people did not want one. It is not clear how the questions were identified to meet the needs of the parish – I have included comments in my completed questionnaire. The better way was obviously to engage in face-to-face meetings, and several were planned but had to be curtailed due to COVID restrictions. I fear that the NDP process has suffered considerably and has not been a community based exercise that I was hoping. Publication in the Cider Press has not helped and has felt like propaganda at times. The web site is not very user-friendly and hard to navigate. The Call for Sites process was not clearly explained and it should have taken place after draft settlement boundaries had been proposed. Clearly some sites were offered without knowledge of the intention of the Call, in particular Site 11 which was well outside any boundary.

22. I would like to thank the members of the NDP for giving up their spare time to undertake this project. New housing is a contentious topic and there will inevitably be members of our community that win or lose both emotionally and financially. We moved to Stoke Cross to live in a rural environment within a small community. We did not and do not want shops and the trappings of a town life.

23. Herefordshire will want to target Stoke Lacy for building space on frequent occasions in the future. Whilst there is a need to positively identify land for development the boundaries must be tight – e.g. don't allocate space for more than 20 and include houses not their large gardens.

24. I think the questionnaire ought to have included a 'don't know' response.

25. Well done and thank you for all your time and commitment.

26. Stoke Lacy is a lovely rural village and needs to be kept that way as long as possible. We have already reached the quota for building so need to make sure we don't get any more dense plots built. An odd one here or there is all we need! People looking to move here need to do their homework first as to what facilities there are in a rural village. Thank you to the NDP Steering Committee Group for all your time & effort. You are doing a great job for the village.

27. How were the boundaries defined? Stoke Lacy has seen enough development for the foreseeable future.

28. Re. Q.8: If recreation area near church possible, improve communications (e.g. improve footpaths) to reduce the 'two villages' perception and promote a more coherent village. Re.Q.10: Generate a consortium with website (e.g. 'Stoke Lacy Village Enterprises') to co-ordinate activities (e.g. weddings at the church, receptions at village hall, Plough Inn, etc.) to put Stoke Lacy 'on the map'.

29. The need to stress that no housing is sustainable. Population is in decline.

30. Many community members are very concerned about this process and I ask that the SG carefully assess the context and motivation of the individuals supporting the sites proposed.

There are fundamental problems with the nature of the questions asked in this document. If you are to use the simple methodology of using yes/no answers to determine an outcome you will have to give appropriate weight to the broader comments asked and the 'closed' and directive nature of the questions asked. Questionnaire design is a specific science based on skill and you could be criticized if your analysis is not valid and reliable.

Please ensure that the originally identified sensitive sites are protected, i.e. The Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

The Call for Sites process was handled in an unusual fashion. I would ask you to note that Site 11 is well outside your suggested boundaries and has considerable problems associated with it.

31. Many community members are very concerned about this process and I ask that the SG carefully assess the context and motivation of the individuals supporting the sites proposed.

There are fundamental problems with the nature of the questions asked in this document. If you are to use the simple methodology of using yes/no answers to determine an outcome you will have to give appropriate weight to the broader comments asked and the 'closed' and directive nature of the questions asked. Questionnaire design is a specific science based on skill and you could be criticized if your analysis is not valid and reliable.

Please ensure that the originally identified sensitive sites are protected, i.e. The Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

The Call for Sites process was handled in an unusual fashion. I would ask you to note that Site 11 is well outside your suggested boundaries and has considerable problems associated with it.

32. All covered above.

Appendix 6 – Publicity for the Consultation on the Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021

Copies of Posters




the **MORE**
people expressing their
opinions
the **BETTER**
the **NDP** will represent
Stoke Lacy Parish

contact:
www.stokelacy.co.uk
or phone 01885 448102
to arrange to speak to a member of the
NDP steering group



Boxes
Village Hall
& Church




**DON'T
FORGET**

FILL IT IN NOW

www.stokelacy.co.uk
phone.01885 448102



Boxes
Village Hall
& Church



RESULTS



of the **consultation**
are on the website now

www.stokelacy.co.uk

Appendix 7 – Emerging Draft Plan and Site Options, April to May 2021 -
Summary Document and Questionnaire for Households



**We need your feedback so that the Stoke Lacy NDP
reflects the views of the whole community
on future development in the parish.**

You can find a summary and the latest version of the NDP document in its entirety on the NDP website. The NDP document is very much a working draft, and it will continue to be amended and updated as we move forward. All feedback will be considered carefully, and where possible, incorporated into the final draft plan and circulated for a formal 6 week consultation later in 2021.

The Core Strategy refers to the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) 2009. This shows that Stoke Lacy falls within Timbered Plateau Farmlands Landscape type. The LCA notes this is one of the best preserved of the type in the County and in order to retain its character, it is recommended that densities remain low and development takes the form of modest additions to existing settlements or individual dwellings. This reflects many opinions expressed both at the public meeting and in the feedback from the survey therefore it is essential that it drives the content of our plan and that any development proposals

To reflect community opinion expressed in the Issues & Options survey, the settlement boundaries in both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross have been revised and drawn tightly around bricks and mortar, excluding the church and grounds and known flood areas.

The Steering Group and the Parish Council urge local residents and stakeholders to continue to share their views on the emerging policies together with all aspects covered by this consultation. This is your opportunity to have a say on future development. Going forward we will be consulting with you further on individual aspects, including the Design Codes, which you will see reference to in the policies.

It has been frustrating that current restrictions have meant that we could not have the public meetings that were planned and needed to resort to sending out documents and questionnaires. However, we are hoping to hold the legally required Annual Parish Meeting in the Village Hall during May when we will be available for general NDP discussion. (Awaiting Government Court ruling on Parish Meetings) Please be assured that the Steering Group and Parish Council are absolutely committed to engaging with and listening to as many residents and stakeholders as possible. We will continue to work hard to give everyone the opportunity to be involved at all stages.

A Summary and the full emerging Draft Plan is on the NDP website

www.stokelacy.co.uk

together with the full reports of the Issues and Options Consultation,
AECOM Site Options and Assessment Report, Herefordshire Landscape Character
Assessment and other background evidence.

Options for Site Allocations

The following options for site allocations were assessed by AECOM as suitable for new housing or potentially suitable subject to the mitigation of minor constraints and/or consultation with Herefordshire Council. The site numbering (Sites 3, 4, 5 and 6) refers to the site numbers in the AECOM Site Options and Assessment Draft Report, 2021.

It should be stressed that the results of the assessment is not a recommendation for development.

The Design Codes provide detailed design criteria for individual sites to help ensure high quality design in new development.

Potential Sites submitted by landowners for New Housing

To see more detail about each site go to the full AECOM report which is posted on the website. **The Map below shows the location of these sites.**

Option 1 - Site 3 Crossfield House, Stoke Cross could be allocated for housing development for up to **8 houses**. (AECOM Report page 30.)

Option 2 - Site 4 to the north of Westbury Road, Stoke Cross could be allocated for housing development for up to **7 houses**. (AECOM Report page 30.)

Option 3 - Site 5 OS 5041 to the east of Westbury Road and north of A465, Stoke Cross could be allocated for housing development for up to **10 houses**. (AECOM Report page 31.)

Option 4 - Site 6 OS 4420, Site to the east of the Parish Hall, Stoke Cross could be allocated for housing development for up to **6 houses**. (AECOM Report page 32.)




Potential Site submitted by landowner for business use.

Option 5 - Site 9 (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm) could be allocated for employment uses. (AECOM Report page 33.)


Settlement Boundaries

For the purpose of this consultation, the boundaries in both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross have been revised and drawn tight around bricks and mortar and excluded the church and grounds and known flood areas. If the Parish Council decides to include any possible options for housing sites in the NDP then the settlement boundary will go around and include the site(s).

Stoke Cross Settlement Boundary



Stoke Lacy Settlement Boundary



Draft Policies

The policies have been written to reflect feedback wherever possible but are mindful that the NDP also needs to conform generally with Hereford Council's Core Strategy. You will see that some policies refer to design codes. AECOM will do a thorough assessment of existing properties and landscapes etc. they will then produce a detailed design document which we will publish for consultation and feedback and then use to inform our NDP policies on design.

Draft Policy SL1: Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character

The design of any new build should minimise any adverse visual impacts on the local landscape character of Stoke Lacy Parish, and incorporate the following landscape design principles where they are applicable to the site concerned:

1. Any new building within the settlements of Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross should protect important local landscape features which enhance the character of the built-up area and link it to the open countryside. These include the following: watercourses, ponds, veteran / ancient trees, traditional hedgerows, woodland and traditional orchards. These features should be incorporated into landscaping designs wherever it is practicable to do so.
2. Landscaping schemes should incorporate the planting of native broadleaved woodland species where possible, and plant new traditional species hedgerows in boundary schemes.
3. Landscaping schemes should be used to enhance local wildlife, providing new and restored habitats and contributing to biodiversity net gain. Schemes which support 'rewilding' will be particularly encouraged.
4. Lighting schemes should be designed to minimise light pollution and protect the area's dark skies. Security lighting should be operated by intruder switching, be appropriate to their setting, be unobtrusive and energy efficient and have consideration for neighbouring amenity.
5. Existing public rights of way should be protected, and schemes should provide safe and accessible linkages to nearby walking routes and bridleways;
6. Key Public Views are being identified and proposals should respect these views. Where a proposal impacts on an identified Key Public View, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or similar study should be carried out to ensure that the scheme is designed and sited sensitively and appropriately to mitigate any adverse impacts.

Draft Policy SL2: Local Green Spaces

These are being identified, the policy written and it will be consulted upon at a later date.

Draft Policy SL3: Public Open Spaces

Proposals for new public open spaces to meet local recreational and community needs or improvements to existing spaces will be supported where they include one or more of the following:

- Areas of woodland, trees and wildflower planting to support local biodiversity;
- Planting of herbs and local traditional fruit trees and bushes;
- Seating and picnic areas;
- A play area for young children;
- Facilities for teenagers; and
- Accessible and safe provision for older people and those with mobility problems.

Designs should ensure accessibility for all through provision of adequate car and cycle parking and safe pedestrian and cycle access and paths.

All schemes should protect local residential amenity and be designed to minimise future maintenance costs.

Draft Policy SL4: Protecting Heritage and Local Built Character

This will be addressed in the Design Codes and consulted upon at a later date.

Draft Policy SL5: Promoting Innovative and Sustainable Design

This will be addressed in the Design Codes and consulted upon at a later date.

Draft Policy SL6: Tourism and Rural Enterprise

Development proposals for small scale tourism and rural enterprise will be supported in Stoke Lacy Parish where:

1. Development comprises the sensitive conversion of former agricultural buildings or where new development is proposed, development is of a high design quality which is sensitive to the character of the surrounding rural area;
2. Schemes provide visitor accommodation or small business units to support local rural diversification and employment opportunities;
3. Suitable and safe access is provided, and there is adequate on site car and cycle parking for visitors and occupants; and
4. The amenity of any neighbouring residential areas is protected.

Proposals for farm/village shops and cafes will be encouraged.

Draft Policy SL7: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel

Proposals for new development and conversions should promote walking and cycling and use of public transport. Wherever possible, schemes for new housing and employment related development should:

1. Link to pedestrian, cycle routes and bus stops;
2. Provide suitable and secure storage provision for bicycles; and
3. Include external electric charging points for vehicles and bicycles.

The impact of additional traffic from development proposals on existing rural road networks should be carefully considered and suitable measures should be provided to encourage appropriate traffic speeds.

Developer contributions may be sought to support the provision of a safe and accessible walking route linking the two settlements of Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross.

Draft Policy SL8: Development within the Settlement Boundaries

Proposals for new housing and other development will be supported within the identified Settlement Boundaries of Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy where:

1. Proposals are small in scale to protect local landscape character and setting;
2. Development of infill and backland sites does not have an adverse impact on local character;
3. Suitable and safe access is provided;
4. The amenity of neighbouring residents is protected; and
5. Design is of a high quality, responding to local character and context whilst incorporating low carbon technologies, resource efficiency measures wherever possible.

Proposals for new housing will also be supported on sites identified as site allocations in the NDP.

Draft Policy SL9: Housing Mix

New residential development should demonstrate how it contributes to a suitable mix of tenure, type and size of dwelling across the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Area.

Proposals should demonstrate how they respond to local needs for medium sized family housing (up to three bedrooms) with gardens, starter homes of two bedrooms, and housing designed for older people.

**Please encourage every member of a household
living in Stoke Lacy to have their say,
an NDP should reflect the views
of the whole community.**

(extra response forms can be found near the NDP mail boxes)

Thank you very much for taking the time and interest to respond to this consultation. Your responses and comments will be used to inform decisions about :

- 1. potential site allocations**
- 2. where the settlement boundaries will be drawn and**
- 3. the draft policies**

other comments about the emerging Draft NDP will also be considered.

Return your response form and any additional comments to:

the **NDP mail boxes**: located at the **Village Hall**
or in the **Church porch**

by email: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org

or online on the NDP website: www.stokelacy.co.uk

By: 7th. May 2021.

Note: All personal details will remain strictly confidential and will only be viewed by the NDP Steering Group and will not be distributed or published. All answers to the questions and comments will remain anonymous in any analysis of the completed results. Your contact details will be kept until 3 months after the final NDP referendum after which they will be destroyed.'

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish Draft NDP Response Form

Name:
Postcode:
Email:

Please tick one box for each site option to indicate your degree of support or objection

Where possible give reasons for your answer, and provide any other comments.

	Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Object	Strongly Object	You can support development on only part of a site or suggest the number of dwellings you would support on a site.
Option 1 - Site 3. Crossfield House, Stoke Cross (8 houses)						
Option 2 - Site 4. to the north of Westbury Road, Stoke Cross (7 houses)						
Option 3 - Site 5. to the east of Westbury Road, Stoke Cross (10 houses)						
Option 4 - Site 6. to the east of the Parish Hall, Stoke Cross (6 houses)						
Site 9. (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm) business opportunity						

Any additional comments:

Please tick to indicate	Support	Object	Add any Comments / Suggestions for improvements
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Cross			
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Lacy			
Draft Policy SL1: Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character			
Draft Policy SL3: Public Open Space			
Draft Policy SL6: Tourism and Rural Enterprise			
Draft Policy SL7: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel			
Draft Policy SL8: Development within the Settlement Boundaries			
Draft Policy SL9: Housing Mix			

Any additional comments:

From: Stoke Lacy Parish Council

Dear Stoke Lacy resident,

As you know, a small group of volunteers have been working on the Stoke Lacy NDP since October 2019 with the aim of helping to influence future development within the Parish and produce an NDP document that Herefordshire Council are legally obliged to refer to when considering all planning applications.

The preparation work has now reached a stage where we need your views, feedback, opinions and comments. This document outlines briefly what the NDP is designed to do and asks you to answer a series of questions leaving room for your comments.

This is not the final NDP document, but with your help and input, this will form the basis of set of policies and objectives that are generally agreed by the majority of our community. Once this is prepared we will hold a Community referendum in 2021 on which the entire Parish will have the opportunity to vote. Only after a vote has been taken will our views be taken as legally binding by Herefordshire Council.

Thank you on behalf of Stoke Lacy Parish Council for taking the time to answer the questions and giving your views and rest assured that every comment will be taken into consideration.

Janet Ivison

Chair – Stoke Lacy Parish Council

Everyone ***by 7th.May***
have your say
it's your NDP

www.stokelacy.co.uk



STOKE LACY PARISH
Neighbourhood Development Plan

Boxes at
Village Hall
& Church

Appendix 8 – Consultation Responses to Emerging Draft Plan and Possible Site Allocations

January 2021, Note to Residents

NDP Issues and Options document (results and comments)

Dear Stoke Lacy Residents,

Many thanks to all those who took the time to complete the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan Issues and Options document with feedback and comments. Your views are very much appreciated and will help shape the final NDP outcome.

Out of around 201 houses that we distributed to, we received 65 completed responses (70+ individual people) and all of them, including comments, have now been collated and are available for you to read if you click on the link at the end of this note. This information and any further comments, will feed into the final NDP report which is being drafted over the next few months.

The vast majority of responses and comments were thoughtful, constructive and useful. However, we were disappointed with one or two remarks which were unnecessarily negative, especially towards the new development at Newlands. We would like to point out that these negative comments do not represent the views of the Parish Council, NDP Steering Group or indeed the majority of the community.

It is important to bear in mind that Newlands and indeed all its residents now form a significant part of our community. The parish welcomes them and values the contribution that they have to make towards the NDP and village life in general.

The appointed planning consultant (AECOM) have completed their technical review of the Stoke Lacy 'call for sites' initiative. This is now being verified by Locality who manage NDP Grant applications (<https://locality.org.uk>). Once the final version is received by the Parish Council we will send the results to the landowners before publishing on the Parish and NDP websites. Over the course of the next few weeks the draft NDP report will be compiled by our planning consultant.

The NDP steering group are developing plans for the postponed public meetings and communications in the new year once Covid-19 restrictions allow. These public meetings will give a further opportunity for residents to consider the draft NDP, settlement boundaries and sites offered for development and to make comments which will be considered in the final plan. In the meantime, if you have any further comments or questions please either use the NDP Postbox (at the Church and Village Hall), email to comments@stokelacy.co.uk or phone 01885 448102

Once again, the parish council thank you for your input towards this valuable initiative which gives the entire parish an opportunity to influence planning policy within its boundaries for the years ahead.

(insert link to doc)

Best wishes,

Janet Ivison

Chair - Stoke Lacy Parish Council

Latest News (Cider Press)

**NEW
UPDATE**

**RESULTS ON THE
WEBSITE SOON**


**RESULTS ON THE
WEBSITE SOON**

Poster

**NDP information
go to website**

stokelacy.co.uk

RESULTS



of the **consultation**
are on the website now

www.stokelacy.co.uk

THANK YOU

THANK YOU



SURVEY RESULTS & COMMENTS

link on website

**additional
comments
always
welcome**

**post on website
or in boxes at Church
& Village Hall**




www.stokelacy.co.uk

INFORMATION & COMMENTS

www.stokelacy.co.uk

email: morgg@aol.com



phone: 01885 448102









Responses to Settlement Boundaries and draft policies

Results compiled from responses received from Stoke Lacy community in respect of the NDP consultant document April/May 2021.

(Note: there were 2 documents received where the respondents refused to give their names. These were discounted as it could not be proved they were from the Stoke Lacy Parish community.)












Responses – Call for Sites Options

Results compiled from responses received from Stoke Lacy community in respect of the NDP consultant document April/May 2021.

(Note: there were 2 documents received where the respondents refused to give their names. These were discounted as it could not be proved they were from the Stoke Lacy Parish community.)





PUBLIC CONSULTATION APRIL 2021

ALL COMMENTS TAKEN FROM FEEDBACK FORMS AND COLLATED BY SECTION

SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Why have you drawn settlement boundaries which are not the same as Option A in the original consultation which 80% of residents approved? (refers to both boundaries)

It's not clear what impact the boundary has (refers to both boundaries)

The proposed boundary does not include the site that has already been agreed for 10 houses known as the Orchard (refers to Stoke Cross boundary)

Cannot support at this stage (refers to both boundaries)

As long as red brick workshop at Nether Court is included inside the boundary (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

Do we have power to enforce development? (refers Stoke Cross boundary)

No preference (refers both boundaries)

Townfolk protect themselves and put all development in the countryside (refers both boundaries)

The townfolk seem to want to protect themselves from development but want all growth to be in the countryside. Unfair! (refers both boundaries)

Why are all proposed sites in Stoke Cross area, why no sites at other end of the village, Stoke Lacy??

Why has this area suddenly become Stoke Cross when the signs state Stoke Lacy? Who changed it!!!

I was born in this village and it has always been Stoke Lacy for 75yrs

Good (refers to both boundaries)

Good (refers to both boundaries)

With no schools/medical facilities or shops, settlement boundaries are characterised by the existing pattern of the parish (refers both boundaries)

With no shop/school/medical facilities, settlement boundaries are only relevant to the character and pattern of development in the parish (refers both boundaries)

Not qualified to comment with any understanding (refers Stoke Cross boundary) Boundaries could be tightened as per attached suggestion (refers Stoke Lacy boundary. Map provided suggesting amendment in areas of Herb Lane)

Room needs to be considered for Stoke Lacy to take its fair share of development (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

Stoke Lacy should have potential sites (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

I cannot see any information relating to a boundary change, but any enlargement is unwelcome as it will increase the urbanisation of the area and erode its nature. This is a small agricultural and residential area and any enlargement for yet more poor-quality housing is opposed. (refers both boundaries)

No enlargement of the existing settlement boundaries should be permitted, increasing urbanisation of the area will destroy its character and is not sustainable. (refers both boundaries)

SITES

Option 1 – Site 3 Crossfield House

These numbers are ridiculous. It's not supporting local people; it's forcing development onto a community.

Too many houses. There is no real need for any more new houses in this area.

Creeping urban development. Will be followed up with further development creep no doubt
Urban development creep. Development within the existing boundary would be natural but not outside it.

We have enough development in the village

If we had to have more new build, estate type housing, this is the least bad option

Would not alter view of village

There's too much traffic already. There have been a number of near miss accidents recently

I don't think it is safe to increase the amount of additional traffic from that junction. I've seen 2 near misses in a month so far this year

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Overdevelopment of area

Enough new housing en masse already in Stoke Lacy

Not 8 houses on this site. Support 1 or 2 houses on this site

Would support 1 or 2 houses on this site -not 8

Too many houses at this site. Would support a small development of 1-3

This appears to be a fairly narrow strip of land with limited options for house/garage/garden orientation in order to accommodate the suggested 8 dwellings. Combine Option 1 with Option 4 together with the adjacent orchard plot which has/had planning for some 10 or so dwellings and the sum of those plots appears more appealing. Could be connected and all accessed from the A465 as opposed to the Swedish House lane which may have no known owner and pose legal access/maintenance difficulties.

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has already been met!

Current road is unadopted, entrance onto A465 dreadful, more water draining across roads/fields. Greenfield development

Entrance onto A465 is terrible, greenfield site, where does all the water go? Where are the local services going to cope with increased demands?

1 or 2 houses maximum

I feel the access could run through the Orchard which has already got planning commitment however would impact heavily on the houses between the proposed site and Woodland View Ruin viewpoint from lower in the village eg Hopton Lane. Adjacent to new development

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross is already overdeveloped. All of these sites are part of the natural environment of Stoke Cross. A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable. Building of more would interfere with rural vistas

Any more development of Stoke Cross will spoil the feel of the village. Also, there isn't a shop, doctors or school. Cars would be in constant use.

1 or 2 houses only

1 or 2 houses only

As expected, we support the site. However, we consider 8 homes to be over development; we are mindful of our immediate neighbours and consider 2 self builds to be more acceptable

Possible drainage difficulties

Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

Support only after the Orchard has been developed

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the

requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Option 2 – Site 4 To the north of Westbury Rd, Stoke Cross

These numbers are ridiculous. It's not supporting local people; it's forcing development on a community. It's greed as simple as that

Ridiculous number of houses. This is a conservation area, not a huge free for all. Trying for a quick buck

Creeping urban development into rural agricultural land. Outside the settlement boundary

Urban development creep into an agricultural area that is outside the settlement boundary

We have enough development in the village

Current lane not suitable

More new housing estate, visible from the roads, changing the face of our village

Access to/from a very narrow lane with steep hill at junction to access main road

Noise, traffic pollution, impact to local wildlife. Plant more trees, plants, native species

The lane is dangerous, people speed up/down already. Additional noise/pollution is not welcome not to mention the impact to local wildlife

Less impact on current properties

Exit onto the C1116

(General comments referring to site options 1-4) Enough new housing en masse in SL

(General comment referring to site options 2-4) No more estates in Stoke Cross. They create division in the community and are out of character with the area

(General comment referring to site options 2-4) Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally they clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands

Open field in a more open location which might require screening which by its very name and nature is no answer to landscape harm.

AECOM made no mention of the septic tank on that plot which could have some bearing on its viability, whereas they did with the more distant Option 3

Access onto a class C road which was denied in Bromyard for the same reason

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has been already met!

Only access onto a narrow country lane !!

loading issues. Access on a bend

Access is terrible. Access onto A465 is plainly dangerous, more traffic on a single-track road, more water flowing into local rivers

Terrible location. Road is single track. Access onto A465 is dangerous, water run off into stream, greenfield site

I think there will be access problems on this road, Westbury Rd
Road junction?

Views and nature of village. This lane to Bredenbury will not support more traffic!

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross is already over developed. All of these sites are part of the natural environment of Stoke Cross. A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable, building of more would interfere with rural vistas

Perhaps 2 or 3 houses

1 or 2 houses only

Support- it would be out of sight and discreet having minimum impact on the existing residents of Stoke Cross

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodland View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Vehicles having to access main road near Woodland View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, would spoil the roll of the land

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

(General comment referring to site options 2 & 3) Compromise drainage. Also increase pressure on sewage site

(objection) as it is near the sewerage farm

Option 3 – Site 5 to the east of Westbury Rd, Stoke Cross

Too many! it's supposed to be a Conservation Area

There is no way this can be justified, Crazy

Would appear to be appropriate commercial development – depending on the use of the site

Would appear to be OK for mixed use as it's alongside the road but is still outside the settlement boundary.

We have enough development in the village

We moved from a city centre to Stoke Lacy making it our forever home. If these houses are built it will obscure our views (the whole reason for buying this house) There was never any mention of this when we bought the house

Would encroach on view from houses at front of estate

Increased junction confusion on main road. Our house is already surrounded on 3 sides, to build in front

would seriously impact quality of living

More new housing estate, visible from roads, changing the face of our village

Access could be achieved onto main road

Terrible access, dangerous traffic levels, noise pollution. Being overlooked somewhat, loss of privacy. Plant more trees and wildflowers

Lack of access, increased traffic generation, being overlooked, loss of privacy, increased noise, pollution, traffic etc. Plant some trees, wildflowers instead. Preserve the green spaces for wild-life

The new house owners have bought their properties with open views. Not fair to build houses opposite

Exit onto either C116 or main road. Over development of this area. Better use as a recreational area or conservation

Enough new housing en masse already in SL

Ideal site for recreation area

No more estates in Stoke Cross, they create division in the community and are out of character with the area

Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally the clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands. Maybe green space for recreation?

Development on this site could mirror that of Newlands development opposite and as a result be less incongruous. Potential rainfall run off together with that runoff already piped from the Newlands site into the Woodend Lane stream could be an issue with increased levels and potential risk of flooding to existing properties in the valley

Access onto a C class road or main road which already has too many turnings

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has been already met!

Access onto a narrow country lane or busy main road

Flooding issues and overuse of sewerage facility

Access is dangerous, way too many houses, Greenfield development. Now building across road is a dangerous precedent

Appalling location. Development of Agric. Land, access dangerous, urban sprawl into countryside, too many houses

10 houses as proposed, not 20

I think there will be access problems with Westbury Rd, Woodland View and the new development coming off the A road in such a short distance causing traffic accidents on the A465

10 houses are far too many. Stoke Lacy has already been extended extensively and not in character with the village. However, if there must be more houses it should be kept away from the more rural areas where wildlife is more likely to be

10 houses as proposed, not 20

Road junction?

No houses. Opposite Newlands estate, drainage, nature of village ruined

A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable

Any new houses on this large important corner site would conflict with the mixture of house styles in the village

Strongly object. The roadside view of Stoke Cross has been spoilt by the Newlands development and further development along the roadside will urbanise the appearance even more. This is a small rural settlement and needs protecting

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodend View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodend View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Stoke Lacy has met the proportional housing quota until 2031

Compromise drainage. Also increase pressure on sewerage site

Object as it is near the sewerage farm

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2

houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-

2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly Object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Option 4 – Site 6 to the east of the Parish Hall, Stoke Cross

Too many! That's 16 houses in a conservation area

There is no way this can be justified, crazy. Too many houses, there is no real demand for any more new houses in this area. This is a conservation area not a huge free for all trying for a quick buck

Creeping urban development of a rural area. Outside the settlement boundary

Development creep into an agricultural area

We have enough development in the village

The village hall should not become engulfed in housing

Would not alter view of village

Personally, I feel there is already enough permitted development in that area. I have animals and children, more people and traffic is not what this village needs

There's already houses permitted in the adjacent field, another 6 houses seems perfectly reasonable

Little impact on current properties. Best choice

Enough new housing en masse already in SL

No more estates in Stoke Cross, they create division in the community and are out of character with the area

Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally they clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands, but maybe green space for recreation?

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands, but maybe green space for recreation?

This appears to be a fairly narrow strip of land with limited options for house/garage/garden orientation in order to accommodate the suggested 8 dwellings. Combine Option 1 with Option 4 together with the adjacent orchard plot which has/had planning for some 10 or so dwellings and the sum of those plots appears more appealing. Could be connected and all accessed from the A465 as opposed to the Swedish House lane which may have no known owner and pose legal access/maintenance difficulties. There would not appear to be a PROW on this plot as suggested Access onto a C class road or main road which already has too many turnings. Speed limit is not adhered to on either road

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the core strategy quota has been already met!

I feel this is the best as access could run through the Orchard which already has planning commitment

Ruin viewpoint from lower in the village. Enough homes planned adjacent to it

Building of more would interfere with rural vistas

No more here

No more houses in that area

Perhaps 2 or 3 if the drainage and sewage systems would be satisfactory

If we are honest, we all knew this site was going to be built on. Although we would prefer that it wasn't, I don't believe we really have a choice

Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

Support only after the Orchard has been developed

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Site 9 Barn conversion at Hopton Court Farm

Support for residential use only. Strongly object to commercial use as this is on residential and agricultural area only.

Industrial development into a residential and agricultural area with all the ----(illegible) of noise and excessive traffic

It's important to support opportunities for business and employment in the area

We have enough development in the village

New uses for existing, redundant buildings – this is the way to go

Narrow, single track, winding lane with blind bends. Have been several accidents in recent years. Wholly unsuitable for an increase in development/traffic. It is also far outside what would be considered main village settlement. This lane is used extensively for walking etc and is access to wood. Any additional traffic would be hazardous

This is a good idea, bring old buildings back into use. I'm all for this idea

Making use of old buildings is a great way of re-using existing buildings, preserving character and offering unique business opportunities

Would strongly support business opportunities. However, business type, hours of operation etc would need to be considered

Satellite development and business

Support a business venture

It depends what type of business and the amount and type of traffic it would attract to a narrow single-track lane

The intended business is unclear as is the amount of traffic entailed on a single-track lane

Small conversions and garden in-fills should take priority

The access lane is already very busy for a lane in the area – there have been 'near misses' on many occasions. It is prone to pot-holes (due to the speed of some vehicles) This is a quiet rural area not suited to industrial use. The infrastructure is already stretched (internet, water etc) and it seems unrealistic to add to the weight

The road is far too narrow to take any business development and traffic. Also, the area is of a rural nature and not appropriate for industrial use and 'white van' traffic

A good opportunity for small business start-ups and employment for the village

The access lane to this site is a small rural single-track road which has high hedges and very limited passing places, leading to frequent reversing when vehicles meet. It is little more than a

farm track in places with several 90-degree bends and numerous potholes caused by large agricultural machinery. These frequently use it as there are several farmers with land to either side of the lane. The potholes created by this are frequently treated but quickly reappear. The road is also subject to surface water in several places via run off from field entrances in the winter. Inadequate drainage causes this to congregate on the blind bend at the church end where there is standing water for most of the winter leading to large flooded potholes. The introduction of more commercial vehicles onto this narrow lane as a consequence of this development will only exacerbate the above issues and make it more difficult for existing residents' traffic which need to use it on a daily basis

The access lane to this site is a small rural single-track road which has high hedges and very limited passing places, leading to frequent reversing when vehicles meet. It is little more than a farm track in places with several 90-degree bends and numerous potholes caused by large agricultural machinery. These frequently use it as there are several farmers with land to either side of the lane. The potholes created by this are frequently treated but quickly reappear. The road is also subject to surface water in several places via run off from field entrances in the winter. Inadequate drainage causes this to congregate on the blind bend at the church end where there is standing water for most of the winter leading to large flooded potholes. The introduction of more commercial vehicles onto this narrow lane as a consequence of this development will only exacerbate the above issues and make it more difficult for existing residents' traffic which need to use it on a daily basis

Not shown on map. Where is this site please?

Traffic down narrow lane would be a problem

Depends on type of employment

Not shown on map?

I agree employment improves a village socially

Access via the narrow Hopton Lane is difficult and disturbs the wildlife of Netherwood

Access to more traffic will be damaging

No more traffic in Hopton Lane

Access for business use could be difficult. Hopton Lane is always in need of repair

Other than questioning whether this is a 'green' option with regard to the extra traffic that would be generated, we have no strong feelings

Support for business is important

Would depend on type of business, noise impact and traffic movement as narrow lane

Would depend on type of business, noise impact and traffic movement as narrow lane

Any additional comments – related to Sites

(Reference Site 9) The lane (Hopton Lane) and unmade road leading to site 9 are not appropriate for increased traffic use as they are used by farm vehicles, residents, walkers, riders etc. The unmade road is also a public footpath. There are no passing places. Use of the land for workshops is not appropriate due to incidental noise and as this is a residential and agricultural area this is out of keeping and could become a nuisance and source of dispute

(Reference Site 9) Access is via an unmade track which is also a footpath. There are no passing places and Hopton Lane is a single-track lane that is not suitable for more traffic. There are no services (water, electricity and telephone) to this area and there is legitimate concern that adding these will create further pressure on these facilities

Why are all the sites for development in Stoke Cross? Lots of areas down in Stoke Lacy not being used, should be at least one potential site

The site allocations are completely unfair. Why are they all in Stoke Cross? I think Stoke Lacy needs to take its fair share

Stoke Lacy is now up to the housing levels that are required of us. We have a good development at Newlands, and I feel strongly that development now ought to be odd conversions (granny annexe), a new home here and there (like the one property on the C116 which already has permission. More business opportunities (small workshops attached to homes) Site options 1-4 bunch up housing/make problems/overcrowd rural area/overstretch sewage

Any further development should be homes for people not estates for profit. Only build in one's and twos at any one time-in the tradition of the way houses have been built in the area in the past. Drainage must be properly designed to not have detrimental impact on neighbours and wildlife

Planners should increasingly focus on enhancing the community rather than estates for profit. This means smaller developments to enable elderly members to remain in the community rather than in Care Homes

Stoke Cross has enough development. To help bring both parts of Stoke Lacy together, the foot-path should be investigated. Maybe look for funding?

Stoke Cross has enough development. To help bring both parts of Stoke Lacy together, the foot-path should be investigated. Maybe look for funding?

At present it appears that the siting of settlement boundaries runs along the back of many existing dwellings. That being the case does that preclude extension to any of those dwellings as then falling outside the settlement boundary or should the line include the garden for instance? I am not in favour of including the industrial units within the settlement boundary as that could create a large potential building plot. That said I can see why they have been included.

As we are not directly affected by any of these proposals, I believe the majority view of the nearby residents should be supported and will do so once that is known

Since we live at the furthest reaches of Stoke Lacy, I think it best to allow those residents who live closer to the sites listed to have priority voting

Major flooding concern. The 28 dwellings already have made the situation a lot worse. They use a hydro-brake and a tank to smooth the output, but the brook seems to be at maximum capacity during heavy rainfall. This is imperilling the 2 grade 2 listed buildings at the bottom – Hall Place Farm and the Oast House. With 10 more properties already set to be added, the situation could become very grave. Where in the NDP has this been addressed?

Options 1,2,3 are dreadful. All developments are outside of Stoke Cross/Lacy using Greenfield sites. Access is dangerous. Option 3 is agricultural land and is a Greenfield site, it is plain It unsuitable for development and increases urban development over the A365 which is a dangerous precedent. All water will drain from these sites into the stream and cause more flood risk in the village

Options 1,2,3 are dreadful. It's difficult to see how worse locations could have been chosen.

Greenfield site, terrible access, dangerous access onto A465. Where are the local services to support more people? Water runoff will increase flood risk in a flood exposed zone. Option 5 appears to create a dangerous precedent by building a mini housing estate north of A465

Any new houses in village should be built in one's or two's, certainly not an estate

In the last survey development sites were suggested for both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross so why in this consultation document is only Stoke Cross considered? Surely sites in both areas should be considered. Why should all sites be in Stoke Cross? Developments of the type suggested could bring a variety of ages into the actual village of Stoke Lacy as well as Stoke Cross which can only be a good thing, otherwise Stoke Cross will end up being a diverse population whereas Stoke Lacy will become a retirement village then die out!

We have exceeded Hereford's wishes in developing Newlands estate. This is a village with no amenities other than hall and church. We want to prevent extra cars and road use. No footpaths up and down hill.

Infill of one or two houses acceptable in a village. Large development absolutely inappropriate
Stoke Cross would be grossly over-developed

We already have too many new houses in the village (planned and completed) We do not need or want any more

I spoke out in favour of the Newlands development because I felt Stoke Lacy was an aging population and we needed some new people in the village. I felt that development was enough and objected to Neville Symonds application. I therefore strongly object on the same basis- 28 new houses in a village the size of Stoke Lacy is sufficient for the foreseeable future and these new proposals are so closely packed together, we will be more of a town than a village.

More provision needs to be made for an open public space at the top of the village- somewhere to walk dogs, sit and meet others without having to get into a car and come to Netherwood.

The number of proposed properties is probably not enough to fulfil the quotas set by HCC

I feel we have sufficient new houses in the Stoke Lacy/Cross area. Over the past few years we've had an increase, assuming that the Orchard will be developed, of 38 new houses. We are a small country village, dependant on nearby Bromyard for shops, surgery, hospital, dentist and schools. Bromyard is struggling to accommodate its increase in population. Increasing the size of Stoke Lacy/Cross is just going to add to the traffic and parking problems. Let's leave it as it is!

We believe strongly that Stoke Cross has seen adequate large development and are disappointed that none is considered for Stoke Lacy settlement. The decision to allow continued development of Stoke Cross while protecting the Stoke Lacy boundary will only lead to an even more divided community. This NDP should be used to unite the community rather than divide it further

Draft Policies

SL1 – Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character

I agree with the points in the policy but am against any new build

Support

Fundamentally this means NOT large estates but small homes that serve community needs

Builds of one's or two's not estates

Most of this happens under planning regs anyway doesn't it? How can you link footpaths without passing over ?? new farmland (writing not clear. Further short comment following this but illegible)

No 5 must finish the statement with 'where possible'. It must be remembered that these paths cross private land and it is often/.....(words illegible). This must be protected important to protect the character of the village from over development

Protecting yes but clarity is required on what 'enhancing' means. Does 5 need 'enhancing'?

What does 'enhancing' mean? It won't be 'enhanced' by more development!

SL3 - Public Open Space

I think the policy needs rewording as it would currently allow teenagers to ride their motor vehicles through designated woodland which I would definitely oppose. Any play area should be centrally located to reduce the requirement for car parking

Whilst open space could be used to bring our community together, careful consideration must be made so as this does not impact on existing residence
Destroy Greenfield sites but plant some wildflowers!
Bizarre! Most of the planning options here will destroy Greenfield sites but we should 'plant herbs' !
Support if we can find spaces
Local community should designate public spaces
Local people should be encouraged to identify and maintain meeting places
Some improvements to the footpath between Stoke Cross and the church will enable better access on foot to the wood and churchyard
It's not a town
Need to for our (illegible)
A worthy statement but unlikely to happen
Putting in some pavements would be good. My blind daughter is unable to walk her guide dog as no safe routes
Other than the woodland amenity area off Hopton Lane there is no public open space – all private land

SL6 – Tourism and Rural Enterprise

Tourism NO. Rural enterprise should be treated on a case- by -case basis through the existing planning system
But emphasis on small scale
Unsure

With reservations re access, noise and light levels

Based on policy detailed it is most important to ensure that the road infrastructure can easily accommodate developments
This is very difficult to reply to as it is not clear where the plan would be
Far more detail is needed. The policy is too general. Our lane can only take walkers and cannot deal with any more rural enterprise than the current existing farms
Increasing traffic on single track lanes for commercial vehicles should be avoided
Beware of increasing traffic on single track lanes which are not suitable for commercial vehicles
Yes to small scale businesses and workplaces. Need more growth
I support rural business, but location needs to be correct and not in remote locations on poor roads etc
A worthy statement but unlikely to happen
There really is no scope for tourism. Rural enterprise should remain agricultural
There is no scope for tourism. What is meant by rural 'enterprise' in this context?

SL7 - Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel

The expectations are unrealistic. Cycle paths on developments of up to 10 houses are not going to be of any great length and cycle paths on the roads are going to be impossible to instate. More houses will mean more cars and more traffic on our roads. We are fooling ourselves if we think people are going to give up their cars. A typical 4 bedroomed house in the countryside with grown up children will have 4 cars parked outside. At weekend probably 5/6. If

we are going to accept more houses let's be honest and make sure adequate parking is available. There are cars parked on the pavement on the Newlands estate already and that has been during lockdown when no visitors are allowed

Pointless. Just fine sounding proposals so it all 'looks good on paper'

Should enable changes to vehicles and travel in future

Should be flexible to allow for changes to vehicles and travel in the future

But who, if any of us, uses the bus?

Sites should not rely on cars etc and not allow development in more remote sites (Site 9)

The provision of safe pedestrian pathway between 'up' and 'down' areas of the village is a high priority

Yes if there's any real demand

Yes if there's any demand for it

SL8 - Development within the Settlement Boundaries

It mentions that development will be supported if small in scale. None of the options are small in scale apart from the barn conversion

Support

There is no development within settlement boundaries

This is a pointless proposal as all development appears to be outside of the settlement boundary

Given lack of facilities development within settlement boundaries is not justifiable

With no facilities development within the settlement boundaries is difficult to justify

Where? There's not much space as it is

Only where appropriate

SL9 – Housing Mix

This is written to exclude 4 bedroom and larger houses, so I believe it is too prescriptive. People working from home will need the larger houses

Support

More houses for local youngsters

Why do we need starter homes? What young couple is going to come to Stoke Lacy when there are no facilities?

Single builds. Garden in-fills

Policy should be in line with the mixed build character of Stoke Lacy

Individual houses. Variety of styles. Small. In keeping with the mixed build character of the area

Provision for retirement in a rural area? Smaller bungalows with views for downsizing countryside!

Family housing should take priority to encourage young families with children into the village

Family housing

Build some traditional oak framed houses. They look easy on the eye and use local/traditional methods

Small houses owned by council or housing association is the last thing we need. They don't care about their property and drop litter

How about higher quality houses that acknowledges vernacular style – not more tacky box development. Housing should be affordable but higher quality. The new 'tacky box' development

in Stoke Cross is a good example of what is NOT required – charmless and characterless – could be anywhere in the UK

Higher quality development of affordable housing when it's appropriate, but not tacky box development such as that at Stoke Cross. Try using some character and vernacular style!

Any Additional Comments – Related to Settlement Boundaries and Policies

I think the policies are good and sensible. However, I can not support the scale of additional housing these options provide. We have had our quota of new housing in the village

Due to COVID this process has relied too much on internet access. The documents are very long and take a considerable amount of time to read through and digest. No doubt I have missed something or wrongly interpreted it. Some of the references refer to planning policies that are more than 10yrs old, are they still relevant? We need to have a public meeting so that more of the residents can access the information, ask questions to better understand the documents and put their point of view over. It would be wrong to continue without ensuring everyone has had the opportunity to discuss and engage with the process

Drainage is always a major consideration

Many thanks to the team.

We try to keep Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy as one village. This is difficult as no footpath joining them. We have welcomed Newlands; they are here, and we try to include them. This is a rural village – farms – tractors. It should retain this character come what may. Too many houses at the top of the village will create a 'them and us' mentality which we don't want

As we are in an environmental crisis, I cannot support any development on Greenfield sites. We should be holding on to every bit of green space we still have.

This is not a development plan for Stoke Lacy but a charter to destroy the countryside around Stoke Lacy/Cross!

Draft Policy SL2 – 'Local Green Spaces'. No wonder this is being delayed as Options 1,2,3 overleaf seem to be aimed at destroying Green Spaces!

(Further comment ref SL6) This would depend on the lanes used. Hopton lane, as mentioned overleaf, is a winding and narrow with many farm vehicles so 'Tourism' might be difficult. Rubbish tossed on the lane has been an issue in the last year and would need managing if more people used the lane.

Developments reflective of local need-downsizing to enable people to stay in their area and supportive friends. Starter homes to allow young people to stay local.

No mention of self-builds – would reflect locality and better quality

Avoid negative effects on adjacent buildings

Safe access to public highways

In-fills or near building clusters should be allowed outside the settlement boundaries

No mention of self-builds – likely to be in the character of the area and better quality

Housing reflective of local need – downsizing to allow people to stay in the area / smaller starter homes to allow young people to stay local

Drainage does not adversely affect river water quality

High quality sustainable design with emphasis on sustainably sourced materials and energy efficiency

Safe access to public highway

Single builds outside the settlement boundaries should be allowed – in-fills or near building clusters – not detrimental to the character of the area

Should be a shop in the village

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Thank you to the NDP Steering Group and Parish Council for undertaking this task which is difficult and fraught with opportunities for people to bring up negativity and conflict.

This is clearly a rural and agricultural area and should remain as such.

Any housing development should remain within existing boundaries and not be allowed to increasingly urbanise the area. It would also be good if housing development could actually be attractive and not more characterless and anonymous sprawl like the development at Stoke Cross. Commercial development should remain agricultural or agriculture related, or the character of the area will be changed and spoiled forever

Copy of Email to all Landowners who submitted sites

Dear

Attached to this email are 3 documents compiled from the recent NDP Consultation document distributed in Apr/May:

- 1) NDP Responses to Call for sites
- 2) NDP Responses to Settlement Boundaries and Draft Policy's
- 3) NDP Transcription of Comments collated by section

As a landowner who submitted an area for possible development, please would you review the documents and email us if you have any further comments on the outcomes relating to your submission.

These comments must be received by Wednesday the 9th June so that the Steering Group can include in a final presentation which will be sent to the Parish Council the following week.

Best regards
NDP Steering Group

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation on Draft Plan

Responses to Questions V1

Policy	Question	SG Response
Draft Policy SL1: Protecting and enhancing Landscape Character	What does 'enhancing mean? It will now be enhanced by man develop new!	There may be opportunities through new development to enhance local landscape character, for instance by planting traditional local species in landscaping schemes and restoring wildlife habitats. Policy criteria 1, 2 and 3 set out how this might be achieved.
Draft Policy SL1: Protecting and enhancing Landscape Character	Protected yes, but clarity is required on what 'enhancing' means - does need 'enhancing'?	
Draft Policy SL1: Protecting and enhancing Landscape Character	Most of this happens under planning regs anyway, doesn't it? Link footpaths without passing over new farmland?	Public Rights of Way are protected but some development schemes include proposed diversions or have an impact on the attractiveness of existing routes. Overall PRoW offer opportunities to encourage more walking and cycling rather than reliance on the car, and this criterion encourages linkages to existing routes to support more sustainable movement where possible.
Draft Policy SL7: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel	But - who out of any of us uses the bus?	The NDP should promote sustainable development and it is a plan for the next 10 years. Climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions globally are likely to lead to significant changes in how we live. Reduced reliance on the car and increased use of public transport are likely to form part

		of measures to support more sustainable travel choices in the future.
Draft Policy SL8: Development within the settlement boundaries	Where? There's not much space as it is.	<p>The settlement boundaries have been drawn fairly tightly around the existing built form of the 2 settlements in the Draft Plan. This is because residents have raised concerns about the scale of recent housing development, and the Steering Group has responded by identifying settlement boundaries which support smaller scale schemes in the future, such as through infill or garden development.</p> <p>However it is worth noting that the settlement boundaries may be revised further as work on the NDP progresses. If, for example the NDP includes any site allocations then the settlement boundary of the relevant settlement would be drawn around the allocation.</p>
Additional Comments	At present it appears that the settlement boundaries run along the back of many existing dwelling. This being the case, does that preclude extensions to any of those dwellings as then falling outside the settlement boundary or should the line include the garden for instance?	<p>The intention was to limit future development opportunities by drawing the boundaries close to the built form. Development outside the boundary would be considered to be in the countryside and rural area planning policies would apply.</p> <p>The Steering Group will be reviewing the settlement boundaries, taking into account all the responses to the consultation and will consider this point carefully.</p>
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Cross	The proposed boundary does not include the site that has already been agreed for 10 houses known as the Orchard?	When the settlement boundaries are finalised, they should include existing 'commitments' ie sites with unimplemented planning consents and sites where development has commenced but is not completed.
Additional Comments	Why are all the sites for development in Stoke Cross?	There was no intention for the NDP to concentrate development in Stoke Cross.
Additional Comments	Why are there only potential sites for development in Stoke Cross and not Stoke Lacy?	<p>The Parish Council undertook a Call for Sites and all landowners in the Parish were invited to submit potential sites for consideration in the NDP.</p> <p>The submitted sites included sites adjoining both settlements and sites in the countryside. They were all subjected to the same technical assessment by consultants AECOM, through</p>
Additional Comments	In the last survey, development sites were suggested for both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross. Why in this consultation document is only Stoke Cross considered?	
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Cross	Why are all the proposed sites in Stoke Cross area? Why no sites	

	at other end of the Village, Stoke Lacy?	the national Locality Technical Support programme for neighbourhood plans. The technical assessments are set out in the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan Site Options and Assessment Draft Report, February 2021 which is published on the website.
Additional Comments	The site allocations are completely unfair. What are they all in Stoke Cross? Stoke Lacy needs to take its fair share.	<p>For various technical reasons such as location in the countryside, flood risk and access constraints, some submitted sites were not considered suitable for development, and these sites were therefore not included in the public consultation. In effect they were 'screened out'.</p> <p>The sites identified as potential options for site allocations in the NDP were considered either suitable for allocation, or suitable for allocation subject to the mitigation of minor constraints and/or consultation with Herefordshire Council. All these sites happened to be in and around Stoke Cross.</p>
Draft Policy SL9: Housing mix	Provision for retirement in a rural area?	<p>Policy SL9 supports housing designed for older people.</p> <p>This is appropriate as Herefordshire as an ageing population (see p29 of the Core Strategy) and there is a need to provide suitable house types in the future to meet local needs. Older residents often wish to remain in their local communities, where there is an existing support network of friends and family, for as long as possible, but may need more appropriate, accessible housing to do so.</p> <p>Also by providing more housing for local older people, there will be opportunities for smaller households to downsize, thereby increasing the availability of family sized housing in the local area.</p>
Draft Policy SL9: Housing mix	Why do we need starter homes? What young couple is going to come to Stoke Lacy when there are no Facilities?	It is appropriate to support a range of housing to meet local needs. Some young people may wish to stay in the area where they have a support network of existing family and friends.
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Cross	Why has this area suddenly become Stoke Cross when the signs state Stoke Lacy? I was born in this village and it has	Stoke Cross is the Parish.

	always been Stoke Lacy for 75 years.	
New Settlement Boundary for Stoke Cross	Do we have power to enforce development?	No. Decisions on planning applications are made by Herefordshire Council, and appeals are determined by the Government's Planning Inspectorate. By law, planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Once made (adopted), the NDP will form part of the development plan so the NDP policies will have significant weight in decision making.
Additional Comments	Why have you drawn the settlement boundaries which are not the same as Option A in the original communication which 80% of residents approved?	The settlement boundaries have been revised to be tighter than in the original options and to exclude areas of flood risk. There will continue to be amendments to the boundaries as the NDP is progressed.
Additional Comments	Major flooding concern. The 28 dwellings already have made the situation worse. They use hydro-brake and a tank to smooth the output, but the brook seems to be at maximum capacity during heavy rainfall. This is imperilling the Grade 2 listed buildings at the bottom - Hall Place Farm and the Oast House. With 10 more proposed properties already set to be added, the situation could become very grave. Where in the NDP has this been addressed?	Climate change is causing greater frequency of severe adverse weather events such as heavy and prolonged rainfall, and this is impacting on the frequency of flood events in many areas. National planning policy and Herefordshire Council planning policies steer new development away from areas at risk of flooding where possible. The technical site assessments included consideration of flood risk and the proposed settlement boundaries also have taken account of the Government's flood maps for planning. The design policies for the NDP will be prepared taking account of the design codes which have been commissioned but are not yet completed. There may be criteria in the design codes related to minimising flood risk in new development as part of promoting more sustainable design.
Additional Comments	Where are the local services to support more people?	Stoke Lacy is a rural area and local services are limited. There is a village hall, church, public house and limited bus service and a number of local businesses providing employment. The 2 settlements are identified as suitable for some housing growth in the Herefordshire Local Plan Core

		<p>Strategy 2011-2031 to support the future sustainability and viability of the community.</p> <p>Those wishing to live in areas with more services may prefer more urban areas.</p>
Site 9. (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm) business opportunity	Not shown on map? Where is this site please?	Please refer to Map 2 in the full document.
Site 9. (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm) business opportunity	Not shown on map? Where is this site please?	
Additional Comments	Some of the references refer to planning policies that are more than 10 years old, are they still relevant?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy is the adopted local plan for the area. However it is currently being reviewed and at some point there will be a new local plan.</p>
Additional Comments	Are houses being built in Herefordshire with no employment prospects and poor transit links now frozen by inane Green policies, to accommodate people fleeing from urban areas now ridden with crime?	The growth strategy of Herefordshire is set out in the Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031. Most development will be focussed in Hereford and other urban areas (11,200 homes) but 5,300 will be accommodated in rural settlements - see Policy SS2 Delivering new homes.

Appendix 9 – Regulation 14 Consultation Publicity

Copy of Poster



STOKE LACY PARISH Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Plan is nearing completion.

Join us to view the plan and to comment upon it:

- + Wednesday 19th January – Drop in between 7pm to 9pm to the Village Hall**
- + Saturday 22nd January – Drop in between 2pm to 4pm to the Village Hall**

For more information and to comment go to www.stokelacy.co.uk or ring 01885 448102.



Everyone have your say it's your NDP

**www.stokelacy.co.uk
phone.01885 448102**

Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group.

Copy of Flyer to Local Households

Dear Resident of Stoke Lacy,

Save the Dates.

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) is nearing completion. This is the strongest tool that you will have to influence Herefordshire Council in determining the type of parish in which you want to live.

The important formal 6 weeks consultation stage is approaching where further comments and guidance are required from parish residents in order to make this the best plan that it can be.

As part of this process two Parish Consultation meetings have been organised for:

- **Wednesday 19th January – Drop in at any time between 7pm to 9pm in the Village Hall**
- **Saturday 22nd January – Drop in at any time between 2pm to 4pm in the Village Hall**

The current plans, forged from residents' comments, will be on display including supporting information such as maps and photographs. The NDP Steering Group and the Parish Council will be on hand to answer your questions.

This will be your last chance to make comments which will form the basis of a review before the final NDP is referred to the parish in a referendum in a few months' time.

Other opportunities over the 6 weeks consultation will be available for you to make new comments or add to your previous comments. Other stakeholders including Herefordshire Council, the Environment Agency and local businesses will also have the opportunity to make their comments in the period

More details will be provided in the New Year.

In the meantime, please save these dates in your diary!!

Copy of Cider Press notice

Dear Resident of Stoke Lacy,

Save the Dates.

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) is nearing completion. This is the strongest tool that you will have to influence Herefordshire Council in determining the type of parish in which you want to live.

The important formal 6 weeks consultation stage is approaching where further comments and guidance are required from parish residents in order to make this the best plan that it can be.

As part of this process two Parish Consultation meetings have been organised for:

- **Wednesday 19th January – Drop in at any time between 7pm to 9pm in the Village Hall**
- **Saturday 22nd January – Drop in at any time between 2pm to 4pm in the Village Hall**

The current plans, forged from residents' comments, will be on display including supporting information such as maps and photographs. The NDP Steering Group and the Parish Council will be on hand to answer your questions.

This will be your last chance to make comments which will form the basis of a review before the final NDP is referred to the parish in a referendum in a few months' time.

Other opportunities over the 6 weeks consultation will be available for you to make new comments or add to your previous comments. Other stakeholders including Herefordshire Council, the Environment Agency and local businesses will also have the opportunity to make their comments in the period

More details will be provided in the New Year.

In the meantime, please save these dates in your diary!!

Screenshots of Parish Council Website

The screenshot displays the Stoke Lacy Parish Council website. The header includes the council's name and a navigation menu with links to Home, NDP Website, Planning Applications, Council Business, Your Comments, The Parish, and Contact. The main content area features the council's name, a tagline, and information about the next meeting. A prominent red banner states: ***** Last date for Community Consultation feedback & response forms - 7th March *****. Below this, the title **Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)** is followed by a sub-header: **Notification of Formal Public Consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) (Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended))**. The text explains that the NDP has been published for formal consultation and provides details about the consultation period, which runs from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022. It also mentions that the Draft Plan, evidence base, and other supporting documents are available for viewing and download from the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.stokelacy.co.uk. Hard copies of all Neighbourhood Plan documents are available from the Clerk, and an email address parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org is provided for contact.

Stoke Lacy Parish Council

Your Parish council – The closest tier of government to you. The voice of local people.

Parish Council meetings 2022: [SLPC Meetings 2022](#)

The next meeting of the parish council will be held on Wednesday the 9th of March 2022 at 7pm in SLVH. [Agenda 9 March 2022](#)

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

***** Last date for Community Consultation feedback & response forms - 7th March *****

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

***** Last date for Community Consultation feedback & response forms - 7th March *****

Notification of Formal Public Consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) (Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended))

This notification is to advise you that the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been published for formal consultation by Stoke Lacy Parish Council. The Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared by the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group on behalf of Stoke Lacy Parish Council. The Draft Vision, Objectives, Policies and Proposals are all informed by the responses to the public consultation on the Issues and Options and Draft Plan which took place from 2020 – 2022. The Draft Plan is also supported by Design Codes, which were prepared by consultants AECOM in 2021 under the Locality Technical Support programme.

The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022.

The Draft Plan, evidence base and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded from the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.stokelacy.co.uk Hard copies of all Neighbourhood Plan are available from the Clerk – please email parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

The screenshot shows the Stoke Lacy Parish Council website. The navigation bar includes links for Home, NDP Website, Planning Applications, Council Business, Your Comments, The Parish, and Contact. The main content area is titled "The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022." It explains that the Draft Plan, evidence base, and other supporting documents are available for viewing and download from the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.stokelacy.co.uk. Hard copies of all Neighbourhood Plan documents are available from the Clerk - please email parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.

The Regulation 14 consultation public meetings with the Parish took place on the following dates:

- Wednesday 19th January 2022 between 19:00 and 21:00 and,
- Saturday 22nd January 2022 between 14:00 and 16:00

A Response Form was provided for comments, but the Parish Council also welcomes comments by email or in writing. Please submit all comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan by email to: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org or post by hand to the NDP mail boxes located at the Village Hall or in the Church porch. Following the public consultation process on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Plan will be amended and submitted to Herefordshire Council together with supporting documentation, including a Basic Conditions Statement demonstrating how the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, and a Consultation Statement setting out who has been consulted, how the consultation has been undertaken and how the representations received have informed the revised Plan.

Herefordshire Council will then re-consult, before the Plan is subjected to an Examination by an independent Examiner. If the Examiner is satisfied that, subject to any recommended changes, the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, then the amended Plan will be subjected to a local Referendum. If there is a Yes vote, then the NDP will be made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council and used to help determine planning applications in the Parish.

When we submit the plan, personal information, including your name, address and email may be shared with Herefordshire Council to enable them to discharge their legal duties in relation to publicising and consulting on the submission version of the

The bottom of the screenshot shows a Windows taskbar with a search bar, task icons, and system tray information including "Rain coming" and the date "08/03/2022".

This screenshot continues the content from the previous one. It shows the text: "Examiner is satisfied that, subject to any recommended changes, the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, then the amended Plan will be subjected to a local Referendum. If there is a Yes vote, then the NDP will be made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council and used to help determine planning applications in the Parish."

When we submit the plan, personal information, including your name, address and email may be shared with Herefordshire Council to enable them to discharge their legal duties in relation to publicising and consulting on the submission version of the plan and for organising the examination in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations. If you respond using the Response Form there is a box to tick to indicate your consent. If you respond by email or letter please indicate that you consent for your personal details being provided to Herefordshire Council to enable them to perform their duties. If you require any further information, please contact parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org

Next NDP Steering Group Meeting is Wednesday 16th March at 7pm in The Plough.

Yours Sincerely - Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group

[Click here to access the Reg 14 consultation and all relevant NDP documents](#)

Latest news updates (Click subject to open link)

[Herefordshire Rural Hub March 2022 Newsletter](#)

[Community Newsletter March 2022](#)

[Stoke Lacy Parish Council Queen's Platinum Celebrations Meeting](#)

The bottom of the screenshot shows a Windows taskbar with a search bar, task icons, and system tray information including "Rain coming" and the date "08/03/2022".

NDP Website (from Parish Council website Link)

The screenshot displays the Stoke Lacy Parish Council website. The header features the council's crest and name. A navigation bar includes links for Home, NDP Website, Planning Applications, Council Business, Your Comments, The Parish, and Contact. The main content area is titled 'Stoke Lacy NDP Regulation 14' and contains a section for the 'Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)'. This section includes a notification of formal public consultation, details about the draft plan, and a consultation period running from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022. It also lists consultation dates and provides contact information for the parish clerk.

Stoke Lacy NDP Regulation 14

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

Notification of Formal Public Consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) (Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended))

This notification is to advise you that the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been published for formal consultation by Stoke Lacy Parish Council. The Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared by the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group on behalf of Stoke Lacy Parish Council. The Draft Vision, Objectives, Policies and Proposals are all informed by the responses to the public consultation on the Issues and Options and Draft Plan which took place from 2020 – 2022. The Draft Plan is also supported by Design Codes, which were prepared by consultants AECOM in 2021 under the Locality Technical Support programme.

The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022.

The Draft Plan, evidence base and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded from the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.stokelacy.co.uk Hard copies of all Neighbourhood Plan are available from the Clerk – please email parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org

The Regulation 14 consultation public meetings with the Parish took place on the following dates:

- Wednesday 19th January 2022 between 19:00 and 21:00 and,
- Saturday 22nd January 2022 between 14:00 and 16:00

A Response Form was provided for comments, but the Parish Council also welcomes comments by email or in writing. Please submit all comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan by email to: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org or post by hand to the NDP mail boxes located at the Village Hall or in the Church porch. Following the public consultation process on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Plan will be amended and submitted to Herefordshire Council together with supporting documentation, including a Basic Conditions Statement demonstrating how the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, and a Consultation Statement setting out who has been consulted, how the consultation has been undertaken and how the representations received have informed the revised Plan.

Herefordshire Council will then re-consult, before the Plan is subjected to an Examination by an independent Examiner. If the Examiner is satisfied that, subject to any recommended changes, the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, then the amended Plan will be subjected to a local Referendum. If there is a Yes vote, then the NDP will be made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council and used to help determine planning applications in the Parish.

When we submit the plan, personal information, including your name, address and email may be shared with Herefordshire Council to enable them to discharge their legal duties in relation to publicising and consulting on the submission version of the plan and for organising the examination in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations. If you respond

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-development-plan-ndp/

Home NDP Website Planning Applications Council Business Your Comments The Parish Contact

the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Plan will be amended and submitted to Herefordshire Council together with supporting documentation, including a Basic Conditions Statement demonstrating how the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, and a Consultation Statement setting out who has been consulted, how the consultation has been undertaken and how the representations received have informed the revised Plan.

Herefordshire Council will then re-consult, before the Plan is subjected to an Examination by an Independent Examiner. If the Examiner is satisfied that, subject to any recommended changes, the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, then the amended Plan will be subjected to a local Referendum. If there is a Yes vote, then the NDP will be made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council and used to help determine planning applications in the Parish.

When we submit the plan, personal information, including your name, address and email may be shared with Herefordshire Council to enable them to discharge their legal duties in relation to publicising and consulting on the submission version of the plan and for organising the examination in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations. If you respond using the Response Form there is a box to tick to indicate your consent. If you respond by email or letter please indicate that you consent for your personal details being provided to Herefordshire Council to enable them to perform their duties. If you require any further information, please contact parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org

Yours Sincerely - Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group

[Click here to access the Reg 14 consultation and all relevant NDP documents](#)

Parish Council Minutes
Latest Draft Minutes

Search this website

You live locally? Want to know what's going on? Subscribe and get updates. — Its FREE

Email *

Draft NP Rep For...docx

Type here to search

Rain coming

13:01 08/03/2022

stokelacy.co.uk

 **STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL Stoke Lacy NDP**

NDP Agenda/Notes NDP Project Management Discussion Contact Us Login Register

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

Stoke Lacy Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

On the 5th February 2020, we held the first NDP Parish Meeting to explain and discuss support for the Stoke Lacy NDP. This meeting was attended by around 60 residents of the Parish, Lynda Wilcox from the Herefordshire Association of Local Councils (HALC) and the newly formed Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group. It has taken over 2 years of regular Steering Group Meetings, Parish Questionnaires, guidance from Herefordshire Council, Planning Consultants and various other activities for the Stoke Lacy NDP SG and Parish Council to reach this important stage.

On Monday 17th January 2022, the NDP entered the Formal 6 week Consultation stage which is known as Regulation 14. At this stage, we present the residents of Stoke Lacy with a draft version of the NDP Document and the NDP Design Codes along with several other formal documents. To promote the NDP and show the community the extensive work that has been undertaken, two 'Drop in' style open Parish

Search ...

Recent Posts

- NDP SG Notes 23rd February 2022
- NDP SG Agenda 23rd February 2022
- Agenda 23rd Feb 2022
- Agenda 23rd February 2022
- NDP SG Notes 24th January 2022

Draft NP Rep For...docx

Type here to search

Rain coming

13:01 08/03/2022

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

Stoke Lacy Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

On the 5th February 2020, we held the first NDP Parish Meeting to explain and discuss support for the Stoke Lacy NDP. This meeting was attended by around 60 residents of the Parish, Lynda Wilcox from the Herefordshire Association of Local Councils (HALC) and the newly formed Stoke Lacy NDP Steering Group. It has taken over 2 years of regular Steering Group Meetings, Parish Questionnaires, guidance from Herefordshire Council, Planning Consultants and various other activities for the Stoke Lacy NDP SG and Parish Council to reach this important stage.

On Monday 17th January 2022, the NDP entered the Formal 6 week Consultation stage which is known as Regulation 14. At this stage, we present the residents of Stoke Lacy with a draft version of the NDP Document and the NDP Design Codes along with several other formal documents. To promote the NDP and show the community the extensive work that has been undertaken, two 'Drop in' style open Parish meetings were held on Wednesday 19th January – Village Hall 7pm to 9pm & Saturday 22nd January – Village Hall 2pm to 4pm. At these two meetings, parishioners had the opportunity to review, read and feedback on the documentation prepared by the Steering group and Parish Council. There was an attendance of around 20% of the Stoke Lacy community and in general the events were well attended and received a positive verbal response.

Next stages

Once the 6 week Consultation period has ended, all the comments and feedback received from Stoke Lacy Parishioners, Businesses, interested parties and stakeholders will be analysed and where appropriate, the Draft NDP Document will be updated. The completed documents will then be sent to Herefordshire Council for inspection. Herefordshire Council will also ask to see evidence of process and engagement with the community all of which have been collated and saved by the NDP Steering Group. (Note: this stage of the process may be delayed due to issues with Phosphates across the county, which is out of the control of the Steering Group) Once the Stoke Lacy NDP has gone through the formal stages, there will be a Referendum at which the Parishioners can vote whether to adopt or reject the NDP proposal.

NDP Steering Group

The next Steering Group Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 16th March at 7pm in the Plough Inn. All Residents are welcome and if you

Draft NP Reg For...docx

Windows taskbar: Rain coming, 13:01, 08/03/2022

NDP Steering Group

The next Steering Group Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 16th March at 7pm in the Plough Inn. All Residents are welcome and if you would like to raise points about the draft NDP and associated documents please do come along. In the meantime if you have any queries please email our Parish Clerk on: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk

Thank you - Stoke Lacy NDP SG

NDP Regulation 14 Consultation Documents

Please read the NDP Reg 14 Documents (NDP Reg 14 & NDP Design Codes) below and then download the response form. The form(s) should then be either emailed to parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk or print out and posted through the NDP Letter Boxes at the Church and Village Hall.

Section 1. Regulation 14 Documents (click on the title to open the link)

Consultation period runs from – Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022

[Reg 14 – Parish Meetings Village Hall Displays](#)

[NDP Reg 14 Plan \(complete version\)](#)

[NDP Reg 14 Plan Response Form \(Word version\)](#)

[NDP Reg 14 Plan Response From \(PDF version\)](#)

Draft NP Reg For...docx

Windows taskbar: Rain coming, 13:01, 08/03/2022

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL stokelacy.co.uk. The page content includes:

- Section 1. Regulation 14 Documents** (click on the title to open the link)
- Consultation period runs from – Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022**
- Reg 14 – Parish Meetings Village Hall Displays
- NDP Reg 14 Plan (complete version)
- NDP Reg 14 Plan Response Form (Word version)
- NDP Reg 14 Plan Response Form (PDF version)
- Comments are also invited on the NDP Design Codes Document (See below in Section 3 Technical Evidence)**
- NDP Design Codes Response Form (Word version)
- NDP Design Codes Response Form (PDF version)
- Copies of letter / email sent to consultees
- Poster for NDP Parish Meetings
- Flyer delivered to all Parishioners by NDP SG & PC
- Environment Report – Dec 2021



The browser's taskbar at the bottom shows a search bar with the text "Type here to search", several application icons, and a system tray with a weather forecast of "Rain coming", the time "13:01", and the date "08/03/2022".

The screenshot shows the same web browser window, but the page content has scrolled down to:

- Flyer delivered to all Parishioners by NDP SG & PC
- Environment Report – Dec 2021
- Appropriate Assessment Report – Dec 2021
- Section 2. Public Consultation**
- Issues & options phase**
- Public meeting notes – February 2020
- Complete Final version of the Issues and Option Document
- Issues & Options Summary and Questionnaire version (v5)
- Issues & Options Survey Results (Bar Charts)
- Issues & Options Survey Results
- Draft Plan and Options for Sites**
- Complete version of First Draft Plan v2
- Draft Plan Summary V2
- Call For Sites Parish Consultation

The browser's taskbar at the bottom is identical to the one in the first screenshot.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022



Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

[Comments & Contact Details](#)

You can comment by: email at comments@stokelacy.co.uk or posting in NDP collection boxes situated at the Church and Village Hall.

Thank you for your time

Thank you – Stoke Lacy NDP SG

Introduction to Stoke Lacy NDP – Your chance to shape Stoke Lacy's future

What are the benefits of producing a Neighbourhood Development Plan?

A Neighbourhood Development Plan can help the community play a greater role in shaping the future of their area. It can bring together local residents, businesses, community groups, landowners and developers to share ideas and build consensus about what development needs to be implemented and what is beneficial for the local community. It can also help build relationships between the local community and service providers. A neighbourhood development plan (NDP) offers communities the only real opportunity to set the priorities and design principles for planning within their area. Without one, a neighbourhood can be exposed to whatever development the local council and developers deem necessary.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan entails considerable work and community involvement and engagement will be essential if the project is to be successful. An NDP Steering Group has been set up under the responsibility of the Parish Council who are working actively on behalf of the community.

Background to NDP project 2019 – 2020

Following an invitation to all Stoke Lacy residents from the parish council, a public meeting was held on the 6th October 2019 to establish whether there was interest in developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan for Stoke Lacy. At that meeting a representative from Herefordshire council introduced the subject and provided information about NDPs. After a discussion, a vote was held amongst the members of the public attending and it was agreed that a steering group should be formed to move forward with a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the parish.

Everyone from the Parish was invited to an initial launch of the NDP project on Wednesday 5th February 2020 at Stoke Lacy Village Hall to start sharing a vision for our community. Around 60 members of the community attended and HALC (Herefordshire Association of Local Councils) hosted the meeting to describe and outline the requirements of the NDP and how important it is for Parishes to have an input to local planning decisions.


For more detailed information on NDP's please visit Herefordshire Council website [here](#)

[SG Login](#)

© 2022 Stoke Lacy NDP • Built with GeneratePress

Herefordshire Council

Development Plan

 **Coronavirus in Herefordshire**
Information on staying safe, protecting others and any impact on our services

[More coronavirus information](#)

Home > Planning and building control > Neighbourhood areas and plans directory > **Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Name	Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan
Parishes in neighbourhood area	Stoke Lacy
Current stage	The Neighbourhood Development Plan is at the Regulation 14 draft plan stage.
Dates of each stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Neighbourhood area application date: 20 November 2019Designation date: 8 January 2020Regulation 14 draft plan submitted: 14 January 2022Regulation 16 plan submitted: N/APlan sent for examination: N/ADate of referendum: N/A
Website	Stoke Lacy Parish Council website
Pre-draft plan stage	Stoke Lacy Parish Council have submitted a neighbourhood area request to Herefordshire Council.

[Need Help?](#)

herefordshire.gov.uk/directory-record/5972/stoke-lacy-neighbourhood-development-plan

- Date of referendum: N/A

Website	Stoke Lacy Parish Council website
Pre-draft plan stage	<p>Stoke Lacy Parish Council have submitted a neighbourhood area request to Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>The consultation ran from 27 November 2019 to 8 January 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Neighbourhood area application formNeighbourhood area boundary map November 2019Decision documentDecision site noticeSEA scoping report March 2020
Regulation 14 draft plan stage	<p>Stoke Lacy Parish Council submitted their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan to Herefordshire Council on 14 January 2022.</p> <p>The consultation runs from 17 January to 7 March 2022.</p> <p>Please visit the Stoke Lacy Parish Council website which contains details on the consultation and how to respond.</p> <p>All queries and comments to this draft plan should be sent directly to parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk and not to Herefordshire Council's neighbourhood planning team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan December 2021Draft environmental report December 2021Draft appropriate assessment December 2021
Other pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Search for another neighbourhood plan

[Need Help?](#)

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the address bar displaying herefordshire.gov.uk/directory-record/5972/stoke-lacy-neighbourhood-development-plan. The page content includes a list of links at the top: [Neighbourhood area application form](#), [Neighbourhood area boundary map November 2019](#), [Decision document](#), [Decision site notice](#), and [SEA scoping report March 2020](#). Below this, the section **Regulation 14 draft plan stage** contains the following text: "Stoke Lacy Parish Council submitted their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan to Herefordshire Council on 14 January 2022. The consultation runs from 17 January to 7 March 2022. Please visit the [Stoke Lacy Parish Council website](#) which contains details on the consultation and how to respond. All queries and comments to this draft plan should be sent directly to parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk and not to Herefordshire Council's neighbourhood planning team." This is followed by three links: [Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan December 2021](#), [Draft environmental report December 2021](#), and [Draft appropriate assessment December 2021](#). The **Other pages** section includes [Search for another neighbourhood plan](#) and [Neighbourhood areas and plans consultations](#). The Windows taskbar at the bottom shows the search bar, task view button, and several application icons. The system tray on the right indicates a temperature of 5°C, mostly cloudy weather, and the date/time as 13:37 on 31/01/2022.

[Neighbourhood area application form](#)

[Neighbourhood area boundary map November 2019](#)

[Decision document](#)

[Decision site notice](#)

[SEA scoping report March 2020](#)

Regulation 14 draft plan stage

Stoke Lacy Parish Council submitted their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan to Herefordshire Council on 14 January 2022.

The consultation runs from 17 January to 7 March 2022.

Please visit the [Stoke Lacy Parish Council website](#) which contains details on the consultation and how to respond.

All queries and comments to this draft plan should be sent directly to parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk and not to Herefordshire Council's neighbourhood planning team.

[Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan December 2021](#)

[Draft environmental report December 2021](#)

[Draft appropriate assessment December 2021](#)

Other pages

[Search for another neighbourhood plan](#)

[Neighbourhood areas and plans consultations](#)

Appendix 10 - Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations

Company	Email address
Campaign to Protect Rural England	admin@cpreherefordshire.org.uk
Diocese of Hereford	diooffice@hereford.anglican.org
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	Ryan.norman@dwrcymru.com and forward.plans@dwrcymru.com
Environment Agency	WestMidsPlanning@environment-agency.gov.uk and Graeme.irwin@environment-agency.gov.uk
Education Funding Agency	Yasmin.holmberg@education.gov.uk
Natural Resources Wales	enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk
Herefordshire Nature Trust	Enquiries@herefordshirewt.co.uk
Herefordshire Primary Care Trust	Hw.primarycare@nhs.net
Highways England	info@highwaysengland.co.uk
Historic England	e-midlands@historicengland.org.uk
Homes England	enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk
National Grid	Nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com
National Trust	enquiries@nationaltrust.org.uk
Natural England	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
Network Rail (West)	townplanningwestern@networkrail.co.uk
Hereford Travellers Support Group	paebkam@aol.com
RWE Npower Renewable	Jeremy.smith@rwe.com
Severn Trent Water	Growth.development@severntrent.co.uk
The Coal Authority	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
Woodland Trust	Justin.milward@woodland-trust.org.uk

Other organisations:

- Pencombe Group: clerk@pencombegrouppc.org.uk
- Bromyard & Winslow: clerk@bromyardandwinslow-tc.gov.uk
- Avenbury: avenburyparishclerk@gmail.com
- Bishops Frome: clerk@bishopsfromeparishcouncil.gov.uk
- Much Cowarne Group: clerk@muchcowarnegroup-pc.gov.uk
- Ocle Pychard Group: clerk@oclepychardgroup-pc.gov.uk

Copy of letter / email

STOKE LACY PARISH COUNCIL

c/o 4 Millfield
Canon Frome
Ledbury
Herefordshire
HR8 2TH

14 January 2022

Dear Consultee,

Notification of Formal Public Consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)
(Regulation 14 Town and Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended))

I am writing to advise you that the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been published for formal consultation by Stoke Lacy Parish Council.

The Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared by the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group on behalf of Stoke Lacy Parish Council. The Draft Vision, Objectives, Policies and Proposals are all informed by the responses to the public consultation on the Issues and Options and Draft Plan which took place from 2020 – 2021.

The Draft Plan is also supported by Design Codes, which were prepared by consultants AECOM in 2021 under the Locality Technical Support programme.

The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 17th January 2022 to 5pm Monday 7th March 2022.

The Draft Plan, evidence base and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded from the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan website: www.stokelacy.co.uk

Hard copies of the Neighbourhood Plan are available from the Clerk – please email parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk

The Regulation 14 consultation public meetings with the Parish are due to take place on the following dates:

- Wednesday 19th January 2022 between 19:00 and 21:00 and,
- Saturday 22nd January 2022 between 14:00 and 16:00

A Response Form is provided for comments, but the Parish Council also welcomes comments by email or in writing.

Please submit all comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan by email to: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk or post to the above correspondence address, or by hand to the NDP mail boxes located at the Village Hall or in the Church porch.

Following the public consultation process on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Plan will be amended and submitted to Herefordshire Council together with supporting documentation, including a Basic Conditions Statement demonstrating how the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, and a Consultation Statement setting out who has been consulted, how the consultation has been undertaken and how the representations received have informed the revised Plan.

Herefordshire Council will then re-consult, before the Plan is subjected to an Examination by an independent Examiner. If the Examiner is satisfied that, subject to any recommended changes, the NDP meets the required Basic Conditions, then the amended Plan will be subjected to a local Referendum. If there is a Yes vote, then the NDP will be made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council and used to help determine planning applications in the Parish.

When we submit the plan, personal information, including your name, address and email may be shared with Herefordshire Council to enable them to discharge their legal duties in relation to publicising and consulting on the submission version of the plan and for organising the examination in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations. To comply with the requirements of the recent Data Protection legislation, please confirm you have read and understood this statement and give your consent for your details to be passed on to Herefordshire Council.

If you respond using the Response Form there is a box to tick to indicate your consent. If you respond by email or letter please indicate that you consent for your personal details being provided to Herefordshire Council to enable them to perform their duties.

If you require any further information, please contact the parish clerk at the addresses provided above.

Yours Sincerely

Paul R Hayden

PR HAYDEN
Parish Clerk
Stoke Lacy Parish Council

Appendix 11 – Response Forms

Draft Plan Response Form

Stoke Lacy Draft NDP (v6A) – Response & feedback form

Public Consultation Mon 17th Jan 2022 to 5pm Mon 7th Mar 2022

Name	
Organisation	
Address	
Email	
Tel. No.	

Data Protection - please indicate your choice with a tick ✓

I do consent to my contact details being provided to Herefordshire Council so that they can keep me informed about the next stages in the NDP process.	
I do not consent to my contact details being provided to Herefordshire Council	

Please indicate whether you support or object each of the following and provide any comments or suggestions to explain how you think the NDP Review may be improved.

Policy Number	Support (Please Tick ✓)	Object (Please Tick ✓)	Comment
Draft Vision			
Draft Objective 1.			
Draft Objective 2.			
Draft Objective 3.			
Draft Objective 4.			
Draft Objective 5.			
Draft Objective 6.			

Draft Objective 7.			
Draft Policy SL1: Protect and Enhance Landscape Character and Biodiversity			
Draft Policy SL2: Local Green Space			
Draft Policy SL3: Public Open Space			
Draft Policy SL4: Protecting Heritage and Local Built Character			
Draft Policy SL5: Promoting Innovative and Sustainable Design			
Draft Policy SL6: Tourism and Rural Enterprise			
Site Allocation SL7/1 - Site 9 (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm)			
Draft Policy SL8: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel			
Draft Policy SL9: Development within the Settlement Boundaries			
Draft Site Allocation SL9/1 Crossfield House, Stoke Cross			
Draft Policy SL10: Housing Mix			

Please use the box below for comments on the NDP Design Codes Document (v4)

Thank you for your time and interest in the Stoke Lacy NDP

Please return this form by 5pm Monday 7th March 2022 to:

- Email: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk
- Or: post in the NDP post boxes at the Church and Village Hall

Design Codes Response Form

Stoke Lacy NDP Design Codes – Response & feedback form

Public Consultation Mon 17th Jan 2022 to 5pm Mon 7th Mar 2022

Name	
Organisation (if applicable)	
Address	
Email	
Tel. No.	

To which part of the Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan does your representation refer?

Page Number	
Paragraph Number	
Policy Number	

Are you supporting, objecting, or making a comment? (Please Tick v)

Support	
Object	
Making a Comment	

Data Protection - please indicate your choice with a tick.

I do consent to my contact details being provided to the Herefordshire Council so that they can keep me informed about the next stages in the NDP process	
I do not consent to my contact details being provided to Herefordshire Council Herefordshire Council	

Please use the box below for comments on the NDP Design Codes Document (v4)

Thank you for your time and interest in the Stoke Lacy NDP

Please return this form by 5pm Monday 7th March 2022 to:

- Email: parishclerk@stokelacyparishcouncil.org.uk
- Or: post in the NDP post boxes at the Church and Village Hall


Appendix 12 – Village Hall Displays

Welcome to the

Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan

DRAFT VISION AND OBJECTIVES

The Draft Vision and Objectives for the NDP have been prepared by the Steering Group, taking into account comments made during the consultations. The Vision sets out how the Parish should look in the future and the Objectives provide the framework for preparing the NDP planning policies and proposals to achieve the Vision.



Stoke Lacy Parish and Neighbourhood Area

DRAFT VISION FOR STOKE LACY NDP

Stoke Lacy is a rural community which wishes to retain its distinctive character of historic and heritage assets while allowing the community to flourish and develop. Development should be sustainable thereby meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Emphasis should be on Climate Smart Choices and resource efficiency. By 2031, residents of Stoke Lacy will continue to enjoy a high quality of life with good access to local facilities and to the exceptional countryside around the Parish.

DRAFT OBJECTIVES FOR STOKE LACY NDP

Objective 1: To protect and enhance valued landscapes and views and the intrinsic character and beauty of our countryside; to recognise the wider benefits including those of the best and most versatile agricultural land and of the trees and woodlands; to protect our dark skies, wildlife habitats and biodiversity; to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. (See NDP Policies SL1: Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character and Biodiversity and SL2: Local Green Space).

Objective 2: To develop a greater sense of community and identity and improve the cohesion between the several separate communities that make up Stoke Lacy Parish ensuring new residents feel welcome, and everyone feels safe and valued. (See NDP Policy SL3: Public Open Space)


Objective 3: To support and enhance existing local facilities including the Village Hall, Church and Plough Inn Public House, and to actively encourage community involvement and engagement in Parish activities. (Through the preparation of the NDP and other Parish Council activities).

Objective 4: To ensure all new buildings make a positive contribution to local character and distinction whilst embracing innovative and contemporary design, with resource efficiency very much in the foreground. Design codes should be used to ensure land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places which maintain the area's prevailing character and setting including rural gardens. (See NDP Policies SL4: Protecting Heritage and Local Built Character and SL5: Promoting Innovative and Sustainable Design).

Objective 5: To provide a supportive framework for all appropriate local, rural economic development. (See NDP Policy SL6: Tourism and Rural Enterprise and Site Allocation SL7/1: Barn Conversion for Employment Use at Hopton Court Farm).

Objective 6: To improve accessibility for all so that roads and footpaths, and particularly the A466 will be safer, well maintained and have good signage. (See NDP Policy SL8: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel).

Objective 7: To sustain age diversity in the community by ensuring the availability of affordable property for the younger generation and suitable property for an ageing population. This will enable them to remain in the community that they know and by which they are supported as their housing needs change. New housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of our community. (See NDP Policy SL9: Development within the Settlement Boundaries, Site Allocation SL9/1: Crossfield House, Stoke Cross and Policy SL10: Housing Mix).



Stoke Lacy NDP – Why is it important?

Planning approvals across Hereford are ultimately decided by Herefordshire Council Planning Department.

There are ways in which residents can object to proposed planning:

- Send an objection to the Council
- Write to the local Councillor (in our case Three Crosses, Jonathan Lester)

As a parish collectively, the only influence we have over planning applications before they are approved or rejected is through the NDP.

The NDP, once approved by Herefordshire Council and residents, is a legal document that developers and the council are obliged to take notice of before passing plans.

Therefore, the Stoke Lacy NDP is vitally important to all of us who live in the Parish and who care about what happens to our surroundings.

Stoke Lacy NDP – How many other Parishes have NDP's?

Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP) in Herefordshire

- The Map opposite shows all the parishes across Herefordshire and gives the status of their NDP's.
- In theory, if Developers or Herefordshire Council were looking for places to develop, those parishes without an NDP present the easiest opportunity and those in the process of developing an NDP, the next easiest.
- In Parishes with a 'made' NDP, developers and Herefordshire Council must take note of the contents of the NDP.



Stoke Lacy NDP – What do we need from you?


We need you to look at the NDP documentation that is on display and make comments. (If you like)

We are not looking for you to help us re-write the NDP document, this is a Legal Document and has been drafted with the assistance of a professional Planning Consultancy. And, don't feel that you are obliged to make any comments. If you have none, that is fine as the Steering Group and Parish Council have spent the last 2 years preparing and developing the NDP on your behalf.

Please make a note of any questions and comments on the feedback pages provided. The Steering Group members are here to guide you around the displays, otherwise feel free to read then sit down and write down your questions or comments.

All your questions and comments will be reviewed by the Steering Group after the 6 week Consultation Period. Where appropriate, these will then be incorporated into the final version of the NDP Documentation which will be published before the referendum.

We hope that you will approve of the considerable efforts of the Parish Council and NDP Steering Group and that you will support and approve the NDP when we hold the referendum later in the year.



NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Planning Policy 4.10

The NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) advises in paragraph 174 that 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ...
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.'



4.11 Herefordshire Core Strategy Policy LD1 – Landscape and townscape sets out that 'Development proposals should:

- demonstrate that character of the landscape and townscape has positively influenced the design, scale, nature and site selection, protection and enhancement of the setting of settlements and designated areas;
- conserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic beauty of important landscapes and features ... incorporate new landscape schemes and their management to ensure development integrates appropriately into its surroundings; and
- maintain and extend tree cover where important to amenity, through the retention of important trees, appropriate replacement of trees lost through development and new planting to support green infrastructure.'

PROTECTING AND ENHANCING LOCAL LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND BIODIVERSITY

Draft Policy SL1, Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character and Biodiversity, below, has been prepared to encourage development to protect and enhance those key features which contribute to local landscape character and biodiversity and to protect the area's nationally significant dark skies and important Key Public Views.

The Policy draws on Design Code 02 Green infrastructure, active travel and open space which provides advice on providing enhancements to buildings to support wildlife, and Design Code 03 Views and landmarks which considers landscape character, views and natural environment assets. It also includes wording to help ensure development will not have an adverse effect on the conservation objectives of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to species of European importance.




DRAFT POLICY SL1:

Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character and Biodiversity. Proposals should demonstrate consideration of Design Code 02 Green infrastructure, active travel and open space and Design Code 03 Views and landmarks, and the area wide and character area specific design principles. The design of any new build should minimise any adverse visual impacts on the local landscape character of Stoke Lacy Parish, and incorporate the following landscape design and biodiversity principles where they are applicable to the site concerned:

1. Any new building within the settlements of Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross should protect important local landscape features which enhance the character of the built-up area and link it to the open countryside. These include the following: watercourses, ponds, veteran / ancient trees, traditional hedgerows, woodland and traditional orchards. These features should be incorporated into landscaping designs.

2. Landscaping schemes should incorporate the planting of native broadleaved woodland species where possible, and plant new traditional species hedgerows in boundary schemes.
3. Landscaping schemes should be used to enhance local wildlife, providing new and restored habitats and contributing to biodiversity net gain.
4. Buildings should incorporate features to enhance biodiversity including bat bricks, bird boxes and hedgehog gravel boards;
5. Lighting schemes should be designed to minimise light pollution and protect the area's dark skies. Security lighting should be operated by intruder switching, be appropriate to the setting, be unobtrusive and energy efficient and have consideration for neighbouring amenity.
6. Existing public rights of way should be protected, and schemes should provide safe and accessible linkages to nearby walking routes and bridleways wherever possible.
7. Key Public Views are identified in Figure 1 and proposals should respect these views in accordance with Design Code 03. Where a proposal impacts on an identified Key Public View, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or similar study should be carried out to ensure that the scheme is designed and sited sensitively and appropriately to mitigate any adverse impacts.

All proposals must demonstrate that they protect, conserve, and enhance the natural environment in accordance with the principles in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policies SD3, SD4, LD1, LD2 and LD3. This includes demonstrating to a high standard, so that the competent authority may be sure, that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the conservation objectives of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to species of European importance. Planning permission will only be granted if it is shown so that the planning authority can be certain that the proposal, with mitigation, will not increase nutrient inputs to the SAC.



LOCAL GREEN SPACE

5.16 It is a characteristic of the Parish of Stoke Lacy that dwellings are interspersed with agricultural land, woods and green spaces.

5.17 The NPPF includes a relatively new provision - the designation of Local Green Space to protect locally significant areas from development. This is set out in paragraphs 101 to 103. Paragraph 102 sets out the criteria for such designations: 'The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'



5.20 The Local Green Spaces which meet the criteria in the NPPF are identified on the Policies Map for Stoke Lacy (Map 3A) and protected in Policy SL2 below.



DRAFT POLICY SL2: LOCAL GREEN SPACE

The following areas as identified on the Stoke Lacy Policies Map (Map 3A) are protected as Local Green Spaces:

- Netherwood
- Churchyard.

Proposals for inappropriate development will only be allowed in very special circumstances.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Draft Policy SL3 below, supports the provision of a new public open space in the Parish and encourages developers to include contributions to help provide a suitable new space for the benefit of local people. When recreational green spaces are considered, it is important that ongoing maintenance is taken into account.

DRAFT POLICY SL3: PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Proposals for new public open spaces to meet local recreational and community needs or improvements to existing spaces will be supported where they include one or more of the following:

- Areas of woodland, trees and wildflower planting to support local biodiversity;
- Planting of herbs and local traditional fruit trees and bushes;
- Seating and picnic areas;
- A play area for young children;
- Facilities for teenagers; and
- Accessible and safe provision for older people and those with mobility problems.

Designs should ensure accessibility for all through provision of adequate car and cycle parking and safe pedestrian and cycle access and paths. Preferably proposals should be centrally located, within walking distance of residential areas but sited and designed to minimise disturbance and protect residential amenity.

All schemes should be designed to minimise future maintenance costs and be designed in consultation with the local community.

BUILT CHARACTER

The Stoke Lacy Design Guidance and Codes document was produced to inform new pocket development proposed in the area. It presents a summary of the key characteristics as a 'character assessment' of the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan Area which make the neighbourhood area a special place to live in and visit.

This information was then used to inform a specific Design Guide to promote sustainable, representable development and guide best practice across the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The document has been used to inform NDP Policies SL4 Protecting Heritage and Local Built Character and SL5 Promoting Innovative and Sustainable Design and other policies where relevant.

The identified Character Area boundaries, CA1 Stoke Lacy Conservation Area and Village, CA2 Stoke Cross and CA3 the Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area refer to local character assessment and are not the same as the settlement boundaries identified on the Policies Maps in the NDP.

DRAFT POLICY SL4: PROTECTING HERITAGE AND LOCAL BUILT CHARACTER.

1. Development proposals should demonstrate how they have incorporated Design Code 01 Pattern and layout of buildings. In particular designs for development across the neighbourhood area should:

- Reflect local spatial character by adopting similar development layouts;
- Have a density and scale which respond to the local character of low density and small-scale developments;
- Be designed to be permeable, providing vehicular and non-vehicular connections to the existing settlement;
- Provide street connections to enhance connectivity within and through the development and parish, particularly by improving pedestrian connectivity along the A465, to existing Public Rights of Way, and to the countryside;
- Integrate opportunities for contextual views, habitat corridors, and active travel;
- Use layouts which respond to site specific micro-climates to increase the environmental comfort for building users, both internally and externally; and
- Support passive surveillance for enhanced security, particularly relating to streets, pedestrian, bicycle access, play and parking areas.

2. Development proposals should demonstrate how they have incorporated Design Code 02 Green Infrastructure, active travel and open space. In particular designs for development across the neighbourhood area should:

- Retain mature trees and hedges and ensure new planting is appropriate to the local microclimate and soil type, and species are climate resilient;
- Include orchards and hedges where possible;
- Incorporate green infrastructure to provide interconnectivity between existing green infrastructure networks;
- Use SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) where appropriate; and
- Include active travel infrastructure where development is close to bus stops.

3. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 04 Architecture and details. In particular schemes should:

- Maintain the traditional vernacular of two story pitched roofed houses, although bungalows may be acceptable to provide variation in house types particularly where the local context includes single storey conversions of former farm buildings;
- Use perpendicular sited buildings to mark boundaries and create a sense of enclosure;
- Include detailing such as gabled porches, dormers and chimneys. Decorative bricks such as Henrich Bond and contrasting lintels and sills courses are encouraged where they accord with settlement character;
- Incorporate generous eave and verge overhangs and traditional, natural or sustainably sourced innovative materials in soffits or verge cappings; and
- Include innovation such as green/brown roofs or standing seam where appropriate to the local context. Flat roofs for buildings, extensions, garages and dormer windows should be avoided.

4. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 05 Materials. In particular schemes should:

- Use suitable materials and landscape treatments where building elevations are exposed and subject to prevailing winds and rain, taking into account sustainability and longevity. The preference is for locally sourced materials such as Herefordshire brick and stone which is aligned with local geological character;
- Give careful attention to matching the local attributes and variation across facades;
- Consider timber frame construction sourced from local suppliers;



- Use slate or terracotta tiles in roofs. Standing seam and timber shingles roofs may offer an innovative alternative to slate or terracotta;
- Avoid low quality concrete tiles; and
- Use brick or stone walls or native planted hedge in boundary treatments.

5. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 06 Building modifications, extension, conversion and plot infill. In particular extension schemes should:

- Use suitable bricks of similar appearance and size to the host building;
- Be subordinate to the existing building; the original building should remain the dominant element of the property regardless of the number of extensions;
- Not cause unacceptable detriment to the privacy of neighbouring dwellings;
- Incorporate an architectural style which accords with the host building, by using the same or innovative complementary design language, character and fenestration rhythm;
- Consider modern designs with contrasting high-quality materials for extensions to listed or heritage buildings of significance, with clear definition between old and new;
- Be thermally efficient, secure and provide enough natural light, where external office spaces are provided for working from home;

6. Infill plot development should respect the scale, massing and architectural details of the character area within which it sits.

7. Proposals should demonstrate how they have incorporated Character Specific Design Codes.

In particular: In CA1 - Stoke Lacy Conservation Area and Village:

- The quantity of roadside facing development should be restricted to one or two; and
- Communal access and development that extends further than one plot back is supported.

In CA2 - Stoke Cross:

- The number of dwellings in a scheme should be restricted to five or less;
- Centrally located new development could support sensitive mixed uses; and
- New developments should have not more than two dwellings facing the A465 with a primary elevation.

In CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area, subject to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 - 2031 Policy RA3 - Herefordshire's countryside:


- Small-scale farm conversions which respect the original farm building layouts are supported; and
- High quality, sensitively sited and appropriate new houses on single plots may be suitable.

DRAFT POLICY SL5: PROMOTING INNOVATIVE AND SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

All development proposals should demonstrate how designs have incorporated high standards of resource and energy efficiency as recommended in the guidance set out in Design Code 07 Waste, recycling and utilities and Design Code 08 Sustainability and building performance.


1. Waste, Recycling and Utilities Developments should integrate the following into designs:

- Appropriately designed storage for waste and recycling;
- Renewable energy technologies;
- Simple rainwater harvesting facilities such as water butts to reduce water consumption and provide opportunities for water storage and re-use of grey water;
- Sensitive lighting design in accordance with NDP Policy SL1. Lighting design should incorporate ambient lighting levels and identify sensitive receptors to artificial lighting; and
- Electric vehicle charging, mobility vehicle charging, cycle charging and secure storage.



2. Sustainability and building performance Developments should include the following:


- High levels of air tightness through insulation, draught proofing and glazing;
- Use of low carbon heating and energy technologies;
- Consideration of increased occurrence of future adverse weather events such as extreme heat, cold and storm events which increase flood risk; buildings should be designed to be well ventilated and cool in summer, warm in winter, and flood resilient; and
- Landscaping of gardens and green spaces to reduce flood risk and provide shading and shelter.



3. Renewable technologies should be well integrated to protect the existing character of the building in accordance with Design Code 06. PV, solar thermal or other building mounted services should be located discretely. Where new technologies are proposed for listed buildings or other heritage assets, installation should respect the key elevations.

4. Developments which aim to renovate, upgrade and enhance derelict or degrading properties should be encouraged as re-use is more sustainable.

5. Overall developers should aim to go above and beyond current building regulations to future proof development.



TOURISM AND RURAL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

Draft Policy SL6 below, has been prepared to support appropriate and small-scale tourism and local business related development in Stoke Lacy:

DRAFT POLICY SL6:

Tourism and Rural Enterprise Development proposals for small scale tourism and rural enterprise will be supported in Stoke Lacy Parish where they conform to the relevant Design Codes and:

1. Development comprises the sensitive conversion of former agricultural buildings or where new development is proposed, development is of a high design quality which is sensitive to the character of the surrounding rural area;
2. Schemes provide visitor accommodation or small business units to support local rural diversification and employment opportunities;
3. Suitable and safe access is provided, and there is adequate on-site car and cycle parking for visitors and occupants;
4. Applicants can demonstrate that the local highway network is adequate in terms of design and capacity to cater for any increases in traffic generation; and...
5. The amenity of any neighbouring residential areas is protected, and noise and light pollution are minimised. Proposals for farm/village shops and cafes will be encouraged.



SITE ALLOCATION:

BARN CONVERSION FOR EMPLOYMENT USE AT HOPTON COURT FARM: SITE 9

7.15 Site Allocation. In response to the Call for Sites, a site at Hopton Court Farm was put forward for consideration for employment uses. The Technical Site Assessment Report set out that Site 9 (Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm) is potentially suitable, subject to the mitigation of minor constraints. Therefore, this site was included in the consultation on the emerging draft plan as an option for a site allocation for rural employment.


7.16 The responses from residents to the proposal were mixed. 29% strongly supported or supported the proposal, 43% were neutral, 21% objected or strongly objected and 6% did not answer.

7.17 The comments set out a number of concerns, particularly about the unsuitability of rural, single-track roads such as Hopton Lane to accommodate more traffic, noise and disturbance. However, comments in support of the proposal included that the scheme would provide opportunities for business and employment in the area, give new uses for existing, redundant buildings and bring old buildings back into use. There was also support for business ventures, small business start-ups and employment in the area.

7.18 Site Allocation SL7/1 supports the conversion of a barn at Hopton Court Farm for employment uses subject to criteria.

The conversion of the barn at Hopton Court Farm as shown on the Policies Map (Map 3A) is supported where:

1. Proposals are for the conversion of the building to workshops and employment uses;



2. Suitable mitigation measures are provided to protect and enhance the area of Traditional Orchards (a Priority Habitat) which is adjacent to the site;
3. The septic tank on the site is removed and any ground contamination is made safe;
4. Development is of a suitable scale taking into account the location close to a dwelling and other farm buildings;
5. Development does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of nearby residents, particularly in terms of noise and disturbance; and
6. Traffic movements can be accommodated safely within the rural road network.

IMPROVING ACCESSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

Draft Policy SL8 below, has been prepared to encourage new development to promote more sustainable travel and improved accessibility for all.

DRAFT POLICY SL8:

IMPROVING ACCESSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

Proposals for new development and conversions should promote walking and cycling and use of public transport. Wherever possible, schemes for new housing and employment related development should conform to Design Code 02 Green Infrastructure, active travel and open space and:

1. Link to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and bus stops;
2. Provide suitable and secure storage provision for bicycles;
3. Include external electric charging points for vehicles and bicycles; and
4. Contribute towards improved pedestrian and cycle linkages between Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross and enhancements to paths which provide access to the site.



DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

What is a settlement boundary? A settlement boundary is a line that is drawn on a plan around a village. It reflects the area where a set of plan policies, as in an NDP, are to be applied.



Policy SL9 below, has been prepared to guide new housing development within the settlement boundaries. The settlement boundaries are shown in Map 3A for Stoke Lacy and Map 3B for Stoke Cross.

DRAFT POLICY SL9:

DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Proposals for new housing and other development will be supported within the identified Settlement Boundaries of Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy as shown on the Policies Maps (Maps 3A and 3B) where they conform to the relevant Design Codes and:

1. Proposals are small in scale to protect local landscape character and setting. 'Small in scale' comprises developments of 1-3 houses, or slightly more where the proposal can demonstrate high-quality design which responds positively to the local context, Design Codes and design policies in the NDP;
2. Development of infill and backland sites does not lead to unacceptably high densities which would have an adverse impact on local character;
3. Suitable and safe access is provided;
4. The amenity of neighbouring residents is protected;
5. Design is of a high quality, responding to local character and context whilst incorporating low carbon technologies, resource efficiency measures wherever possible;
6. Development does not exacerbate flood risk and where possible provides a betterment; and
7. Suitable drainage and wastewater treatment is provided in line with Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SD4 Wastewater treatment and river water quality.



CONCLUSIONS OF THE AECOM REPORTS ON THE ASSESSMENT OF SITES SUBMITTED BY LANDOWNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT



Stoke Lacy Parish Council is considering options for potential allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential and employment use.

Following a call for sites in 2020 which resulted in 12 sites being promoted for allocation, a site assessment report was produced in January 2021 which provided recommendations on the suitability for development of those sites. Since the January 2021 report was published, a new site has become available and has been promoted to the Parish Council. All sites were appraised using the same methodology as the January 2021 report.

Site 6 is considered suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to the provision of suitable access through the adjacent land with planning permission, and to consideration of the landscape and habitats.

Sites 3, 4, 5 and 9 are considered to be potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to identified constraints being addressed, including the provision of suitable access (sites 3, 5 and 9), landscape consideration (site 4) and heritage/archaeological considerations (sites 4 and 5).

Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 are not considered suitable for allocation. Sites 1, 8, 10 and 11 would result in isolated development in rural locations, whilst site 2 is unsuitable due to flood risk. Furthermore, sites 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 have significant access constraints.

Site 13 (currently the subject of a planning application to build 20 houses) is unsuitable for development due to the potential impact of development on the character of the settlement, the adverse impact on locally important views and landscape character, and the potential for harm to the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, of all of the 13 sites assessed in the original report and the later addendum, one site is considered to be suitable for development (Site 6) and a further four sites (Sites 3, 4, 5 and 9) are considered to be potentially suitable, subject to identified constraints being addressed.

Of these five sites, four are being promoted for residential development and one (Site 9) is being promoted for employment use. The remaining 8 sites are considered unsuitable for development.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Four of the 13 sites considered in the January 2021 report and the September Addendum are suitable or potentially suitable for allocation for housing or mixed-use development. One of these sites (Site 5) has the potential to accommodate 10 or more dwellings and could be required to include a proportion of affordable housing depending on the thresholds for provision of affordable housing in your area. It is therefore potentially suitable for Discounted Market Housing (e.g., First Homes), affordable housing for rent, or other affordable housing types (see NPPF Annex 2). The proportion of affordable housing is usually set by the Local Plan but is expected to be above 10%, unless the proposed development meets the exemptions set out in NPPF para 65.

SITE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY.

In total, thirteen sites were assessed by AECOM to consider whether they would be appropriate for allocation in the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan. Table 5.1 sets out a summary of the site assessments, which should be read alongside the full assessments available in Appendix A.

"Traffic light" rating: Red indicates the site is not appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan and Green indicates the site is appropriate for allocation. Amber indicates the site may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated. The traffic light rating for all the sites assessed in this report are shown on the maps at Figures 5.1 to 5.4.

The summary table shows that Site 6 is considered suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to the provision of suitable access through the adjacent land with planning permission, and to consideration of the landscape and habitats.

Sites 3, 4, 5 and 9 are considered to be potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to identified constraints being addressed, including the provision of suitable access (sites 3, 5 and 9), landscape consideration (site 4) and heritage/archaeological considerations (sites 4 and 5).

Sites 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 are not considered suitable for allocation. Sites 1, 8, 10 and 11 would result in isolated development in rural locations, whilst site 2 is unsuitable due to flood risk. Furthermore, sites 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 have significant access constraints.

Site 13 (currently subject to a planning application for 20 houses), is considered to be unsuitable for allocation due to the potential impact of development on the character of the settlement, the adverse impact on locally important views and landscape character, and the potential for harm to the setting of listed buildings.

The full assessments are available in the Appendix A of the full assessment report in February 2021 and the Addendum Report in September 2021.



DRAFT SITE ALLOCATION SL9/1: CROSSFIELD HOUSE, STOKE CROSS

The consultation on the emerging Draft Plan asked residents and stakeholders for their opinions on the sites identified in the AECOM Technical report as suitable for housing or suitable subject to constraints being overcome.

These were:


- Site 3 (Crossfield House) for 8 houses
- Site 4 (to the north of Westbury Road, Stoke Cross) for 7 houses
- Site 5 (to the east of Westbury Road, Stoke Cross) for 10 houses and
- Site 6 (to the east of the Parish Hall, Stoke Cross) for 6 houses.

A Table showing the responses is provided in Appendix 5. There were also a large number of comments, both in support of and objecting to each site. Overall, there were more objections than support for each site, although a significant proportion of respondents (ranging from 20% - 30%) were neutral or did not answer. Comments included concerns about the scale of development proposals, urban creep, traffic and access issues, negative impacts on local wildlife and other residents, and flooding and drainage / sewerage issues. 5.21 The following site allocation is therefore identified in the Draft Plan.

The part of the garden at Crossfield House, Stoke Cross as shown on the Policies Map (Map 38) is allocated for housing development for up to 2 dwellings.

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE SUPPORTED WHERE:

1. Suitable and safe access for all modes is provided to the A465 from the existing narrow road south of Woodland View;
2. Existing hedgerows and the pond on the site are retained where possible; and if removed mitigation measures include replacement / relocation and planting schemes use appropriate local native species; and
3. Suitable mitigation measures are provided to protect and enhance the Priority Habitat area of Traditional Orchards to the south of the site.



Map 38

HOUSING MIX


Policy SL10 below, sets out the preferred house types in the Parish.

DRAFT POLICY SL10: HOUSING MIX

New residential development should demonstrate how it contributes to a suitable mix of tenure, type and size of dwelling across the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Area.

Proposals should demonstrate how they respond to local needs for medium sized family housing (up to three bedrooms) with gardens, starter homes of two bedrooms, and housing designed for older people.

Self-build schemes and schemes for larger housing which provide flexible space for homeworking will also be supported providing they conform to the Stoke Lacy Design Codes.



STOKE LACY DESIGN GUIDANCE AND CODES

AECOM has been commissioned to provide design support to Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan Area through the Government-funded Neighbourhood Planning Programme led by Locality.

Objectives:


The main objective of the document, which is available in full on the Parish Council website and on tables in the Village Hall is to establish principles to ensure new development is designed and planned according to existing character and the context of Stoke Lacy. It sets out a series of design guidelines related to residential development.

The document initially provides context 'character assessment' to the design guidelines including strategic issues identified by Neighbourhood Planning Group together with the aspirations of the community, as, although not strictly design issues, these must be considered in the context of any design proposal.

The detailed design guidance and codes can be found on pages 60-79 in the **STOKE LACY DESIGN GUIDANCE AND CODES**.

- Design Code 01: Pattern and layout of buildings.
- Design Code 02: Green infrastructure, active travel and open space.
- Design Code 03: Views and landmarks.
- Design Code 04: Architecture and details.
- Design Code 05: Materials.
- Design Code 06: Building modifications, extension, conversion and plot infill.
- Design Code 07: Waste, recycling and utilities.
- Design Code 08: Sustainability and building performance.

The full report is available online and also a summarised version containing only the 8 Design Codes.



NDP SG – Recommendations to Parish Council


NDP Site Call for Sites
Recommendations from the NDP Steering Group to the Parish Council

(Comments from the Stoke Lacy NDP Community Consultation April / May 2021.)

In general, the residents of Stoke Lacy Community are not keen for any further development and there is a strong feeling that the Parish has already met its Herefordshire Council target for housing with the development of Woodland View.

"I feel we have sufficient new houses in the Stoke Lacy/Cross area. Over the past few years we've had an increase, assuming that the Orchard will be developed, of 30 new houses. We are a small country village, dependent on nearby Bromyard for shops, surgery, hospital, dentist and schools. Bromyard is struggling to accommodate its increase in population. Increasing the size of Stoke Lacy/Cross is just going to add to the traffic and parking problems. Let's leave it as it is"

"Stoke Lacy is now up to the housing levels that are required of us. We have a good development at Newlands, and I feel strongly that development now ought to be add conversions (ginnery converted), a new home here and there....More business opportunities (small workshops attached to homes) Site options 3-4 bunch up housing/truck problems/overcrowded rural area/overstretch sewage"



Everyone
have your say
it's your NDP
www.stokelacy.co.uk
 phone 01885 448102

Information available online at
<https://www.stokelacy.co.uk>

NDP SG – Recommendations to Parish Council

However, if development is absolutely necessary, there is a bias towards small developments, garden developments and housing that ensures local people stay in the area.

"We have exceeded Hereford's wishes in developing Newlands estate. This is a village with no amenities other than hall and church. We want to prevent extra cars and road use. No footpaths up and down hill. 20ft of one or two houses acceptable in a village. Large development absolutely inappropriate"

"Any further development should be homes for people not estates for profit. Only build in one's own back garden if any one time in the tradition of the way houses have been built in the area in the past. Storage must be properly designed to not have detrimental impact on neighbours and wildlife."

"Developments reflective of local need-downsizing to enable people to stay in their area and supportive friends. Starter homes to allow young people to stay local."

"Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an 'island' and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unless as that may seem, small amount 3-4 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, local employment or views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes."

NDP SG – Recommendations to Parish Council

It was also clear from the comments that people feel that the community is separated partly because there is no footpath between Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross.

"Some improvements to the footpath between Stoke Cross and the church will enable better access on foot to the wood and churchyard."

"Stoke Cross has enough development. To help bring both parts of Stoke Lacy together, the footpath should be investigated. Maybe look for funding?"

"Putting in some pavements would be good. My blind daughter is unable to walk her guide dog as no safe routes."

"The provision of safe pedestrian pathway between 'up' and 'down' areas of the village is a high priority."

Bringing the two parts of Stoke Lacy Village together would have benefits not just for the social aspects of the community but it may also increase the size of the congregation at the Church and increase the use of the Plough Inn.

If you have any questions, please ring
 01885 448102
 or email comments@stokelacy.co.uk

NDP SG – Recommendations to Parish Council

The NDP Steering Group recommend that if any further development is required to meet the needs of the Stoke Lacy NDP and Herefordshire Council housing strategies, they should be small developments of houses, utilizing garden infills and housing that would support the local community.

With this in mind, the sites identified that we feel would be supported by the community are:

Site 3 – Crossfield House, Stoke Cross – Since submitting the AECOM figures of 8 houses, Sally Horsnett has re-stated her intention of two self-builds on this site.








Site 9 – Barn Conversion at Hopton Court Farm (Business opportunity)

Finally, another consideration for the Parish Council is to investigate the possibility of implementing a footpath between Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross to bring the community closer together and diminish the feeling of "two separate communities" that currently exists. It is appreciated that this may be a complex task and has been investigated before, but it would be worth investigation grant funding to initiate a project looking at the feasibility.

Photos of Public Events



Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022



Appendix 13 - Regulation 14 Consultation Response Tables

Table 1 Herefordshire Council

Team / Department	Page No.	Para No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
1. Neighbourhood Planning	All				Note that all the comments made to the pre-consultation draft have been taken on board in the draft version	Noted.	No change.
2. Strategic Policy Core Strategy Conformity Assessment				Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Noted.	No change.
2.1			SL1	SD3; SD4; LD1; LD2	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.2			SL2	SS6; OS3	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.3			SL3	OS1; OS2; OS3	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.4			SL4	SD1; LD1; LD4;	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.5			SL5	SD1; SS1; SS6	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.6			SL6	E4; RA4; RA5; RA6	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.7			SL7/1	RA5	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.8			SL8	SS4; MT1	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.9			SL9	RA2; RA3	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.10			SL9/1	N/A	Y	Noted.	No change.
2.11			SL10	H3	Y	Noted.	No change.
					Other comments/conformity issues:	Noted.	No change.

					<p>The plan is in general conformity with the policies of the Core Strategy and Strategic Planning therefore raises no objections to this draft NDP.</p> <p>Strategic planning understand that Stoke Lacy have already exceeded their proportional growth requirement (RA2) therefore accept the inclusion of limited and small scale growth policies.</p>		
3. Development Management							
3.1				Comment	<p>General</p> <p>A contents page to list the NDP Policies would be ideal to help all users.</p>	Accepted.	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p><u>Insert Table of Policies with page numbers</u></p>
3.2			SL1	Comment	<p>As a positive, the visualisation of Key Public Views which helps understand what is valued by the neighbourhood area, is welcomed.</p> <p>Is it possible to clearly define new build – is this</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>‘New build’ refers to all new development. Amend SL1 Part 1 so refers to ‘All new development’ to make clearer.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend SL1 Part 1:</p> <p>‘Any new building ...’ <u>All new development</u></p>

					<p>solely new residential development or all types of development?</p> <p>With reference to the River Wye SAC, we noted it to be replicated on several occasions in the NDP. Could this be a separate policy in itself?</p>	<p>The wording referring to the River Wye SAC was previously provided by Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>Following further consultation with HC, the NDP Team advised using one nutrient neutrality policy (using the wording agreed with Natural England) to cover all the aspects with regards to the River Lugg phosphate/SAC issue rather than a number of criteria in various policies.</p>	<p><u>Copy the SAC wording to provide one single new Policy and delete this paragraph from other NDP policies and site allocations.</u></p>
3.3			SL2	Comment	<p>It is felt that the policy should be amended in its wording to say that proposals for such development will only be allowed in very special circumstances as inappropriate development would effectively give the impression that it should not be supported.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL2 as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL2 to:</p> <p>'Proposals for inappropriate development will only be allowed in very special circumstances.'</p>
3.4			SL3	Comment	<p>At a glance, it is felt that the policy could be undermined. For example, if you are only requiring a developer to provide one of those elements and not multiple elements, you may not get what you are hoping for.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL3 as suggested.</p> <p>The reference to Netherwood at the top of p30 (para 5.24) is simply a note of a comment made</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL3 to:</p> <p>'Proposals for new public open spaces to meet local recreational and community needs or improvements to existing spaces <u>should be proportionate to the development concerned.</u>'</p>

					<p>As a suggestion, could it be amended in its wording to say it is proportionate to the development concerned e.g. we have thresholds for play provision in Core Strategy</p> <p>Whilst not in the policy, you've made reference to saying that explicitly saying at top of page 30 to provide facilities for Netherwood when Policy SL2 states that development is not allowed except in very special circumstances.</p>	<p>by a member of the public during a public consultation exercise and is not included in Policy SL3.</p>	<p>Schemes will be supported where they include one or more of the following:...</p>
3.5			SL4	Comment	<p>This is too long a policy and can be more simply broken down into 3 if not 4 separate policies as it appears to try to cover every material consideration.</p> <p>Policies could be broken into heritage, built character, design, green infrastructure etc.</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Revise Policy by breaking it down into several different policies linked to the design codes ie:</p> <p>SL4: Pattern and Layout of Buildings</p> <p>SL5: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>SL6: Detailing and Materials</p> <p>SL7: Conversions, Extensions and Infill</p> <p>SL8: Character Areas</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL4 to the following and reformat so subsections a, b, c etc now run numerically so the policies are consistent across the NDP.</p> <p><u>Draft Policy SLX: Protecting Heritage and Local Built Character Pattern and Layout of Buildings</u></p> <p>4- Development proposals should demonstrate how they have incorporated Design Code 01 Pattern and layout of buildings (<u>see Appendix 7</u>)</p> <p>In particular designs for development across the neighbourhood area should:</p>

						<p>(It is felt that the Policy titles should refer as closely to the design codes as possible to reduce confusion.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflect local spatial character by adopting similar development layouts; 2. Have a density and scale which respond to the local character of low density and small scale developments; 3. Be designed to be permeable, providing vehicular and non-vehicular connections to the existing settlement; 4. Provide street connections to enhance connectivity within and through the development and parish, particularly by improving pedestrian connectivity along the A465, to existing Public Rights of Way, and to the countryside; 5. Integrate opportunities for contextual views, habitat corridors, and active travel; 6. Use layouts which respond to site specific micro-climates to increase the environmental comfort for building users, both internally and externally; and 7. Support passive surveillance for enhanced security, particularly relating to streets, pedestrian/bicycle access, play and parking areas. <p>Character Area Specific Design Codes</p> <p>In CA1 - Stoke Lacy Conservation Area and Village:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

							<p>8. The quantity of roadside facing development should be restricted to ones or twos; and</p> <p>9. Communal access and development that extends further than one plot back is supported.</p> <p>In CA2 - Stoke Cross:</p> <p>10. Centrally located new development could support sensitive mixed-uses; and</p> <p>11. New developments should have not more than two dwellings facing the A465 with a primary elevation.</p> <p>In CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area, subject to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 Policy RA3 – Herefordshire’s countryside:</p> <p>12. Small-scale farm conversions which respect the original farm building layouts are supported; and</p> <p>13. High-quality, sensitively sited and appropriate new houses on single plots may be suitable.</p> <p><u>Policy SLX: Green Infrastructure</u></p> <p>2- Development proposals should demonstrate how they have incorporated Design Code 02 Green infrastructure, active travel and open space (<u>see Appendix 7</u>).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In particular designs for development across the neighbourhood area should: a. Retain mature trees and hedges and ensure new planting is appropriate to the local microclimate and soil type, and species are climate resilient; 2. Include orchards and hopyards where possible; 3. Incorporate green infrastructure to provide interconnectivity between existing green infrastructure networks; and 4. Use SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) where appropriate; and c. Include active travel infrastructure where development is close to bus stops. <p>Character Area Specific Design Codes</p> <p>In CA2 - Stoke Cross:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Sufficient planting should be incorporated to visually mitigate new development. <p>In CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area, subject to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 Policy RA3 – Herefordshire’s countryside:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Schemes should reduce habitat loss, increase tree cover and interconnect green infrastructure networks. <p>Policy SLX: Detailing and Materials</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>3. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 04 Architecture and details <u>and Design Code 05 Materials (see Appendix 7).</u></p> <p>In particular schemes should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain the traditional vernacular of two story pitched roofed houses, although bungalows may be acceptable to provide variation in house types particularly where the local context includes single storey conversions of former farm buildings; 2. Use perpendicular sited buildings to mark boundaries and create a sense of enclosure; 3. Include detailing such as pitched porches, dormers and chimneys. <u>Flat roofs for buildings, extensions, garages and dormer windows should be avoided.</u> Decorative bricks such as Flemish Bond and contrasting lintels and string courses are encouraged where they accord with settlement character; 4. Incorporate generous eave and verge overhangs and traditional, natural or sustainably sourced innovative materials in soffits or verge cappings; and 5. Include innovation such as green/brown roofs or standing
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>seam where appropriate to the local context.</p> <p>Flat roofs for buildings, extensions, garages and dormer windows should be avoided.</p> <p>4. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 05 Materials. In particular schemes should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Use suitable materials and façade treatments where building elevations are exposed and subject to prevailing winds and rain, taking into account sustainability and longevity. The preference is for locally sourced materials such as Herefordshire brick and stone which is aligned with local geological character; 7. Give careful attention to matching the tonal attributes and variation across facades; 8. Consider timber frame construction sourced from local suppliers; d. Use slate or terracotta tiles in roofs. Standing-seam and timber shingles roofs may offer an innovative alternative to slate or terracotta; 9. Avoid low quality concrete tiles; and 10. Use brick or stone walls or native planted hedge in boundary treatments.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>Character Area Specific Design Codes</p> <p>In CA1 - Stoke Lacy Conservation Area and Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Strong architectural variation is encouraged with distinct dwelling types; 12. High-quality innovation should compliment traditional architecture, the Conservation Area and wider character area; and 13. Single plot infill or small-scale farm style developments should vary building typology. 14. Materials should be sympathetic to the Conservation Area and setting. <p>In CA2 - Stoke Cross</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Greater architectural variation should be demonstrated across development; and 16. Pitched roofs of 45° or greater are encouraged. <p>In CA2 - Stoke Cross & CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area, subject to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 Policy RA3 – Herefordshire’s countryside:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17. New development in remote areas should accord architecturally with nearby precedent. 18. New development should use unifying local materials to increase synergy with nearby developments; and
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>19. Locally characteristic brick, stone or hedge boundaries should be specified, and timber panel or feather edge fencing should be avoided on primary elevations.</p> <p>Policy SLX: Conversions, Extensions and Infill</p> <p>5. Designs should demonstrate how they have incorporated the neighbourhood area-wide Design Principles set out in Design Code 06 Building modifications, extension, conversion and plot infill (see Appendix 7). In particular extension schemes should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use suitable bricks of similar appearance and size to the host building. 2. Be subordinate to the existing building: the original building should remain the dominant element of the property regardless of the number of extensions; 3. Not cause unacceptable detriment to the privacy of neighbouring dwellings; 4. Incorporate an architectural style which accords with the host building, by using the same or innovative complimentary design language, character and fenestration rhythm;
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>5. Consider modern designs with contrasting high-quality materials for extensions to listed or heritage buildings of significance, with clear definition between old and new;</p> <p>6. Be thermally efficient, secure and provide enough natural light, where external office spaces are provided for working from home;</p> <p>7. Infill plot development should respect the scale, massing and architectural details of the character area within which it sits.</p> <p>Character Area Specific Design Codes</p> <p>In CA1 - Stoke Lacy Conservation Area and Village and CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area, subject to Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 Policy RA3 – Herefordshire’s countryside:</p> <p>8. The character of old farms and farm buildings should not be simplified and lost through redevelopment.</p> <p>In CA2 - Stoke Cross:</p> <p>9. Extensions or building modification should enhance the overall architectural character of the property and create synergy with Neighbourhood Area character.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<u>Check and renumber all NDP Policies where required.</u>
3.6			SL4	Comment	As a suggestion, should the policy simply refer to saying that development refers to meeting the design codes, then including the design codes as an appendix?	Partially accepted. The Parish Council would prefer to keep as much detail as possible in the NDP policies to afford greater weight in decision making but it is accepted that the relevant design codes could be copied into an appendix as well.	Amend NDP. <u>Copy the complete design codes into a new Appendix.</u>
3.7			SL4	Comment	A question as to why is active travel included with green infrastructure and open space, as it does not appear to have any logic.	Noted. See 3.5 above. The reference to Active Travel should be deleted. Policy SL8 also refers to Design Code 02 and refers to active travel.	No further change.
3.8			SL4	Comment	It is felt that whilst it is a very detailed policy, you only have one commitment (10 at Village Hall which could be resolved prior to NDP passing referendum) and one allocation (for circa 2 dwellings). Is the neighbourhood area likely to have anything of scale to justify all these ele-	It is accepted that this is a very detailed design policy for an area where only small-scale future development is proposed. The design codes which informed this policy were prepared alongside the NDP at a time when decisions about housing site allocations had not been made. The Call for Sites	No further change.

					<p>ments or could it be simplified. Particularly, in SL9 you are referring to small-scale development anyway. Could much of the policy be omitted and it simply to say that character should respect local vernacular.</p>	<p>generated several major sites, and these were all subjected to technical assessment and then public consultation. The process resulted in the NDP retaining only one small site in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>However the area continues to be subject to significant development pressure and the Parish Council would prefer to retain detailed design policies in the NDP if possible as part of 'future proofing' the Plan, taking into account current development pressures and the uncertainties around the new emerging Herefordshire Local Plan and new housing growth requirements. In addition the Government has made it clear that NDPs have a role in setting out design codes at a neighbourhood level (see NPPF para 127 which sets out 'Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development, both through their</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						own plans and by engaging in the production of design policy, guidance and codes by local planning authorities and developers.'	
3.9			SL4	Comment	We have questions over maintenance over some proposed elements e.g. orchards and hopyards, often difficult to enforce.	Noted. If possible the Parish Council would prefer to retain these however as they are characteristic features of the area. The Policy does say 'wherever possible'.	No change.
3.10			SL4	Comment	What does 3b mean? Perpendicular sited buildings	Noted. 'Vertical emphasis' would be a better phrase.	Amend NDP. Amend Policy SL4 3b: Use perpendicular sited buildings with a vertical emphasis to mark boundaries and create a sense of enclosure;
3.11			SL4	Support	As a positive, it is refreshing to see reference to considering modern design and if breaking down into an extensions only policy, this is very good and probably as good as it could be.	Noted.	No change.
3.12			SL4	Comment	This an ultimately a policy where significant new residential development is unlikely, given what has already been built and committed to. It	Noted. See 3.8 above for justification to retain the policy in the NDP (amended to	No further change.

					feels over the top and needs a re-think.	be several shorter policies).	
3.13			SL5	Comment	<p>As a positive, good to see reference to electric vehicle charging.</p> <p>Criteria 5 should be omitted, as if you are saying go above and beyond and an applicant/development does it, the policy says it aims to not must.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted. Delete criterion 5.</p> <p>In any case this is likely to be superseded by the new HC Draft SPD on Environmental Building Standards.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Delete SL5 part 5.</p> <p>5. Overall developers should aim to go above and beyond current building regulations to future proof development.</p>
3.14			SL6	Comment	<p>We are pleased to see a policy to do with tourism.</p> <p>A major point was raised that there is no reference to Wye Valley Brewery or the adjoining Woodend Lane business park? This is particularly noteworthy given the settlement has quite a concentration of commercial businesses and that there is was no policy with seek to explore options retain the brewery and business park as employment land, if business operations expand to the point where re-location may be necessary. Given its/ drawn within the settlement boundary for the NDP, are we expecting</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Identify Wye Valley Brewery and business park as 'employment land' within the settlement boundary of the Policies Map (Map 3B).</p> <p>Include new Policy in the NDP linked to Core Strategy Policy E2.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p><u>Identify Wye Valley Brewery and business park as 'employment land' within the settlement boundary of the Policies Map (Map 3B).</u></p> <p>Add new Policy referring to the employment site:</p> <p><u>'Policy SL (X) Employment Site</u></p> <p><u>The Wye Valley Brewery, Woodend Lane Business Park and the outdoor storage business as identified on Stoke Cross Policies Map 3B are safeguarded as employment land and buildings under Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Policy E2 – Redevelopment of existing employment land and buildings.'</u></p> <p>Insert new supporting text:</p>

					<p>that if such a commercial use is abandoned, further residential development hereabouts on these sites.</p> <p>It is suggested that the NDP settlement boundary clearly identifies the extent of Wye Valley Brewery and the business park, and makes this protected employment land. This allows for a new policy to be separately created to ensure that change of use of protected employment land to residential or other uses would require appropriate marketing prior to being considered for residential use.</p>		<p><u>'During the Regulation 14 public consultation, Herefordshire Council recommended that Wye Valley Brewery and the adjoining Woodend Lane business park should be identified on the policies map and protected as employment land. There is also an outdoor storage business on two sites occupied by NSA Event Bars (Neville Symonds Associates Ltd) adjacent to Drakewell. Stoke Lacy has quite a concentration of commercial businesses and the NDP provides an opportunity to support the retention of the brewery and business park as employment land, if business operations expand to the point where re-location may be necessary. This would help to ensure the area continues to provide accessible local employment opportunities.</u></p> <p><u>Therefore the employment land is identified on Policies Map 3B and safeguarded in Policy SL (X) Employment Site.'</u></p> <p>The chapter (7.0 Business and Tourism) may need reformatting and editing so that this new section comes near the beginning – possibly after 7.1.</p> <p>Refer to NPPF and Core Strategy Policy E2.</p>
3.15			SL8	Comment	It is suggested that Criteria 4 be omitted as given the likely scale of	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Delete criterion 4.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Delete Policy SL8 Part 4.</p>

					proposed schemes now anticipated, as suggested in Policy SL9 and the allocated site, it would not generate s106 contributions.		4. Contribute towards improved pedestrian and cycle linkages between Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross and enhancements to paths which provide access to the site.
3.16			SL9		<p>Reference to 1-3 houses or slightly more appears to be conflicting with Policy SL4 which says for up to 5 houses. It would not be advised to say 'slightly more', but rather keep it specific in numbers being defined rather than being unnecessarily vague and leaving it to a subjective view.</p> <p>As a consequence, is point 2 needed when you're saying small-scale given the likely anticipated houses schemes which are likely to be forthcoming in future.</p> <p>Again this policy feels very repetitive when we have seen the same elements repeated in other policies.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Some parts of the Policy could be deleted as they are covered elsewhere in more detail:</p> <p>Part 2 is covered in SL4, 1a, 1b and 6.</p> <p>Part 5 is covered in SL5.</p> <p>Part 8 could be deleted as repeats from SL1.(TBC)</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL9 part 1 to:</p> <p>1. Proposals are small in scale to protect local landscape character and setting. 'Small in scale' comprises developments of 1-3 houses, or slightly more up to 5 where the proposal can demonstrate high-quality design which responds positively to the local context, Design Codes and design policies in the NDP;</p> <p>Delete part 2: 2. Development of infill and backland sites does not lead to unacceptably high densities which would have an adverse impact on local character;</p> <p>Delete part 5: 5. Design is of a high quality, responding to local character and context whilst incorporating low carbon technologies, resource efficiency measures wherever possible;</p> <p>Delete Part 8: 8. Proposals demonstrate that they protect, conserve, and enhance the natural environment in accordance with the principles in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policies SD3, SD4, LD1, LD2 and LD3. This includes demonstrating to a high standard, so that the competent</p>

							authority may be sure, that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the conservation objectives of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to species of European importance. Planning permission will only be granted if it is shown so that the planning authority can be certain that the proposal, with mitigation, will not increase nutrient inputs to the SAC.
3.17			SL9/1	Comment	<p>Where is anything to do with specific design or is that reliant on SL4?</p> <p>What is meant by 'other development'?</p> <p>Saying reference to a SAC again, make it is own policy, as applying the plan as a whole</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy SL4 (as amended) would provide design guidance.</p> <p>Policy SL9 refers to housing development so 'other development' should be deleted.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy SL9: Proposals for new housing and other development will be supported ...'</p> <p>(TBC)</p> <p>Delete SL9/1 Part 4:</p> <p>4. Proposals demonstrate that they protect, conserve, and enhance the natural environment in accordance with the principles in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policies SD3, SD4, LD1, LD2 and LD3. This includes demonstrating to a high standard, so that the competent authority may be sure, that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the conservation objectives of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to species of European importance. Planning permission will only be granted if it is shown so that the planning authority can be certain that the proposal, with mitigation, will not increase nutrient inputs to the SAC.</p>
3.18			SL10	Comment	Good to see reference to the current Housing Market Area figures but	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 3.8 above.</p>	No change.

					again, are likely housing schemes in Stoke Lacy going to be of a scale where housing mix is imperative.		
3.19				Comment	<p>Other Matters/Missing Policies for consideration</p> <p>We noted that there was no renewable energy policy – links to Core Strategy Policy SD2</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Add in a new Policy .</p> <p><i>There is a brief mention in 7.6 saying: 'As well as this, many farms have seen the addition of renewable energy and more sustainable practices so that they can continue producing food to world leading standards while caring for the environment.'</i></p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Add new Policy on Renewable Energy. After 7.6:</p> <p><u>'SLX Proposals for New Renewable Energy Technology Schemes</u></p> <p><u>Small scale renewable energy or low carbon energy proposals that demonstrably benefit the community, and respect local character, residential amenity and highway safety will be supported.</u></p> <p><u>Such schemes should be located on brown field sites or be roof mounted and avoid the use of productive agricultural land.'</u></p> <p>Add new supporting text:</p> <p><u>'During the Regulation 14 public consultation Herefordshire Council and CPRE noted that there was no renewable energy policy in the NDP and that applications for renewable energy schemes are likely to become much numerous in the coming decade. Policy SL X has been included in the NDP to help guide such schemes when they come forward in the future.'</u></p>

							<u>Refer to NPPF and Core Strategy Policy SD2.</u>
3.20				Comment	There was no policy regarding the protection of social and community facilities including that of The Plough, Village Hall and Church – links to Core Strategy Policy SC1	Accepted. The community facilities could be identified on the Policies Map and protected under a new NDP Policy.	<u>Amend NDP.</u> <u>Add community facilities to Policies Maps 3A and 3B.</u> <u>Add in a new Policy after 5.15:</u> <u>'Policy SLX Community Facilities</u> <u>The following community facilities in Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy are identified on the Policies Maps:</u> <u>1. The Plough Inn</u> <u>2. Village Hall and</u> <u>3. Church of St Peter & St Paul</u> <u>Proposals involving the loss of a community or local service will be strongly resisted. In exceptional circumstances, however proposals for a change of use of a community facility or local service will be considered where it has been clearly demonstrated, following at least 12 months open marketing at a price reflective of market value, that the use is no longer viable, or it will be replaced by an equivalent or enhanced community use in an equally accessible location.'</u> Insert additional supporting text: <u>'During the Regulation 14 public consultation, Herefordshire Council</u>

							<p><u>noted there was no policy regarding the protection of social and community facilities including that of The Plough, Village Hall and Church linking to Core Strategy Policy SC1. These community facilities are therefore identified and protected in Policy SL(Y) Community Facilities and on the Policies Maps'</u></p> <p>Some reordering of Chapter 5.0 Community Facilities may be required and Planning Policy should refer to the relevant paras of the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy SC1. Move Netherwood section (5.13) to before Local Green Space section.</p>
3.21				Comment	<p>Agricultural development is a large proportion of applications in the neighbourhood area and whether a policy should be included for this?</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Include a new Policy to guide decisions on agricultural development.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Insert new Policy in Business and Tourism section under 'Farming in Stoke Lacy' p42:</p> <p><u>Policy SL X: Agricultural buildings and poly tunnels requiring planning permission</u></p> <p><u>The growth and expansion of rural businesses through conversions and through well-designed new buildings that respect the character of the countryside will be supported.</u></p> <p><u>Development proposals must respect the following:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Amenity of neighbours, with regards to noise, odour and outlook;</u>

							<p><u>2. Careful siting of new buildings and landscaping schemes to minimise visual and landscape impacts and larger buildings should be “broken up” via the sensitive use of materials, colour or ridge height;</u></p> <p><u>3. Use of natural materials, including wood and the use of neutral, earth tones to help blend new buildings into their surroundings; and</u></p> <p><u>4. Use of energy and resource efficiency measures.</u></p> <p>Insert supporting text:</p> <p><u>During the Regulation 14 consultation Herefordshire Council and CPRE suggested that agricultural development forms a significant proportion of planning applications in the Parish and proposals for intensive livestock units and polytunnels can cause considerable controversy within small rural communities. Policy SL X therefore provides guidance for such proposals within Stoke Lacy neighbourhood area.</u></p>
3.22				Comment	As raised above, it is important that a policy for retention or protection of Employment Land/Commercial Uses is considered a priority	Noted. Refer to 3.14 above.	No further change.

3.23				Comment	<p>Little is discussed in relation to Barn Conversions and Policy RA3 housing development, which may wish to be explored or incorporated into SL9.</p> <p>Given the way the settlement boundary is drawn, windfall development is likely to be a main proportion of housing delivery.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy SL4 Parts 5 and 7 (as amended) refer to modifications and conversions.</p>	No change.
4. Transportation and Highways							
4.1			General	Comment	<p>It would be useful if our Highway Design Guide for New Developments could be referenced somewhere in the document.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Add reference to this document in the supporting text of 8.7.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 8.7: <u>'Herefordshire Council's Highways Design Guide for New Development should be followed.'</u></p>
4.2			Portrait of Stoke Lacy	Comment	<p>The National Byway section between Chester and Cirencester passes through the western edge of the parish</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Include this information in the Plan.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Add to 2.6: <u>'The National Byway section between Chester and Cirencester passes through the western edge of the parish.'</u></p>
4.3			Objs	Comment	<p>Objective 6: To improve accessibility for all so that roads and rights of way footpaths, and particularly the A465 will be attractive and safer for</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Objective 6:</p>

					all users, well maintained and have good signage. They should also encourage active travel use.(See NDP Policy SL8: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel)		Objective 6: To improve accessibility for all so that roads and rights of way foot-paths , and particularly the A465 will be attractive and safer for all users , well maintained and have good signage. <u>They should also encourage active travel use.</u> .(See NDP Policy SL8: Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel)
4.4			SL1	Comment	Existing public rights of way should be protected, and schemes should provide safe and accessible linkages to nearby walking routes, cycle routes and bridleways wherever possible.	Accepted. Amend NDP as suggested.	Amend NDP. Amend SL1: Existing public rights of way should be protected, and schemes should provide safe and accessible linkages to nearby walking routes, <u>cycle routes</u> and bridleways wherever possible
4.5			SL4	Comment	2e – Active travel infrastructure shouldn't be restricted to development that is close to bus stops, for example, cycle storage should be/is a standard requirement.	Noted. Refer to 3.5 and 3.7. The reference to Active travel has been deleted from SL4. SL8 could be revised – see 4.7 below.	No further change.
4.6			SL4	Comment	7a + e – Generally the highway authority encourages development to have an active frontage as this often results in lower speeds by creating a village/built-up environment.	Noted. However these are drawn from the design codes.	No change.

4.7			SL4	Comment	<p>Para d. Provide street connections to enhance connectivity within and through the development and parish, particularly by improving pedestrian and cycling connectivity along the A465, to existing Public Rights of Way, and to the countryside;</p> <p>Para e. Include active travel infrastructure, such as where it enhances links connects where developments to public transport bus stops.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend NDP as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Elements of SL4 related to active travel are now in (former) SL8 (see 3.5 above).</p> <p>Amend SL8 (as amended):</p> <p>Para d. Provide street connections to enhance connectivity within and through the development and parish, particularly by improving pedestrian <u>and cycling</u> connectivity along the A465, to existing Public Rights of Way, and to the countryside;</p> <p>Add to SL8:</p> <p>'Include active travel infrastructure, <u>such as where it enhances links and connects</u> developments to <u>public transport</u>.'</p>
4.8		3.3	SL6	Comment	<p>Para 3.</p> <p>3. Suitable and safe access is provided that encourages active travel modes as the preferred mode of transport, and there is adequate on-site car and cycle parking for visitors and occupants;</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend NDP as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend SL6 part 3: Suitable and safe access is provided <u>that encourages active travel modes as the preferred mode of transport,</u> and there is adequate on-site car and cycle parking for visitors and occupants;</p>
4.9		8.1		Comment	<p>Bus services from Stoke Lacy to Hereford now operator 7 days per week</p> <p>Stoke Lacy does appear in the timetable - I think</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend 8.1 as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend 8.1: For only 6 days per week there is an infrequent bus service to Hereford and Worcester via Bromyard that stops at</p>

					perhaps someone has looked at the summary version which just includes the main timing points, the full timetable does include Stoke Lacy		<p>Stoke Lacy, Stoke Cross and Cricks Green. The bus service provides poor connectivity to other towns. On the 7th day there is not a bus service. Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross do not even have a mention in the current bus timetable!! The nearest rail station is Hereford.</p> <p><u>Replace with:</u> <u>'Public transport is limited and reportedly unreliable through the parish . As at April 2022, the 420 bus service operates through Stoke Lacy along the A465. There are 5 buses per week day travelling from Stoke Lacy to Worcester via Bromyard and 3 buses daily at weekends. There are 6 buses to Hereford on weekdays and 3 buses daily at the weekend. Connections via public transport are poor to other market towns such as Leominster and Ledbury. The nearest rail station is at Hereford.'</u></p>
4.10			SL8	Comment	Proposals for new development and conversions should promote and encourage walking and cycling and use of public transport. Wherever possible, schemes for new housing and employment related development should conform to Design Code 02 Green infrastructure, active travel and open space and develop and enhance Link to existing	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend SL8 as suggested</p>	<p>Amend NDP</p> <p>Amend SL8 to:</p> <p>Proposals for new development and conversions should promote <u>and encourage</u> walking and cycling and use of public transport. Wherever possible, schemes for new housing and employment related development should conform to Design Code 02 Green infrastructure, active travel and open space and:</p>

					pedestrian and cycle route links to local amenities s -and bus stops;		<u>Develop and enhance</u> Link to existing pedestrian and cycle route <u>links to local amenities</u> s -and bus stops;
4.10			SL9		Suitable and safe access is provided particularly where this encourages active travel;	Accepted. Amend SL9 as suggested.	Amend NDP. Amend SL9: <u>Suitable and safe access is provided particularly where this encourages active travel;</u>
4.11			SL9/1	Comment	Appropriate visibility onto the A465 will need to be demonstrated and is only likely to achieve visibility commensurate with speeds of 30mph whereby 85 th percentile speeds are likely to be higher	Accepted. Add further criterion to Allocation SL9/1.	Amend NDP. Amend SL9/1. Add to 1: Suitable and safe access for all modes is provided to the A465 from the existing narrow road south of Woodland View <u>and appropriate visibility onto the A465 is demonstrated</u>
5. Environmental Health (Environmental Protection – noise/air)			SL9	Comment	Policy SL9: Development within the settlement boundary would suggest a change to point 4 to read 'the amenity of neighbouring and future residents is protected' This is to ensure that not only the amenity of existing residents is protect by also those in the future.	Accepted. Amend SL9 Part 4 as suggested.	Amend NDP. Amend SL9 Part 4 to: The amenity of neighbouring <u>and future</u> residents is protected'
6. Environmental Health (Environ-			SL9/1	Comment	Site allocation SL9/1 – appears to have had no previous historic potentially contaminative uses	Noted.	No change.

mental Protec- tion – contami- nated land)							

- **Strategic Housing**

None received

- **Landscape/Conservation/Archaeology**

Building Conservation – none received

Landscape – none received

Archaeology – none received

- **Economic Development**

None received

- **Education**

None received

- **Property Service**

None received

- **Parks and Countryside**

None received

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

- **Waste**

None received

If any additional comments are received before the closing date, this will be forwarded separately.

Table 2 Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations

Consultee Name Ref. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
1. National Highways	All			Comment	<p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>Regulation 14 Consultation on the Stoke Lacy NPD Draft Plan</p> <p>Thank you for consulting National Highways on the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan. National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.</p> <p>In responding to Local Plan consultations, we have regard to DfT Circular 02/2013: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development ('the Circular'). This sets out how interactions with the Strategic Road Network should be considered in the making of local plans. In addition to the Circular, the response set out below is also in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant policies.</p> <p>We note that the SRN in closest proximity to the plan area is the A49 trunk road which is roughly 7 miles from Stoke Lacy. We have considered the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan and as</p>	Noted.	No change.

					<p>the plan does not introduce any new development sites or transport related policies that are likely to impact upon our network, we consider that the contents of the plan are for local determination, and we have no further comments to make.</p> <p>If I can be of any further assistance on this matter, please do not hesitate in contacting me.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Assistant Spatial Planner, Midlands Operations Directorate</p>		
2. Coal Authority	All			Comment	<p>Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan - Regulation 14</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For the Attention of: Stoke Lacy Parish Council Herefordshire Council</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	Noted.	No change.
3.1 CPRE	All			Comment	<p>Dear Sir/Madam 2nd February 2022</p> <p>Stoke Lacy Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 14 Consultation</p> <p>I have been asked to comment on Clifford Parish's draft Neighbourhood Development Plan on behalf of Herefordshire Campaign to Protect Rural England.</p> <p>First can I congratulate all those involved in producing the Plan which is clearly the result of many hours work and demonstrates both great knowledge of, and commitment to your parish.</p>	Noted.	No change.

3.2	All			Comment	<p>We do not have your detailed knowledge of the area, nor do we feel it would be right to question local choices about the content of the Plan or indeed, detailed policy wordings. Any suggestions therefore reflect CPRE's national concern for the rural landscape as a whole.</p> <p>We see Neighbourhood Plans as a way to protect all that is best in rural landscapes and would hope that every rural plan would contain where relevant, policies designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and stipulate ways of protecting unique characteristics of the area eg 'dark skies', tranquillity, distinctive landscapes and settlement patterns - Protect the broad sweep of landscapes - Ensure that any development does not adversely the environment in terms of noise, air, water or light pollution - Encourage design which enhances local landscape and settlement character - Protect important views and - Address inappropriate locations for development including: - housing, - industrial scale energy generation and - economic activity (eg intensive livestock farming units and large scale polytunnels). <p>You have addressed many of the key issues for your parish.</p> <p>The following comments specific to your draft Plan may be helpful:</p>	Noted.	No change.
3.3			SL6 / New Policy wording	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst you have addressed Tourism and rural enterprise in draft Policy SL6 and have underpinned your draft NDP with protection of the rural nature of your parish you may wish to include 	Accepted – refer to Table 1, 3.2.1 and the new Policy.	No further change.

					specific reference to Intensive Livestock Units and Polytunnels . Planning applications for such units can cause considerable controversy within small communities		
3.4			SL1 Part 5	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You have mentioned lighting but you may wish to include specific controls over light pollution. This will include mention of street lighting but very importantly should make specific mention of security lighting and require lighting plans for business development. Similarly, any development relating to large agricultural or tourist enterprises may require consideration of light pollution. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy SL1 Part 5 states: 'Lighting schemes should be designed to minimise light pollution and protect the area's dark skies. Security lighting should be operated by intruder switching, be appropriate to the setting, be unobtrusive and energy efficient and have consideration for neighbouring amenity.'</p> <p>Further text could be added to refer to business / agricultural development.</p>	<p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Insert additional text at the end of Policy SL1 Part 5: <u>'Business development must have lighting plans and large agricultural units or tourist enterprises in the countryside should avoid light pollution.'</u></p>
3.5			SL5 / New Policy	Comment	Draft Policy SL5 refers to sustainable design of development. There is no mention Renewable Energy , such as solar and wind farms You may wish to consider mentioning the scale of any such developments that you would find acceptable such as a statement to the effect of "small scale developments may be supported...." You may also take the view that you would give support to solar farms only if they demonstrably benefit the community and you may wish such	Refer to Table 1 3.19.	No further change.

					<p>development to be on brown field sites or roof mounted and suggest that the use of agricultural land is inappropriate.</p> <p>Applications for renewable energy schemes are likely to become much numerous in the coming decade and this is a very important consideration.</p> <p>I hope these comments are useful to you in moving forward with your NDP</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>		
4. National Grid	All				See Appendix A	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These are matters which would be addressed during the development management process.</p>	No change.
5. National Trust	All			Comment	<p>Dear Paul</p> <p>Thank you very much for your email of 14 January 2022 about Notification of Formal Public Consultation on the Stoke Lacy Draft. We're always grateful to hear from our members and supporters.</p> <p>As you will see I have copied your email in to the East Regional Office as they are best placed to look into this and respond to you; I am sure they will contact you soon.</p> <p>If you need to contact them directly with any follow up enquiry, you can email them direct at EE.customerenquiries@nationaltrust.org.uk , and further contact details can be found in our Handbook, app or website.</p>	Noted.	No change.

					<p>Thank you again for taking the time to contact us, as well as for your support of the National Trust.</p> <p>Dear Paul</p> <p>Thank you for contacting the National Trust about the draft Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan. Due to a limit on our resources for engaging in planning work we are currently only making comments on neighbourhood plans in areas where the National Trust owns land or buildings. We don't own land or building in the neighbourhood plan area but I would like to take this opportunity to wish you well in taking your plan forwards.</p> <p>Regards</p>		
6. Herefordshire & Worcester- shire CCG		7.8 7.9		Comment	<p>Thank you for notifying Herefordshire & Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) of the regulation 14 consultation on the draft Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>Herefordshire & Worcestershire CCG has no direct comment on the plan, but are pleased to note the importance placed on improved broadband and telecommunications infrastructure which is of benefit to the provision of healthcare into rural communities.</p>		

Table 3 Residents

Consultee Ref. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
1.	P41	7.1		Comment	<p>Hi Paul</p> <p>Hope all is well with you.</p> <p>In relation to the draft it may well be me but I am unable to find an application for approval of reserved matters in relation to the orchard application P172292 as stated on page 50/51.</p> <p>On page 41 I would suggest that Local Hire Services are not principal local employers and as far as I am aware if they are carrying on a business from the address supplied have no right to to do so.</p> <p>I hope to be at the 9th February meeting.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Up to date information about planning applications is available on the Herefordshire Council website.</p>	<p>Amend NDP</p> <p>Delete p41:</p> <p>Local Hire Services Plant, Machinery Hire, Tool, Plant, Access, Welfare and toilets. https://www.localhireservices.co.uk.</p>
2.	P41	7.1		Comment	<p>With reference to page 41 of NDP, concerning Local Hire Services in Woodend Lane.</p> <p>This business seems to be conducted from a private house in Woodend Lane. When the present owners first arrived here some years ago they set up a business, which involved hiring out skips from their house. This involved much journeying back and forth with heavy vehicles. Following a visit from Hereford Council this stopped.....for a while. But soon we in the lane became aware that the journeying to and fro had recommenced, this time with mobile toilet units. It has become increasingly difficult to see exactly what is happening because the site has been progressively hidden behind a</p>	<p>Refer to 1 above.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

					<p>lleylandii hedge and a concrete wall. But the trucks and trailers are evident from early morning to night. They bump along the road which is now pitted with deep potholes. A further assault on our peaceful country lane is the erection of several high intensity lights, on for several hours each evening.</p> <p>This is not just a personal rant. I have spoken to several of the lane dwellers who are outraged (not an exaggeration) by what has been allowed to happen. We ask simply that we may be able to enjoy the peace and quiet of this lovely country lane. We are aware also that as the COVID restrictions are lifted the business owners may feel that they can continue to expand their business without concern.</p>		
3.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
4.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Object	<p>When I came to the village (Stoke Lacy) 52 years ago it was a village but all this development has spoilt this beautiful village!</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Last year Garden rubbish dumped opposite out listed barn. 2. Later that year my car was egged and we were told by a villager that the culprit was from Newlands! 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These are general complaints and do not relate to the NDP.</p>	No change.
5.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

5.2			SL2	Comment	Map 3A shows green spaces. However the churchyard area does not include the southern section.	Noted. Review settlement boundary.	Amend NDP. The SG will review the Stoke Lacy Settlement Boundary in relation to suggestion.
5.3			SL2	Comment	Running along the lane. It should do so. Apologies if I'm looking at an old version of the map (though it is the one on the NDP site)		
6.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
7.1 (2)			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
7.2			SL7/1	Comment	Pending further information on size and usage.	Noted.	No change.
7.3			SL9/1	Comment	Limited to 2/3 houses	Noted.	No change.
7.4			All / General	Comment	Design Codes should be used in association with the NDP Doc as supporting Technical evidence	Noted.	No change.
8.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
8.2			Obj 4	Comment	But not sure what is meant by 'Design codes should be used to ensure land is used efficiently '	Noted. The design codes refer to density.	No change.
8.3			SL4 Part 7	Comment	See comments on the following page (Draft Policy SL4: 7) The AECOM Design Code document clearly shows the pattern of development in Stoke Lacy Parish (Figure 8.The Nolli Map on Page 45). There is a greater concentration of buildings in the settlements of Stoke Lacy and	Noted. Partially accepted. The reference to RA3 should be retained as this Policy sets out the criteria	Amend NDP. Amend SL4 Part 7 (as revised) – add in to CA3: <u>'the countryside and agricultural land should be protected.'</u>

					<p>Stoke Cross with single and clusters of domestic dwellings as well as farms scattered throughout the rest of the parish. This is the pattern of development supported by the majority of the community and protected in the Herefordshire Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>The wording of Draft Policy SL4: 7. (page39) in the NDP document is the key to supporting this pattern of development while protecting agricultural land and the countryside.</p> <p>Similar to Stoke Lacy, there used to be fields and orchards within the settlement of Stoke Cross. These have now gone as it was recently only possible to build within settlement boundaries. If the housing targets change and it is still only possible to build in or adjacent to settlement boundaries, it is likely that Stoke Cross will again be where building takes place, expanding a settlement without shops, schools or other amenities and against the wishes of the community.</p> <p>There are building policies throughout the country covering cities and open moorland. NDPs were introduced to choose and tailor the appropriate building policies which best reflect the character of individual parishes. (NDP doc. Page 18. 4.6)</p> <p>The revised wording of the NDP (CA1 and CA2) should protect settlements from the building of inappropriately sized estates within settlements. The wording of the policy for CA3 is contradictory. Herefordshire Policy RA3. is a general description of countryside across the</p>	<p>for development proposals outside the settlements.</p> <p>The reference to gardens should be avoided as schemes within farm units may not necessarily be in gardens.</p> <p>The NDP has been through many revisions and editing and has been amended at various times in response to consultations. The submission plan will reflect responses to the Reg 14 consultation. It will be further revised following the examination.</p> <p>The Parish Council may wish to improve the layout of the final version by using a graphic designer.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>county, it would not support new houses being built outside settlement boundaries. The community supports single dwellings in building clusters, the policy CA3 should be carefully worded to reflect the specific pattern of home-building in the Parish of Stoke Lacy.</p> <p>A suggestion for revised wording In CA3 - Outer Neighbourhood Plan Area (remove reference to Herefordshire Policy RA3).</p> <p>f. the countryside and agricultural land should be protected g small-scale farm conversions which respect the original building layouts are supported; and h. sensitively sited, high-quality and appropriate new houses on single plots in gardens may be suitable.</p> <p>General comment</p> <p>The AECOM report is a professional document that clearly reflects the character of Stoke Lacy. The pattern of development throughout the parish has created that character. The recent development in Stoke Cross goes against that character and against the wishes of the community.</p> <p>The NDP document has evolved over two years and the emphasis has changed. Initially the focus was on development within and around settlement boundaries and determining where developers could build estates. The AECOM document recommends a different pattern of development which will protect the particular character of Stoke Lacy Parish. The change of emphasis in the NDP document has</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>resulted in inconsistencies / ambiguities and it would benefit from re-reading and careful re-wording to iron these out.</p> <p>Graphic layout - Aligning the images with each other and the text would give this document a more professional look.</p>		
9.1			Design Codes		<p>I am confused by these response forms, I assume this one refers to the AECOM Design Guidance and Codes but there is no mention of AECOM an the comments page is exactly the same as the last page of the other response form for the NDP. I could not find the full AECOM document on the NDP website.</p> <p>This document is by a professional who is advising is how future development could take place respecting the particular character of Stoke Lacy. It also provides references to the planning policies that would achieve this. I hope these have been carefully read and understood so they can be used to make sure that appropriate homes that are needed can be built while protecting the parish from the building of anymore 'out of character' areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 Herefordshire Council comments.</p> <p>It is proposed to include all the design codes in an Appendix of the NDP and to retain much of the content in the amended planning policies of the NDP.</p>	No further change.
10.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
10.2			SL2	Comment	Need clarification on 'inappropriate' development and what are possible special circumstances.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 ref 3.3. The Policy has been amended slightly and 'inappropriate' has been deleted.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces have the</p>	No further change.

						same level of protection as Green Belt. Refer to NPPF section 13 and paras 147 to 151 for more information.	
10.3			SL4	Comment	Policy is quite broad may benefit from tightening up/ narrowing to be more definite and avoid any ambiguities.	Refer to Table 1 Ref 3.5. The Policy has been split into several different policies and some wording changed in line with HC's advice.	No further change.
10.4			SL7/1	Comment	I generally support increased employment opportunities in the village but have concerns of increased traffic potentially making the lane unsafe for cars, walkers, cyclists in the road.	Noted. Refer to Table 1 and Ref 4. Transportation and Highways' comments. These have strengthened the Plan in terms of promoting more sustainable travel across a range of policies. SL7/1 has been deleted.	No further change.
10.5			SL9	Comment	There needs to be consistency in how settlement boundaries are applied to gardens.	Noted. The Steering Group will review the settlement	Amend NDP. Review settlement boundaries in relation to gardens to provide a consistent approach.

						boundaries in relation to this and other comments.	
10.6			SL10	Comment	A mix of housing is a good idea but we need a mix of support in the village for all ages - mother an baby groups, keep fit, good transport links for anyone unable to use a car / don't have access to a car. Somewhere to buy milk / bread etc.	Noted. These are matters outside the NDP but should be considered by the parish council as possible future actions.	No change.
10.7			General / All	Comment	Is there scope for increased / further development at the industrial estate in Woodend Lane.	Noted. Refer to Table 1 Ref 3.14. Herefordshire Council has recommended that the area is identified as an existing employment site and identified on the Policies Map with a new policy.	No change.
11.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Object	See Over The village has been ruined by the Newlands so any more development will only spoil the village further.	Noted. The NDP has to provide a positive planning framework for new development and cannot be used to stop all further development in the future.	No change.

12.1			Vision Objectives Policies SL1-6 SL8	Support		Noted.	No change.
12.2			SL7/1	Object	An industrial unit is wrong for this area – infrastructure – lane internet very fragile pt 6	Accepted. The Steering Group and Parish Council accepts that the site allocation and supporting text should be deleted. The owner could still apply for planning permission and any applications would be determined through the development management process.	Delete SL7/1 and supporting text.
12.3			SL7/1	'N/A' Object	We object strongly to site SL9 for the following reasons: 1. The danger of more transport (white vans etc) operating down a very narrow lane. This was noted as a 'minor constraint' in the draft report. Traffic movements (a significant increase) cannot be accommodated safely in this lane. 2. The nearness or proximity to a major listed building in Lower Hopton (1234410) and medieval moat. 3. Drainage around Dingle Hill would have to be modified. We already have a fragile water network which would have to be seriously researched if any major business structure were to be added into the area.	It is assumed that this refers to SL7/1. The Steering Group and Parish Council accepts that the site allocation and supporting text should be deleted. The owner could still apply for planning permission and any applications would be determined through the development	Delete SL7/1 and supporting text.

					<p>4. The internet capacity is already very poor in the area. Lower Hopton will not be able to sustain a major increase in usage without major works to lay a new fibre optic network.</p> <p>5. The obvious hindrance to direct neighbours including traffic noise, an increase in noise in general and interference in what we enjoy as a rural landscape.</p> <p>6. With the landscape and wildlife values of Stoke Lacy parish this is not an area in which to put a business.</p> <p>As a footnote we are not against the development of Hopton Barn into a barn conversion. This could certainly enhance the area with a couple of tasteful conversions for personal use.</p>	management process.	
12.4			General	Comment	Many thanks to all those who have worked so hard on this NDP.	Noted.	No change.
13.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
13.2			General	Comment	<p>We moved here one month ago and are not yet familiar enough with our habitat to comment constructively.</p> <p>However we can see that an enormous amount of work has taken place as happened in our previous village.</p> <p>My congratulations to all concerned.</p>	Noted.	No change.
14.1			Vision Objectives 1-3	Support		Noted.	No change.
14.2			Obj 4	Both Support and Obj	Using innovation and contemporary design sounds awful. The most important thing is to ensure any new building should fit in with the current buildings.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 Ref 3.1:</p>	No change.

						<p>‘As a positive, it is refreshing to see reference to considering modern design and if breaking down into an extensions only policy, this is very good and probably as good as it could be.’</p> <p>The NDP tries to provide a balance so that while references to local character are important, high quality design can be contemporary rather than a pastiche.</p>	
14.3			Obj 5	Both Support and Obj	The key word here is appropriate.	Noted.	No change.
14.4			Obj 7	Support and Obj	There is not much point in providing houses for most young and old people unless public transport is significantly improved.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP cannot require improved public transport but can encourage development to be sited close to public transport facilities to encourage greater use.</p>	No change.
14.5			Policies SL1	Support	Agree 100%	Noted.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

14.6			SL2	Support		Noted.	No change.
14.7			SL3	Object		Not accepted.	No change.
14.8			SL4, SL5	Support		Noted.	No change.
14.9			SL6	Object	The Local Hire Services item should be removed as this is a private house, and the owners are not allowed to store any machines locally. The website mentioned is that for a commercial organisation and is out of place in this document.	Noted. Refer to Ref 1 above.	No further change.
14.10			SL7/1	No opinion	I have no opinion.	Noted.	No change.
14.11			SL8	Both Support and Obj	I suggest:- Improve public transport Provide a safe footpath between Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross Otherwise the other items listed, in my view, are irrelevant for a small village like Stoke Lacy	Noted. The Policy has been amended slightly following comments from Herefordshire Council – see Table 1 Ref 3.15 and 4.7.	No change.
14.12			SL9 SL9/1 SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
15.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
15.2			General	Comment	Having just moved into Stoke Lacy I do not feel comfortable in expressing observations just yet. However having been involved in an NDP in our previous village, I can say that I fully appreciate the huge amount of work that has been undertaken by everyone involved and having gone through the plan, I can see that it has been well thought out.	Noted.	No change.
16.1			Vision	Support	Fully agree	Noted.	No change.
16.2			Objectives	Support		Noted.	No change.
16.3			SL1	Support		Noted.	No change.
16.4			SL2	Support	In principle agree with the sentiment.	Noted.	No change.

					Wording needs clarification.	SL2 identifies 2 local green spaces. The NPPF sets out that local green spaces have the same type of protection as Green Belt. Refer to the NPPF chapter 13 for more information.	
16.5			SL3	Support		Noted.	No change.
16.6			SL4		Needs clarification.	Noted. This policy should be read in conjunction with the Design Codes. The Policy has been amended to improve clarity and will be several policies in the submission plan which should make it easier to follow.	No change.
16.7			SL5	Support	Agree	Noted.	No change.
16.8			SL6, SL7/1, SL8	Support		Noted.	No further change.
16.9			SL9	Comment	The application of the settlement boundary lines needs to be consistent. All gardens need to be included. Currently they are not – Old Rectory Garden being a case in point - only Half of the garden is included in the settlement boundary.	Noted. The Steering Group should review the settlement boundaries.	<u>Amend NDP.</u> <u>Review and amend settlement boundaries so consistent.</u>

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

16.10			SL9/1 SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
16.11			Design Codes		Overall I believe the Design Codes document to be a very well constructed and detailed document.	Noted.	No change.
17.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
18.1			Vision Objectives	Support		Noted.	No change.
18.2			SL1	Support / Comment	This is of vital importance and should be prioritised as a guiding principle.	Noted.	No change.
18.3			SL2 SL3	Support / Comment	Under what 'very special circumstances' would inappropriate development be allowed. If inappropriate it should not be allowed at all.	Noted. Refer to Table 1 Ref 3.3. The word 'inappropriate' has been deleted. Refer to the NPPF chapter 13 for information about how Green Belt is protected. Local Green Spaces have the same level of protection.	No change.
18.4			SL4	Support		Noted.	No change.
18.5			SL5	Support / Comment	Absolutely crucial if we are to seriously address issues around climate change.	Noted.	No change.
18.6			SL6	Support		Noted.	No change.
18.7			SL7/1	Comment	It would be helpful to have more detailed information about the workshop and employment uses.	Noted. The Steering Group and Parish Council	Delete SL7/1 and supporting text.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

						accepts that site allocation and supporting text should be deleted. The owner could still apply for planning permission and any applications would be determined through the development management process.	
18.8			SL8	Comment	Electric charging points and the use of electric vehicles to eb strongly encouraged.	Noted. This is included in part 3.	No change.
18.9			SL9	Support / Comment	Any developments should be 'small in scale'.	Noted. This is included in Part 1.	No change.
18.10			SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
18.11			General	Comment	<p>The Stoke Lacy Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022 – 2031 is a very comprehensive, clear and well written document. The presentation, photographs and maps make it highly readable and accessible.</p> <p>I fully support the Plan's focus on biodiversity, home energy efficiency, sustainability all of which are absolutely vital in addressing the challenges of climate change. This must be a priority.</p>	Noted.	No change.
19.1			Vision Objectives 1-6	Support		Noted.	No change.
19.2			Obj 7	Support	More infrastructure required if socially affordable housing proposed – transport, childcare, village shop.	Noted.	No change.

						These are all outside the scope of a planning policy document but may be things the Parish Council wish to support as future actions.	
19.3			SL1- SL8	Support		Noted.	No change.
19.4			SL9	Object	I object to Site 3 otherwise I support the proposed development.	Not accepted. Including a site allocation for housing makes the NDP a more robust document and many respondents support the Plan overall. Suggest they mean 'Site 13' – refer to Table 4.	No change.
19.5			SL9/1 SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
19.6			General	Comment	I am very much against development land at Stoke Cross west of A465 being developed. There is no infrastructure to support this eg footpaths, good highway access, visibility onto the A465. Furthermore development in Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross should in my opinion be fore extensions to properties, annexes for elderly relatives. To continue building in a village with no shop, school, doctors surgery, transportation, childcare or jobs doesn't benefit the community – if these resources were in place then happy to consider development options.	Noted. The NDP has to provide a positive planning framework for new development and cannot be used to stop all further development in the future.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

20.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.1			Vision Objectives 1-5	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.2			Obj 6	Support / Comment	Footpath officer has done an excellent job during his tenure with very little support from Balfour Beatty.	Noted.	No change.
21.3			Obj 7	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.4			SL1	Support / Comment	Why was the heritage (traditional) not replaced at Newlands as specified by the planning department.	Not known. The respondent should contact the planning department with queries about planning applications.	No change.
21.5			SL2 SL3	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.6			SL4	Support / Comment	Especially section 5c.	Noted.	No change.
21.7			SL5	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.8			SL6	Object / Comment	Currently Stoke Lacy and neighbourhood sites / hamlets have an ample supply of tourism accommodation in our communities so we do not need more after Hopton Farm developed.	Not accepted. The NDP supports appropriate tourism related development as part of diversification and to strengthen the rural economy.	No change.
21.9			SL7/1	Support / Comment	Go ahead but as above comment says following development of HCF can we cease further submissions beyond settlement boundaries.	Noted. The settlement boundaries should steer development	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

						to the existing built up areas.	
21.10			SL8 – SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.11			General	Comment	The tarmac roads / highways on the minor roads are abysmal and our lane has not been resurfaced in 40 years. There are innumerable pot holes (quite deep in many places) that are further damaged on a daily basis by the heavy HGV vehicles, plus large farming machinery from a local non licensed business.	Noted. These are matters for Herefordshire Highways department.	No change.
22.1			Vision Objectives 1-3	Support		Noted.	No change.
22.2			Objective 4		Use another word - 'Design codes should be used to ensure land is used efficiently '	Not accepted. Objective 4 reads well.	No change.
22.3			Objectives 5-7	Support		Noted.	No change.
22.4			SL1 – SL3	Support		Noted.	No change.
22.5			SL4 (and Design Codes)		Comments on the following page (Draft Policy SL4: 7) Draft Policy SL4:7 It is clear that the AECOM Report reflects the views of the Stoke Lacy community much more than any other document. For that reason it should be at the hub of NDP objectives. It is totally community orientated and against investor developments which tend to bypass planning stipulations such as the availability of shops, schools, adequate drainage and other social amenities. This clearly happened with the Newlands development.	Noted. The design codes will be included in an appendix in the NDP and should be read alongside the planning policies. It would not be appropriate to refer only to gardens as some development on farms may be appropriate on sites which were not previously gardens.	No change.

					<p>There is a need to amend CA3 – Outer Neighbourhood Plan Areas.</p> <p>h. small-scale, high quality and appropriate new houses on single plots in gardens ‘should’ be suitable.</p> <p>The above also means that self-build should be supported for people who want to live in the area. It would enable older residents who are integral to the parish’s community to down-size within the community. As the NDP’s prime focus is on the quality of life of its parishners in the context of housing it is crucial to treat the parish as a whole rather than as bits and pieces falling under different regulations and curtilage definitions. Present developments clearly indicate a hiatus between Stoke Lacy generally and Stoke Cross specifically in terms of planning roll-out.</p>	<p>Development in the countryside falls under Core Strategy Policy RA3 and this does not include self build projects for older residents to downsize into. The new Local Plan may offer an opportunity for Herefordshire Council to consider this in a new or revised policy, provided it is in line with national planning policy.</p>	
22.6			SL5 - SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
23.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support	No comment	Noted.	No change.
24.1			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
24.2			Design Codes	Comment	<p>Good content but better examples of styles could possibly have been selected from the village. Fewer words would have made it easier to read.</p> <p>However, the content of the guidance is good and will help with future planning applications if approved in a referendum.</p>	Noted.	No change.
25.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support	No comments	Noted.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

26.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.1			Vision	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.2			Obj 1	Support / Comment	Dark skies – get Wye Valley to turn off lights late evenings	Noted. This is not a matter for a planning pol- icy but the Parish Council could re- quest it.	No change.
27.3			Obj 2	Support / Comment	Hard to implement.	Noted. This is an aspira- tion.	No change.
27.4			Obj 3	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.5			Obj 4	Support / Comment	Hard to see that Newlands was in character.	Noted. The NDP can only be used to influ- ence future devel- opment.	No change.
27.6			Obj 5	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.8			Obj 6	Support / Comment	Only if appropriate have you tried to walk from village hall to church?	Noted. This is an aspira- tion.	No change.
27.9			Obj 7	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.10			SL1	Support / Comment	Why was hedge removed on roadside at New- lands – against planning consent	Noted. The respondent should contact Her- efordshire Council about planning ap- plications and con- ditions etc.	No change.
27.11			SL2	Support		Noted.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

27.12			SL3	Support / Comment	Suggesting a wildflower meadow is planted as part of a planning application is pure green washing and never sustainable.	Not accepted. Wildflower meadows may be a suitable way to help secure biodiversity net gain.	No change.
27.13			SL4	Support	Essential to protect heritage.	Noted.	No change.
27.14			SL6	Support / Comment	7.1 Local hire services is not a business with planning consent it is a house!!	Noted. Refer to Ref 1 above.	No further change.
27.15			SL7/1 – SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
27.16			General	Comment	Thank you this is a good document, it is not afraid of pointing out the ? problems created by for example Newlands . I agree with most of the design principles however having to ? with new and old is not always necessary or appropriate.	Noted.	No change.
28.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
29.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
30.			SL9	Object	OBJECT I object strongly to the proposed draft "Development with the Settlement Boundaries" and my full objection is set out below I object strongly to the proposed Draft Policy SL9 relating to the "Development within the Settlement Boundaries" ("DSB").	Noted. The Steering Group should review the settlement boundaries.	<u>Amend NDP.</u> <u>Review settlement boundaries so they consistent in approach with regard to gardens.</u>

					<p>My property is Stoke House and it and its boundaries are set out clearly at the Land Registry. The draft DBS has been drawn arbitrarily straight through my garden, setting more than half of the garden, including its meadow, and various existing workshop buildings outside of the draft DSB.</p> <p>The DSB ought to follow the boundary of my property and include all of my garden, which includes its meadow that runs down to the River Lodon. The entire garden, including the meadow, is absolutely a part of the "Settlement". There are a number of clear reasons why this is so:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historically, the meadow has always been part of the garden and when it was the original herb garden that incorporated all of the land, thus it has all always been a part of the Settlement. 2. The draft DSB has been drawn arbitrarily following the lines of various fences that exist across the garden, which are primarily in place to contain the movements of my dogs and in no way delineate borders of the Settlement. 3. When I bought the house, the entirety of the garden was treated as being a part of the domestic residence, with all of the land being clearly registered at the Land Registry and Stamp Duty being paid on the entire purchase amount, with no reductions for allocation of any land as agricultural or commercial, thus legally and explicitly establishing all of its land as part of the Settlement. 4. It has been confirmed to me that in the recent past planning permission for the development of a house on the land that has been drawn outside of the draft DSB was ap- 		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>plied for and granted, subject only to a condition regarding access and that such access was to be right across the meadow, establishing the entire garden, including the meadow, which was explicitly and deliberately required to be used for access to the proposed house, as a part of the Settlement area.</p> <p>I insist that this crucial amendment to the draft DSB be made in respect of Stoke House, to include all of its garden, including all of the meadow, within the DSB.</p> <p>Whilst I have no current intention of applying for planning permission to develop on any part of the garden, times and circumstances change and the future is unpredictable. It is wholly unacceptable that any potential future application should be prejudiced by part of my land having been arbitrarily and incorrectly excluded from the DSB.</p>		
31.			SL7/1	Object	<p>Draft Policy SL1 details protecting public rights of way. This development would have to be accessed by driving vehicles along the pathway track of the Three Choirs Way (this crosses fields before crossing Hopton Lane) –</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Steering Group and Parish Council accepts that the site allocation and</p>	Delete SL7/1 and supporting text.

					<p>an important historic walkway joining Worcester, Gloucester and Hereford. The barn's only access is along the track where the Three Choirs Way turns. This is in direct contradiction to Draft Policy SL5.</p> <p>The Parish Council recommendations based on local opinion was that housing should be encouraged. A conversion to a domestic dwelling would adhere to this and would not put the vehicular access strain on the local area that industrial units would. As detailed in Draft Policy SL6 the roads and surrounding areas used to be maintained. Hopton Lane is already used by large volumes of farm traffic and as a single track lane would not support the greater volume of traffic that this proposed conversion would entail.</p> <p>SL6.4 – 'local highway must be adequate in terms of design and capacity to cater for any increases in traffic generation.'</p> <p>SL6.5 – 'the amenity of any neighbouring residential areas is protected.'</p> <p>Lower Hopton is predominantly a residential area with the majority of farm buildings having been converted to domestic dwellings. Conversion of this barn to a similar dwelling would be highly referable and more in line with local policies.</p>	<p>supporting text should be deleted. The owner could still apply for planning permission and any applications would be determined through the development management process.</p>	
32.1			Vision and Objectives	Support		Noted.	No change.
32.2			SL1	Support / Comment	The protection of public rights of way to enable their use safely is of great importance.	Noted.	No change.

Stoke Lacy NDP Consultation Statement, May 2022

						Public rights of way are also protected in other legislation.	
32.3			SL2 - SL5	Support		Noted.	No change.
32.4			SL6	Support / Comment	The suitability and safety is of paramount importance as is the roads being adequate. The protection of residential areas is also necessary. Details on feedback form.	Noted.	No change.
32.5			SL7/1	Object		Refer to Ref 31. (Duplicate)	No change.
32.6			SL8 SL9	Support		Noted.	No change.
32.7			SL9/1		This should only be considered if the development is in line with points detailed in the NDP.	Noted. The NDP policies should be read as a whole.	No change.
32.8			SL10	Support		Noted.	No change.
33.1			Vision Objectives 1 - 6	Support		Noted.	No change.
33.2			Obj 7	Support / Comment	More infrastructure needs developing to support young people ie childcare / shops / buses	Noted. These are possible actions for other bodies or individuals and lie outside the scope of the NDP.	No change.
33.3			SL1 – SL8	Support		Noted.	No change.
33.4			SL9	Object	I object to Site 3 otherwise I support the proposed development.	Refer to 19.4 above – possible duplication? Not accepted.	No change.

						<p>Suggest they mean 'site 13' - refer to Table 4.</p> <p>Including a site allocation for housing makes the NDP a more robust document and many respondents support the Plan overall.</p>	
33.5			SL9/1 SL10	Support	<p>I support the building of individual houses, annexes, extensions etc.</p> <p>What I do not support is the building of multi household sites, turning the village into an isolated housing eyesore.</p> <p>Large scale housing cannot be supported by the current infrastructure. Site 3 ?? A465 is an example of a multi house site that is totally out of keeping with the countryside and totally unsupported by local infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Suggest they mean 'site 13' - refer to Table 4.</p> <p>Including a site allocation for housing makes the NDP a more robust document and many respondents support the Plan overall.</p>	No change.
34.			Vision Objectives All Policies	Support		Noted.	No change.
35.			SL9	Object	<p>I strongly object to the current boundary of the above property. The outline of the property should extend to the boundary formed by the river. In the future this could impact on my ability to object to any development on land adjacent to the unmarked area. Should this matter not be addressed then I would be forced to object to the entire document even though I would support the remaining drafts.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Steering Group should review the settlement boundaries.</p>	<p><u>Amend NDP.</u></p> <p><u>Review settlement boundaries so they consistent in approach with regard to gardens.</u></p>

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4 Landowners and Developers

Consultee Name Ref. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council's Consideration	Amendments to NDP
1.1 Zesta Planning, on behalf of Lantar Developments Ltd.	All			General comment	Please see attached letter for our comments on the Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.	No change.
1.2	All			General comment	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-submission Consultation under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)</p> <p>These representations have been prepared by Zesta Planning on behalf of Lantar Developments Ltd in response to the current pre-submission consultation of the draft Stoke Lacy Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2031 (SLNP), published pursuant to Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Our client welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the current draft.</p>	Noted.	No change.
1.3	All			General comment	<p>General Legislative Context</p> <p>In order for a Neighbourhood Plan to be successful at independent examination it must be demonstrated that the plan conforms to the 'basic conditions' as set out within Paragraph 8, Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the Basic Conditions Statement for more information about how the NDP meets the required basic conditions.</p>	No change.

					<p>An Independent Examiner will consider whether the basic conditions are met;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have regard to national policies and advice and be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the adopted development plan - Have special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed buildings and their settings or any special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and conservation areas. - Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, - There should be no breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations. 		
1.4	All			General comment	<p>National Policy Neighbourhood Plans must be in conformity with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, (the Framework). Paragraph 13 of the Framework sets out that the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 11), has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. 'Neighbourhood Plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.' Paragraph 18 of the Framework notes that Local Plans should address strategic and nonstrategic matters, with neighbourhood plans covering just non-strategic policies.</p> <p>Paragraph 29 notes that Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the Basic Conditions Statement for more information about how the NDP meets the required basic conditions.</p>	No change.

					<p>development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) notes that neighbourhood plan policies should be clear and unambiguous and supported by appropriate evidence. Paragraph 40 of the PPG notes: 'While there are prescribed documents that must be submitted with a neighbourhood plan or Order there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required for neighbourhood planning. Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan or the proposals in an Order.'</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans should be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the adopted development plan. The adopted development plan for the area is the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031.</p>		
1.5			Objective 7	Comment / Objection	<p>Affordable Housing Delivery</p> <p>Objective 7 of the draft SLNP sets out the objective to ensure the availability of affordable property for the younger generation and suitable property for an ageing population. The need for affordable housing and housing mix is also highlighted at paragraphs 9.22-9.31.</p> <p>This identifies that concerns have been raised that there were no affordable rental properties for local families. The draft plan notes that in Bromyard HMA, affordable housing delivery is below average, with 17% of completions provid-</p>	Noted.	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Objective 7 to:</p> <p>To sustain age diversity in the community by ensuring the availability of affordable suitable property for the younger generation and suitable suitable property for an ageing population. This will enable them to remain in the community that they know and by which they are supported as their housing needs change.</p>

					<p>ing affordable housing, below the county average of 23%. The Issues and Options paper (V3) highlights the need for affordable housing, and notes that upon allocating sites, this must be considered.</p> <p>‘In order to provide a contribution towards affordable housing provision as part of local housing developments, Stoke Lacy NDP would have to support larger schemes of 11 or more houses, for example through site allocations. Otherwise affordable housing schemes (‘exception housing’) outside the settlement boundaries in the countryside may be acceptable under rural area policies in the Core Strategy – although access to local services and facilities would be more limited in these areas. This will be an important consideration when decisions are made about site allocations.’</p> <p>Clearly, there is an identified need for affordable homes within Stoke Lacy and Bromyard, and this is a clear Objective of the NP. However, there is no provision to deliver affordable homes other than through potential rural exception schemes that might come forward. Housing Policy SL9 supports new dwellings within the settlement boundary that are small in scale, noting that this should comprise 1-3 dwellings ‘or slightly more’. As such, there would be no mechanism to deliver affordable homes within Stoke Lacy as the size of development would not be required to provide affordable dwellings. Furthermore, the Issues and Options draft highlighted the importance of affordable housing delivery in determining site allocations.</p>	<p>It is accepted that without major development in the Parish, opportunities for affordable housing provision will be more limited, although it is possible rural exception sites could come forward.</p> <p>With this in mind it may be appropriate to delete the reference to ‘affordable’ housing in Objective 7.</p>	<p>New housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of our community. (See NDP Policy SL9: Development within the Settlement Boundaries, Site Allocation SL9/1: Crossfield House, Stoke Cross and Policy SL10: Housing Mix).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					However, the site options and assessment document (AECOM, February 2021) does not consider the potential to deliver affordable housing. In order to meet the objectives of the draft NDP, delivery of affordable units should have been considered at the site selection phase. The neighbourhood development plan period is 2022-2031, therefore the objectives of the Plan to ensure the delivery of affordable homes should apply to this time period, and not take into account previously approved development prior to the plan period.		
1.6			SL9	Comment / Objection	<p>Housing Policy</p> <p>Policy SL9 sets out that proposals should be small in scale, and define this as developments of 1-3 houses, or 'slightly more'.</p> <p>Firstly 'slightly more' is incredibly subjective and there seems to be no explanation of what this means, this is not clear for the decision maker.</p> <p>Secondly, the limit of residential development to 1-3 houses is justified within the policy as a requirement to protect landscape character. However, this is not supported with any evidence. There has been no landscape assessment which concludes that development should be limited to such a number, there are no landscape designations. Furthermore, sites within a settlement boundary are far more capable of being developed without causing unacceptable harm to the landscape due to their visual association with the built up area. Placing a prescribed limit on the scale of development within settlement boundaries is not therefore justified. This would be equivalent to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1 Ref 3.16.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to the Policy to improve clarity.</p> <p>The approach to development in the NDP has been informed through technical site assessments and extensive community consultation. As Stoke Lacy has exceeded the minimum housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy there is no need to include further major development</p>	No further change.

					<p>the level of protection afforded to settlements within the Green Belt which is not the case here.</p> <p>Moreover, this prescribed limit would stifle appropriate opportunities for development in the villages through, for example, the redevelopment of previously developed land.</p> <p>The draft SLNP notes that 'residents are concerned that developments should be small in scale and infill, rather than comprising major development.' This refers to the Framework definition of major development; comprising 10 or more dwellings or over 0.5ha. There is no clear evidence or justification to limiting development to 1-3 'or slightly more' dwellings.</p>	<p>schemes or site allocations in the NDP.</p> <p>The NDP has to be supported by a majority Yes vote at referendum and further largescale new housing development is likely to prove locally controversial.</p>	
1.7			SL9	Comment	<p>Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy notes that development will be supported in Stoke Lacy/Stoke Cross (figure 4.14 of the Core Strategy). The policy states that housing proposals must be of a design and layout that reflects the size, role and function of each settlement. As such, there is already a policy requirement that a development must be of an appropriate size. Draft SLNP Policy SL9 goes further than Policy RA2, but does not provide any justification for the size restriction other than local survey responses.</p> <p>It is</p> <p>There is already a mechanism within the Core Strategy for development to be appropriate to the settlement, as such, it is considered that Draft Policy SL9 is not necessary nor based on evidence; thus is not appropriate. To resolve this objection, it is recommended that the prescribed limit on the scale of new housing is deleted and instead the policy should</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to Table 1. Herefordshire Council appears comfortable that Policy SL9 (as amended) is in general conformity with the Core Strategy.</p>	No change.

					require that proposals are of a scale that is proportionate to the size, role and function of the settlement, and appropriate having regard to the prevailing density of existing development, the character of the settlement and its landscape setting.		
1.8			SL1 / Views	Comment / Object	<p>Locally Important Views</p> <p>Figure 1 of the draft SLNP identifies six key public views, which are noted as being identified by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Policy SL1 notes that these views should be respected in accordance with Design Code 3, noting that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (or similar) should be carried out to ensure schemes are designed sensitively to mitigate adverse impacts. The draft policy acknowledges the assessment of landscape sensitivity is to be determined by the developer. Firstly, there is no evidence that these key views are important, there is no landscape appraisal or robust evidence which sets out why these views are considered as important, or indeed set out any reason as to why these views should warrant additional protection. Given that the assessment of sensitivity is the responsibility of the developer, we question the purpose of designating key views. If these views are so key, why is there no evidence to support this?</p> <p>Within the survey results response, regarding the key views, the question posed was 'do you support the key views identified by the Steering Group?' with the options, yes, no and not answered. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence to support the identified key views, there</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The key views were first identified by members of the NDP Steering Group as important public views that are locally valued. The views were considered by consultants AECOM and subsequently identified in the Design Codes. They have not been identified through a landscape and visual assessment or other process but the neighbourhood area does not lie within an AONB or other special landscape designation. Consideration of key views through public consultation and Design Codes is considered a proportionate and reasonable approach.</p>	No change.

					<p>was no appropriate opportunity for the community to provide comments on what were considered key views and why. These key views formed an important part of the site assessment and selection process. Within the site selection document, it is noted that the assessment of landscape and visual constraints should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant. There is no evidence for these key views, and the use of this as part of the site assessment is inappropriate. The site assessment criteria is not based on appropriate or indeed any robust evidence. As noted within the PPG, paragraph 40, proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and approach taken. We therefore conclude that this evidence must be revisited.</p> <p>This approach is in line with an Examiner's conclusion during the examination of the Peterchurch Neighbourhood Plan. Please see extract below:</p> <p>105.Criteria g. refers to maintaining and limiting impact on views of the Black Mountains. It is not clear why the views of the Black Mountains have been singled out or how the policy would operate in practice. It implies that other views not referred to are of lesser or even no importance. The protection of views is difficult to justify in planning terms unless they are defined and based on evidence. I recommend therefore that this criteria be deleted as it does not conform to the NPPG guidance¹⁰ that policies "should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence".</p>		
1.9			SL9/1	Comment / Objection	<p>The Site Selection Process</p> <p>The site options and assessment document notes that the site selection process should be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The findings of the site assessment - Discussions with the Planning Authority - The extent to which the sites support the vision and objectives for the NP - The potential for the sites to meet the identified infrastructure needs of the community - Engagement with key stakeholders and; 	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 70. Sets out 'Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of</p>	No change.

					<p>- Neighbourhood plan conformity with strategic local plan policy.</p> <p>The draft SLNP allocates one site for residential development: SL9/1. The site assessment matrix notes an indicative capacity of 8 dwellings. However, the site is allocated for two dwellings as the site owners indicated it would be brought forward for two dwellings. In accordance with draft Policy SL9, the size of residential development within settlement boundaries would be limited to 1-3 or 'slightly more'. There would be no mechanism to deliver a larger development on site. The allocation of the site for 2 dwellings, which is capable of delivering 8, would not comprise an efficient use of land or sustainable development.</p> <p>This draft allocation is in conflict with Policy SD1 of the Core Strategy, as such, the basic conditions have not been met. In addition Objective 4 notes that design codes should be used to ensure land is used efficiently. Clearly, this proposed allocation would not comprise an efficient use of land and is therefore in conflict with Objective 4 of the SLNP</p>	a size consistent with paragraph 69a) suitable for housing in their area.'	
1.10			SL9	Objection / Comment	<p>There is no evidence that the sites have been assessed for their potential to meet the identified infrastructure needs of the community.</p> <p>The allocated site does not support the vision and objectives for the NP. Therefore, the site selection process is not robust or based on appropriate evidence. Also important to note is that the Herefordshire Local Plan is currently under review. The PPG indicates that the allocation of reserve sites can help address emerging evidence of housing need and ensure policies in</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not wish to include reserve sites in the NDP but is aware of significant development pressures in the area.</p> <p>The new emerging Herefordshire Local</p>	No change.

					neighbourhood plans are not overridden by new local plans. Whilst there is no obligation for a NP to do this, given there is an allocation of two dwellings and very tightly drawn settlement boundaries, the draft plan does not seem to make provision for the future. The draft SLNP is not proactive and is likely to be out of date very quickly.	Plan and new housing growth requirements may trigger a review of the NDP and at that time further housing provision may be considered if required.	
1.11				Comment / Objection	<p>Delivery of Benefits</p> <p>Objective 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the draft SLNP seek benefits to be provided; accessibility, support local facilities, public open space, landscape enhancements etc. However, there is no tangible mechanism to deliver benefits.</p> <p>Development of a scale that would deliver benefits by way of developer contributions is precluded. Draft Policy SL3: Public Open Space supports new public open spaces and the preceding text notes that there was strong support for the provision of new public space within the Parish (88% support). Paragraph 5.26 of the draft SLNP sets out that the Parish encourages developers to include contributions to help provide a suitable new space for the benefit of local people. There is a reference to Policy OS1 of the Core Strategy which sets out that the provision of appropriate open space will arise in applications for new dwellings, retail and employment proposals where there is a need to provide informal areas of amenity green space as well as residential institutions, student accommodation, assembly and leisure, hotels or hostels. The following text for Policy OS1 notes that the need for such spaces will be considered</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Objectives (as amended) are achievable through the scale of development envisaged in the NDP. Further policies are being added to the submission plan on the advice of Herefordshire Council in relation to economic development, renewable energy and protecting local community facilities</p>	No change.

					on a site by site basis. Clearly, the draft SLNP's prescribed limit on the scale of housing development and the allocation for two dwellings would be highly unlikely to deliver the enhancements that are outlined within the Objectives or the preceding text of draft Policy SL3. We therefore conclude that the proposed policies do not meet the objectives of the draft SLNP.		
1.12			SL9 Policies Map	Objection / Comment	<p>Development Boundary Selection</p> <p>Herefordshire Council's published guidance on drawing development boundaries for neighbourhood plans notes that a clear set of criteria should be used when defining a settlement boundary. This includes taking into account physical features, line of communication, recent development and important amenity areas. This notes that settlement boundaries should be drawn to facilitate an appropriate level of proportional growth within the plan period.</p> <p>The settlement boundaries are drawn very tightly around the existing built form, there is no opportunity for development and cannot be considered as positively prepared. Within the consultation for the proposed settlement boundaries, two options were presented – labelled as a 'looser option' and a 'tightly drawn option', the 'tightly drawn' option received the landslide vote. The proposed settlement boundary reflects the consultation responses, however the boundaries do not facilitate an appropriate level of proportional growth within the plan period, as noted as important within the Council's guidance. This will severely limit any opportunities for even small scale development during the remainder of the plan period. There is concern that this restriction</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Steering Group identified the settlement boundaries in consultation with residents and taking account of the relevant Advice Note.</p> <p>The settlement boundaries are being reviewed prior to submission – see comments in Table 3.</p>	No change.

					<p>on appropriate growth will cause the village to stagnate and harm the vitality of its community. This would conflict with the advice on Rural Housing within the NPPF. Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy notes that housing growth will be supported in or adjacent to identified settlements; including Stoke Lacy/Stoke Cross. This acknowledges that this will enable development that has the ability to bolster existing service provision, improve facilities and infrastructure and meet the needs of local communities.</p> <p>Draft Policy SL9 of the SLNP supports residential development within settlement boundaries, with the preceding text noting that the aim of the policy is to guide new housing development within the settlement boundaries. Alongside the tightly drawn boundaries, this Policy is not delivering the aims of Policy RA2.</p> <p>It is recommended that either the settlement boundaries within the plan are widened to enable appropriate opportunities for new housing development during the remainder of the plan period, or that Policy SL9 is amended to state that support will be given to appropriate opportunities for new housing on sites adjacent to the settlement boundary. This will ensure that the policy is in conformity with Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Alternative Site: Land at Stoke Lacy As part of the call for sites process, we submitted 'Site 13' on behalf of our clients. This site could deliver 20 dwellings, including 8 affordable homes, public open space and additional foot-path connections.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1.13			SL9		<p>An application for 20 dwellings on the site was submitted and refused. Within the Officer's report it was noted that the principle of development is acceptable, with no objection to the site's location. 'it is considered the proposal, in principle, is an acceptable location for development'</p> <p>The Council's Landscape Officer supported the scheme, noting the landscape mitigation, landscape provision and response to local landscape references. The Council's concerns related to the design approach, but noted that these could have been mitigated through design amendments. We are confident that the Council's comments can be easily addressed through design amendments. The only remaining objection is related to drainage and impact on the HRA. As noted within the appropriate assessment, once mitigation and avoidance measures have been taken into account, there will not be a significant effect on the integrity of the River Wye (including River Lugg) SAC.</p> <p>We have included the original site submission form and red line plan at Appendix 1</p>	It would not be appropriate at this late stage to include a site for major development outside the settlement boundary and particularly one that was recently refused planning consent.	No change.
1.14	All			General Objection	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary, it is considered that the site selection process is inappropriate and is not based on evidence. The identified key views have no evidence to support their inclusion and their role within the site assessment method is inappropriate. The proposed allocation for 2 dwellings on a site that has been identified as being suitable to deliver 8 dwellings, would not</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Refer to points above.</p>	No change.

					<p>comprise an efficient use of land. This is in conflict with the adopted Core Strategy and the provisions of the Framework. The site assessment process is not appropriate and there has been no consideration of the potential to meet the identified infrastructure needs or provide affordable homes. The policies are not in accordance with the SLNP objectives or the need identified within the HMA of Bromyard.</p> <p>As such, it is concluded that the draft SLNP does not meet the basic conditions, so far as it is not consistent with the Core Strategy and provisions of the Framework and would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>		
					Site Boundary – see Appendix 1		

Appendix 1 Zesta Planning – Site Boundary



