

A summary of Comments received from two public meetings, drop boxes available for a total of 8 weeks, three drop in meetings and a stall at the village fete.

TRAFFIC AND ROADS

- 1 Concerned about increasing traffic on rural roads
- 2 Before ANY more development in Yarpole, must address dangerous junction at Cock gate and near the caravan park
- 3 The lanes to and from Yarpole are very narrow and should not be expected to carry any more traffic without serious attention to the problems
- 4 Need for weight and size restrictions
- 5 Access to and from the village should be improved before there is a death
- 6 Better access needed into Yarpole.
- 7 junction leys lane and main road could do with improvement
- 8 Concerned that Site 1 is situated on a very narrow lane so that access onto B4362 only achieved via blind corners
- 9 Worried about increase in traffic on the lane to Brook House Farm. Strongly urges that access for at least some of these houses is via a more appropriate route.
- 10 All roads into Yarpole are inadequate for more traffic
- 11 Junction onto B45362 particularly hazardous
- 12 Primarily a farming community with all the traffic that involves
- 13 Drivers travelling at greater speeds than a few years ago. Roads are already too narrow and development will exacerbate the traffic issues.
- 14 Croft crescent. This is a residential estate road designed for a limited number of houses. Field at end is boggy. Is the road at the top end wide enough to accommodate traffic generated.
- 15 Bircher and Lucton have better vehicular access than Yarpole which has a real problem.
- 16 Draws attention to Page 8 of Parish Plan 2012/13 re Traffic and Transport issues. Most of these issues have yet to be addressed and should be implemented before any consideration is given to more housing development.
- 17 Traffic is difficult to manage and Cockgate does not need any further vehicles crossing it.
- 18 The road between the village and croft could be redesigned to create a more seamless passage, eg reduce speed limit and speed bumps either side of cockgate.

LOW COST AND AFFORDABILITY

- 19 Can we be certain of securing more low cost and/or smaller houses
20 Design Note. More starter homes please
If the plan includes provision for sites to accommodate "affordable" or low cost housing it would be helpful if the document includes an explanation of the financial model that supports this. How will the initial cost be kept low - subsidy? - in the face of developers' need for profits and how will these dwellings be kept affordable? The community need to be reassured that such housing needs can be met and maintained in the long term.
- 21 Affordable/Sheltered Housing. Only within mixed development. We do NOT want "low cost" only as not in keeping with character of village. Also ensure that sheltered housing is included in definition of "affordable"
- 22 Is there a loss of opportunity to treat individual sites collectively to deliver affordable housing. Could we consider a community initiative.
- 23 Do we need to rely on rural exception scheme for affordable
24 Please privilege affordable housing near village amenities.

CHARACTER AND DESIGN

- 25 Spacing of houses. Green lane too near the road and too oppressive
26 Need to build in comments about desirable character of new houses. This has been lost at Green lane development
27 Traffic increase: Mitigate by requiring small developments only where impact is minimal including to neighbours
28 I liked their proposals for Yarpole, no ribbon up Green Lane. Green fingers of land between housing
29 Design/Density Good quality and not too high density to be in keeping with village and rural setting.
30 Particularly pleased to see the desire for "historic green areas within the heart of the settlement". Then references the Section 106 land and hopes that that could be developed as a village green with bench, community orchard, wild flowers etc
31 Surprised that the building of up to 5 houses at Brook House Fram and 7 or 8 houses on land adjacent now means that most of the new development will be built in one part of village rather than being dotted about. Shame because

this is a very pretty area with lovely views and footpaths into the countryside
32 Commendable list of criteria. Very happy to see "shoulds" 3,6,10,11,12,14 and 15
as our main concern is the protection and preservation of the rural nature of
the Parish.

33 Sites 5,7,10 should be limited in number of dwellings and total in whole area should not
exceed 43 by 2031. Design should not be "mini estates" like green lane dev, proposed
Price dev, and green lane cresc and croft cresc.

34 Appreciate need for 43 houses. Distribute throughout the Parish. 5 or less on each site
35 Yarpole must remain a village and not be urbanised
36 style in keeping with rural aspect
37 development could be enhanced by tree planting and soft landscaping
suggest a group (perhaps sub gp of NP) with expertise to advise
on this. Goal to soften impact of new building and create wildlife habitats
Group could have on going role in managing the green spaces
How are you going to protect the natural env and wildlife. Must preserve
rural nature. Would a sub committee on this topic be useful to increase
biodiveristy and enhance rural nature (eg tree planting, protection of
meadows, village green)

38 If planning continues to allow Thomas type development in this village
it will be ruined by 2031

39 Rural village: Charm of Yarpole was that it is/was an unspoilt village. This will be
negated, especially if HC Planning continue to ignore their own criteria and those
of planning inspectorate (she sites St Antony`s and Green Lane)

40 Understands the need for housing but it should be
afordable or low cost; limited to max 5 per development; spread round Parish

41 The village plan called for developemtns of no more than 3-4 houses and he
hopes that can be the outcome for the benefit of us all

42 Although smaller more rural sites may have less impact they will not be near any
public facilities.

43 Need to give priority to local concerns as highlighted in the parish plan that we need
smaller more affordable homes for younger people. Continuing to provide 3 and 4

bedroom properties more suitable for towns is not healthy for the future development of the community.

- 44 Wish for moderate sized detached bungalow complex , perhaps warden assisted,little or no garden but surrounded by green space. Rentable or purchaseable.

FLOODING AND SEWERAGE

- 45 There should be an analysis/estimate of the impact on flood zones arising from the developments likely on the offered sites included in the Plan. Since most of these developments would be upstream of the brook which leaves the village at the Kingsland end of the village the additional stormwater flow must be significant.

- 46 Need to be sure that sites chosen do not exacerbate flooding issues

- 47 Drainage system.Yarpole already overloaded before the 5 new homes at Green Lane were built. Upgrade needed

- 48 Sewage system needs to be improved to cope with extra population

- 49 Have we considered bio approaches

OTHER SPECIFIC COMMENTS ABOUT SITES OR LOCATIONS

- 50 develop poultry houses in leys lane for housing

- 51 refers to Lower House farm development and the rejection criteria used by herefordshire council in 2012. How can these issues (environmental, historical, visual and archaeological) now be deemed OK? Also concerned about access to that development off Brook Lane

- 52 No contact from the owner of Hillside Cottage about her proposed development but this area is prone to flooding due to water course which appears irregularly. In addition water enters septic tank causing sewage to overflow and foul the land. The overflow for the cottage is also small and on other land. It overfills quickly and water from it goes down the drive eroding the tarmac.Would oppose development.

There is no existing structure like a barn only a small and very low garden shed.

- 53 Proposals for Hillside cottage; separate objection making the same points as above.
- 54 Basically an objection to development at Lower House Farm. It picks up on the fact that this is in the Conservation Area and also about traffic concerns on the access lane.
Concerned about it not meeting local need and also mentions that the proposal was rejected in 2012.
- 55 Sites 12 and 13 hardly meet criteria of "preferably within walking distance.."
- 56 Site 6: Quotes HBA6 and HBA9 policies, the latter stating that "..which would result in the loss of important open areas...will not be permitted". Goes on to argue the case for this site to be excluded.
- 57 Prefer minimal extension to the settlement boundary. Lower house farm positive but those to extend croft crescent would over extend the boundary.
- 58 Preferable if development takes place within yarpole boundaries. The area on or proximate to Bircher Common is a treasure for villagers and should be protected.
- 59 A small extension of the boundary at Lower house Fram would be good. We would oppose any development of Croft Crescent.
- 60 Any new housing in Croft would be outside the parish settlements and not within walking distance of pubs, public transport etc. Best to avoid building adjacent to the Common
Croft/Highwood is already a recreational site there need to be no additions to it.
- 61 Shouldn't we be encouraging the smaller villages to be more sustainable?

PROCESS MATTERS

- 62 Can the housing development be phased over the full period or are we dependent on landowner/developer wishes
- 63 Does the plan limit the number of houses that could be built until 2031
- 64 Can we include self build in the figures
- 65 How have we decided how many houses could go on each site
- 66 What is the likely timescale until the Plan is accepted

67 There should be an explanation of the overriding level of control over development up to 2031. For example, what would happen if insufficient development proposals were made to meet the target number of dwellings by 2031? Would Herefordshire Council take over and dictate what must be built and by whom or would the neighbourhood be absolved of its responsibility?

68 The plan should include a tabulation of the number of dwellings that are anticipated for each site included in the plan. At the meeting I asked the question about what "standard" dwelling size(s) were used to determine how the total number of target dwellings could be delivered within the chosen sites. It is important to show this so that:
a) the community can be reassured that the target number of houses can be achieved without further allocation of land and
b) aggrieved owners of offered sites that have not been included in the plan can be persuaded that their offers have reasonably been rejected.

69 Thinks there should be a more clearly defined process with milestones, target dates and deliverables

70 What visibility will be given to comments. Will authors be identified? If so did they know?

71 Can those who have already commented do so again at later stages?

72 When will an on line map of sites be available?

73 What if any are cut off dates for comments and for offers of sites.?

74 How has the number of houses been determined?

75 Don't put forward unsuitable sites for development simply to meet HC target.

76 has HC already identified suitable sites?

77 Comment on coincidence that Herefordshire were looking for sites in sustainable villages and that is how it turned out. Seeking assurance that neither SG or PC specifically approached landowners in Yarpole to offer up sites for development or if they did were landowners in Lucton and Bircher similarly approached.

SUPPORT OR CRITICISM OF MEETINGS

78 Thought presentation and whole package is excellent. Brave and Intelligent approach for which many thanks

79 An excellent meeting with good speakers marred only by lack of audibility

80 I thought the steering group had worked very hard.
81 Questions raised were interesting
82 Tom Rogers` (historical development) summary was fascinating and well written
83 Remiss is saying how well the team presented and how clear and knowledgeable the speakers were. Found the meeting interesting and informative
First of all may I congratulate the NP team for their presentation at the public meeting on 1 November and the work
84 leading up to it. The information was presented very clearly.
85 Plea to have next meetings in Parish hall because of difficulties in seeing and hearing
86 Thank you to all members of Steering Group for informative meeting on 1st November
87 Congratulations to SG

OTHER MATTERS UNCLASSIFIED

88 Any chance of more village centre parking so we can host events at church more easily
89 Enclosed an article from Daily telegraph of 2/11/15 on government
Planning in Principle moves in the Housing Bill going through Parliament
90 Who does Herefordshire think are going to come to live here.
91 Site management: Issues with contractor parking e.g. green lane, need to include some conditions in the plan
92 General concern about ability of NP to achieve what we want when weighed against "interested parties", But support for what we are doing.
93 Has PC made any reps. to Herefordshire about why so many houses
in village with narrow lanes,often single track.
94 Potential for 150 more cars and loss of peace and tranquility
95 Comprehensive and worthy vision and objectives. But what concrete plans
96 Urges us all to read again the Herefordshire Council publication
"Shaping our place 2026" pages 69-77 inclusive
page 73. Character and local distinctiveness should be considered at
the outset. Consider impact on character of cumulative effects.
What need is addressed by 40 new houses? Identify it.
Page 74. major driver should be to reduce the need to travel especially by car
97 Gov policy states location of development should be accessible to public transport

and contribute to carbon emissions reduction. So why 40 houses in Yarpole?

98 Seeking more clarification about the reference to earthworks in the criteria

99 Need to be vigilant about CIL

100 Should be a reference to "mixed types" of property in the site selection criteria

101 Concern that if settlement boundaries can be redrawn each time further development is needed it is effectively a meaningless exercise to set them at all.

102 Opportunities for employment and community facilities should be concentrated in the village proper. Any additions need to be in keeping with the nature of the village and enhance existing opportunities rather than change character of the village.

103 Amend fifth bullet in vision doc to include " and that their property is secure..."