

# MUCH MARCLE PARISH COUNCIL

## Report of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Held in the Rushall Club on Monday 23rd January 2017

Present: J Marsden Chairman

Also Present: Cllr T Weston Cllr G Baker Cllr A Taylor  
J Gibbon H Woodman  
22 residents of Rushall and Kynaston (List attached)

1. **Apologies:** R White

2. **Declarations of interest**

T Weston declared an interest when discussions concerning Dobbin's Pitch arose and did not participate in the discussion.

3. **Planning Policy Context**

The Chairman opened the meeting with a brief review of the position of the Much Marcle Neighbourhood Plan within the context of the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and Herefordshire Council's Core Strategy.

He advised the meeting that the current draft Neighbourhood Plan version 4.3 as published for the Regulation 14 consultation was subject to review because of contradictory advice received from Herefordshire Council's Planning Department concerning the treatment of Kynaston in planning policy terms.

The alternative views being summarised as:

- Kynaston is not a settlement under Core Strategy Policy RA2, but will be treated as 'open countryside' under Policy RA3; and/or
- Kynaston and Rushall could be considered as a joint settlement within the meaning of Policy RA2, in accordance with written advice given in September by K Johnson, following discussion with Kevin Singleton (Strategic Planning Team Leader) of Herefordshire Council's Planning Department and as presented in the Regulation 14 consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan version 4.3.

Responses to the Regulation 14 consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan version 4.3 from Herefordshire Council's Development Management Team had highlighted this discrepancy.

A meeting was scheduled to take place on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> January in an attempt to clarify this issue.

## **ACTION**

The Chairman was requested to notify by email local residents of the outcome of this meeting at the earliest opportunity.

### **4. Proportionate Housing Land Allocations**

The meeting was reminded that, in the interval 2011-2031, the parish needed to provide allocated land for new dwellings to accommodate an increase of 14% or 41 new dwellings.

A paper showing the numbers of dwellings developed/committed and allocated in different areas of the parish was circulated and these numbers are summarised here:

	Much Marcle	Rushall & Kynaston
Developed/Committed since 2011	15	3
Potential Redundant Buildings	10	0
Potential Developments	13	11
Total	38	14
%	73	27

The view was expressed that as the parish contained 286 buildings (of which approx. 82 are in Much Marcle, 16 are in Rushall and 12 are in Kynaston), an additional 11 new dwellings allocated in Rushall and Kynaston was still not proportionate. However, the exact number of properties that lay within the hinterland vicinities (i.e. outside the proposed settlement boundaries of each of the three settlement areas of Much Marcle, Rushall and Kynaston) has yet to be determined.

The cost of affordable housing within the Ross-on-Wye Housing Market Area (HMA) was unknown.

## **ACTION**

J Marsden was requested to find the figure for affordable housing with the Ross-on-Wye HMA in which the parish is situated.

### **5. Much Marcle Settlement Boundary**

The constraints for land development in Much Marcle were identified as:

- land in the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3 around the A449 crossroads (and a wider area in Flood Zone 2);
- important local green spaces – e.g. Barton's playing field, Mortimer's Motte and Bailey, and the Monk's Walk drive up to Hellens Manor;
- UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) Priority Habitats – e.g. traditional standard orchards
- land owned by the Pennington-Mellor-Munthe (Hellens) Charity Trust to the east of the settlement boundary

- land owned by Homme House estate (a listed parkland) to the west of the settlement boundary;
- land owned by the Countryside Restoration Trust to the south of the settlement boundary; and
- the plethora of listed buildings and a Conservation Area.

In view of these constraints, one Rushall resident stated that he felt the 14% target for the parish was unachievable and unsustainable, so it was questioned as to why a Neighbourhood Development plan was needed at all.

## 6. Rushall Settlement Boundary

The idea of replacing a settlement boundary with individual site allocations (rather than the current ‘belt and braces’ approach of site allocations plus settlement boundaries) was suggested, but it was pointed out that the Parish Council believed that a settlement boundary provided tighter control on development. Development outside settlement boundaries the sites would be rural exception sites, which would be restricted to affordable housing or exceptional ‘Grand Designs’ style open market housing.

Rushall residents were concerned that the proposed settlement boundary would allow >2 new houses behind the council houses (Orchard View).

### **ACTION**

R Jolly was asked to lead a sub-group of local residents in the preparation of a revised settlement boundary for Rushall and a design brief for the land behind the council houses (Orchard View) site to encompass features that would attempt to restrict new housing numbers and ensure appropriate design, scale and size of any new development to protect the amenity of adjoining properties.

The Rushall sub-group will also consider and propose any other land suitable for allocation for new housing development within a revised settlement boundary.

The sub-group was asked to forward its suggestions for consideration by the Working Party before its next meeting on February 21<sup>st</sup>. The results of the Working Party deliberations would then be forwarded to the Parish Council for its approval.

### **ACTION**

J Baldwin was asked to report the seepage of sewage waste (from the Severn Trent treatment works behind Orchard View) into the local brook to the Environment Agency.

Other issues raised concerned the ideas of:

- A revised definition of housing infill; and
- phasing of the numbers of new dwellings to be developed.

### **ACTION**

R Jolly to propose an alternative definition of housing infill.

### **7. Housing land allocations at Rushall**

There was a clear preference for deleting the 'land opposite Rushall Club' from the housing land allocations because of its current use as an overspill car park for the Club, although it was accepted that its current use and the public footpath that crosses the site are not 'material considerations' in planning terms - no alternative housing land allocations were proposed. However, the current use as an overspill car park (i.e. a community facility) could carry some weight in relation to the draft NDP policy MM11-Community Facilities.

### **8. Housing land allocations in Much Marcle**

Dobbin's Pitch was briefly referred to and it was stated that, as the site is 'brownfield land', the Working Party still considered it to be developable, despite the refusal of two recent planning applications for new dwellings at this site.

The rationale for the proposed housing land allocations for Old Pike and Hazerdine as rural exception sites for affordable housing was explained.

In conclusion, it was indicated that the Neighbourhood Development Plan will be reviewed by the Parish Council on a 5 yearly basis, and this might entail bringing forward additional alternative land allocations for new housing development if best available evidence suggested that the 14% growth target would not be met.

J Gibbon

January 2017