

# Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022-2026)



## Consultation Statement – December 2022

Prepared by the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group on behalf of Huntley Parish Council

This Consultation Statement has been prepared in support of the Huntley Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan as part of its submission to Forest of Dean District Council.

It has been prepared by the Huntley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, acting on behalf of the Huntley Parish Council (“the qualifying body”).

Paragraph 4 (3) (b) of Schedule 10 (process for making of neighbourhood development orders) states that: (b) a statement containing the following information in relation to that consultation and participation must accompany the proposal submitted to the authority—

- (i) details of those consulted,
- (ii) a summary of the main issues raised, and
- (iii) any other information of a prescribed description.

Neighbourhood planning was introduced under the Localism Act 2011 to give communities the right to shape and develop their areas. The Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared by the Steering Group and led by Huntley Parish Council, shaped by various surveys and public consultations to accurately reflect the needs and wants of the community.

The Steering Group is made up of Parish Councillors and community volunteers. As well as time spent on research through examination of strategic and factual evidence, the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group has carried out many hours of consultation with residents and has considered comments and concerns about Huntley parish. This work has resulted in a Neighbourhood Plan which sets out a vision for Huntley and will ensure that the parish continues to develop as a vibrant community whilst retaining its rural character for future generations.

The following table details some of the key events that helped shape the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
Application to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area	April 2021
Decision Notice: Designation of Neighbourhood Area	October 2021
NDP Facebook page created	21 November 2021
NDP Website launched	29 January 2022
Community Events	August 2021, 19 March 2022, 23 April 2022, 8-13 August 2022
Surveys conducted on the community, housing needs and business views.	3 February to 21 March 2022
Community Consultation on draft Reg 14 NDP	8 to 13 August 2022
Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group meetings	10 February 2022, 13 April 2022, 26 April 2022, 4 May 2022, 30 May 2022, 22 June 2022, 19 July 2022 and numerous ad hoc meetings to discuss specific issues.
Regulation 14 consultation	10 October to 21 November 2022
Habitats Regulation Assessment	August 2022
Strategic Environmental Assessment	August 2022

Comments from the three community events and the surveys have been collated and published on the NDP website. The majority of comments have either led to a policy in the NDP or Parish Council action.

All consultation events are listed in Appendix A of the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan.

A review of the draft Plan was carried out in August 2022 to gain residents views. The formal Regulation 14 consultation was undertaken between 10 October and 21 November 2022. The comments received and their responses are shown in Appendix A.

The NDP Steering Group asked the Forest of Dean Local Planning Authority to carry out a screening opinion on the need for SEA and HRA. A screening opinion could not be resourced by FoDDC and therefore the NDP Steering Group commissioned ENFUSION to undertake SEA and HRA Screening. These documents are included in the NDP evidence base and are published on the NDP website.

## **Appendix A: Regulation 14 Consultation Responses and Actions Taken**

### **A. Invited Consultation Bodies**

The following consultation bodies were invited to comment on the Neighbourhood Development Plan but no response was received.

Churcham Parish Council	Stagecoach West
Blaisdon Parish Council	Community Transport, Newent
Taynton Parish Council	St John the Baptist Church, Huntley
Longhope Parish Council	Diocese of Gloucester
Tibberton Parish Council	Huntley C of E School
Westbury on Severn Parish Council	Churcham Primary School
Network Rail	Two Rivers Housing
Homes England	Gloucestershire Constabulary
Highways England	Forestry Commission
District Environment Health Officer	Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue
Gloucestershire Health and Care Services	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust
Sport England	Upper Ley Farm
Arriva	Ley Fold Farm
Great Western Trains	

### **Voluntary bodies :**

Cricket Club	Tuesday Group
Football Club	Chair Exercise
Lunch Club	Art Club
Yoga	Moosical Fun
Pilates	Friday Drop In
Mothers Union	
New Start Cat Rescue	

## Local Businesses

Leaf Creative

Gardner Garages

Margaret's

Forest Gate

Conservatory Roofing Solutions Ltd

A&M Energy Fires Ltd

Glevum Motors Ltd

DS Designs Europe Ltd

AJM Plumbing and Heating Services Ltd

BHM Developments Limited

Chargrove Property Management Limited

Forest Eco Systems Limited

JAM Design & Build Ltd

Imperium Electrical Installations Ltd

Zmart Holm Limited

Cool Hire Limited

Exare Group Limited

SMCS (Huntley) Ltd

Wood's Family Butchers Ltd

Woodpecker Handyman and Driving Services Ltd

The Red Lion Inn at Huntley Ltd

Kapesh Consulting Ltd

The Compleat Building Company Ltd

Oxalis Trading Limited

TBD Consultants Ltd

Infinite Conceptz Ltd

Benchmark Construction Services Limited

Think Staffing Ltd

Roberts Farms (Glos) Limited

Roberts Plant Engineers Limited

Circle of Beautiful People International Ltd

Benchmark Beauty Ltd

25A Park Road Limited

Forest Gems Ltd

Jenkins Home Improvements Ltd

New Hunt Equine & Country Store Limited

Judlees Property Management Ltd

Town & Country Electricians Ltd

Design of Bespoke Exterior Systems Limited

DJ Sherratt Plumbing & Heating Ltd

Broom Hill Retreat Ltd

Energy Monkey

Ellabelles

Gypsy Wagon

JR Carpentry & Joinery

JR Tiling

Forest Products

And relax holistic therapies

The Train Station

BK Fencing

A1 Leaflet Distribution

The Laurels

Coppice House

Responses were received from the following bodies and their comments are listed below.

Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology	Historic England
Gloucestershire County Council Ecology	The Coal Authority
Gloucestershire County Council Planning	National Highways
Gloucestershire County Council Environment (Minerals & Waste)	National Grid
Gloucestershire Highways	Severn Trent Water
Forest of Dean District Council Planning	Natural England
Environment Agency	Friday Drop In Club
	Bruton Knowles on behalf of landowner

**B. Public Consultation**

16 residents submitted comments which are listed below.


Organisation / Resident	Consultation Notice Delivery method	Review Comment	NDP Consideration and Action Taken
Gloucestershire County Council	email	<p>Thank you for consulting Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) on the Huntley NDP. I have the following officer comments to make.</p> <p><u>Ecology (Biodiversity)</u></p> <p>The main biodiversity constraints have been identified and taken into account in formulating the NDP (Appendices H &amp; I). However, the exception is the mapping of Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs). Many of these are co-incident with key woodland habitats shown in Appendix H (and Figure 19). However, other woodland and habitats within Local Wildlife Sites boundaries are missing. Notably omitted is Great Adam's Wood LWS and partly unmapped are areas within Castle Hill &amp; Cherry Woods LWS. These sites can be seen on the GCC's Policies (Proposals) Map at <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/policies-proposals-map/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/policies-proposals-map/</a></p> <p>Further details of LWSs could be sought from the Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records. However, given the plan's current content we do not think this is necessary. The protected species great crested newt has not been recorded in the parish as far as we are aware but it has been advised to us by NatureSpace as being quite likely to occur in suitable habitats within the parish. Again, though we do not think this observation needs any mention in Appendix I or the main text as it does not affect the plan's policies as set out.</p> <p>The title on page 65 could just say 'Protecting Biodiversity' and similarly the next title become 'Biodiversity Interest in the Parish'. This is because biodiversity includes all 'wildlife,' species and habitats etc.. Under 'Biodiversity Interest in the Parish' perhaps Appendix H could also be mentioned as presenting a review of habitats present in the area? The policies of the plan give support for the conservation and enhancement of local biodiversity as well as landscape character and amenity. Specifically for landscape character we note policy NE1 and in relation to biodiversity policy NE2. Policy In NE2 we would recommend the phrase '<i>in accordance with the latest national and local guidance on Biodiversity Net Gain20</i>' is removed to keep it simple and less likely to become quickly outdated. NE3 is incidentally protective for bats and other nocturnal species.</p> <p>Transport Planning Comments</p> <p>The draft NDP gives close attention to transport issues noting both the role of land use planning in facilitating more sustainable travel behaviours, and the potential for more trips to be met by bus to and from Huntley. It also recognises the potential to strengthen local walking and cycling links. Huntley is situated within a primary transport corridor and only 6 miles from Gloucester. Would there be merit in identifying some of the internal district links (e.g. noting the primary school to which most people walk) and other movement interfaces with local communities and services, where they may be strengthened in terms of accessibility?</p> <p>In addition, the NDP may benefit from reference to the county's adopted Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2020-2041. This identifies the transport policies and delivery programmes which will meet the county's development needs within this timeframe. It covers issues relevant to the Huntley NDP particularly in the LTP Connecting Places Strategy (CPS2 – Forest of Dean).</p> <p>Education Comments</p> <p>Education provision for Huntley has been described on page 42 of the development plan. As described in the plan, Huntley Primary School has already been expanded and it is forecast to be operating at capacity. Any additional housing proposed in the area may require additional education infrastructure to accommodate increases in the pupil population, such as additional buildings, land and/or modifications to existing facilities. The County Council will work with the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Map of LWS added and text updated.</p> <p>Text and NE2 updated</p> <p>Local Transport Plan reference and text added</p>

		<p>District Council to secure appropriate Section 106 contributions from housing developers when identifying options for meeting the additional need.</p> <p>Archaeology Comments The NDP has a good section on historic environment policy and background information, and includes some local listing suggestions for the district council to assess.</p>	
FoDDC Planning	email	<p>The text is very interesting and in-depth and the information it contains is very helpful to inform the NDP policies. It might however be worth considering putting more of the text which is evidence and background within appendices to the main document. This would retain the information and could be in the same document if you wish but it would also make the policies themselves and their explanatory text more easily accessible especially for anyone using the NDP in assessing a planning application. An example is the landscape information in the NDP which is worth having but needs to be held somewhere else.</p> <p>The Non designated Heritage Assets which have been identified are welcome.</p> <p>The Design Guide includes a lot of relevant and interesting information.</p> <p>A monitor and review policy would be a good idea.</p> <p>The NDP seems to be in general accord with the current LP strategy.</p> <p>Comments on specific policies:</p> <p>Policy HM1 unit sizes and types may be desirable but policy may need more evidence than just the LHNA which should be cited to support it. Affordable Housing element will also need to match ours or be justified. It is fine to prefer PDL, but probably cannot require this. Clusters of Affordable Housing section is OK, except where are the sites? However, small clusters may be OK if there was a bigger site?</p> <p>HM2 is OK but could it say housing in the first line? The reference to review is for the text not policy.</p> <p>BE1 is probably in accord with guidance but needs checking, may need a “where possible” or two.</p> <p>BE2 - First paragraph is useful, but perhaps it could be bulleted? The prescriptive bits need a review.</p> <p>BE3 - 35 dwellings? major development? Where is this in HM1?</p> <p>C1 - the fabric of the church etc are protected, the function is not. We would consider the filling station a shop and the village has reasonable access to it.</p> <p>C2 - can't require community support for recreational facilities, can encourage or say NDP will support where it exists but I think the policy goes too far, may be one to leave and see what happens...</p> <p>C3 - need to review Local Green Space, against NPPF</p> <p>Policy C2 – change ‘sighting’ to ‘siting’.</p> <p>Policy C3 Green Spaces and the proposal to include wider areas (not just those which are already formally designated) are noted. However, we have concerns that this is going further than Local Plan guidance. For example, the Mitcheldean approach was to identify landscapes (actually a policy that doesn't add protection but does highlight some key characteristics (Mitcheldean NDP E3)).</p> <p>NE1 - doesn't look like the policy which addresses the landscape protection/ designation which may be sought. This however has its own issues-is it a Local green Space (NPPF) or does it need a Mitcheldean style approach (define the landscape on a plan and cite it in the policy for its particular characteristics). The policy as drafted has a lot of useful stuff in it though.</p> <p>NE2 - some local dimension otherwise a policy covering district and national level as well.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p> <p>Some text moved to Appendices</p> <p>Monitor and Review policy added</p> <p>Text added/updated for HM1, HM2, BE1, BE2, BE3, C1, C2, NE3, TT1, E1, E2, TT1</p> <p>Polices C3. NE1, NE2 amended to reflect the creation of Protection Zones</p> <p>TM1 and TM2 merged</p>



		<p>NE3 - might need to add bat friendly to the requirements as this often governs external lighting and spill from development schemes- again it's a district + policy but useful</p> <p>TT1 - needs review, see below re parking standards and also check noise etc. EV provision is now a national requirement, and the policy needs to change the first sentence assuming the proposals are to be subject to the rest of the Plan.</p> <p>E1 - would allow development outside DSB in isolated setting intended to address stand alone new buildings or would a farm be potentially in an isolated location?</p> <p>E2 - any comment re other pollution, eg impact of effluent etc on water courses?</p> <p>E3 - first requirement very hard to establish.</p> <p>E4 - principle OK but criteria may need review (any potential issue with frequent callers/ deliveries etc)</p> <p>E5 - an area of limited control and general support under national and LP guidance</p> <p>TM1 - Ok though a general approach,</p> <p>TM2 - refer not comply with DG unless there is a design policy somewhere in the NDP, TM2 and TM1 are related need to be clear on which applies to what or merge</p> <p>The car parking requirements which increase in number depending on the number of bedrooms the house has (and including future extensions potentially requiring extra car parking) are noted, but we are unsure about this policy being able to stick without evidence. Maybe leave this in and see how the examiner views it.</p>	
GCC Ecology	email	See GCC submission	
GCC Archaeology	email	See GCC submission	
GCC Environment – Minerals & Waste	email	<p>M&amp;W officers have reviewed the consultation information and at this time do not consider it likely that materially significant mineral and waste impacts will emerge as a result of implementing the consultation's proposals. M&amp;W officers have based this response on potential impacts relating to: - Gloucestershire's mineral resources; the supply of minerals from and / or into Gloucestershire; and the ability of the county's network of waste management facilities to operate at its full permitted potential   M&amp;W OFFICERS RAISE NO OBJECTION.</p> <p>M&amp;W officers have reviewed the consultation information and have no further comments to make.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>No action required</p>

Environment Agency	email	<p>Huntley Parish Council 7 Tibberton Lane Huntley Gloucestershire GL19 3DX</p> <p><b>Our ref:</b> SV/2019/110467/OR-01/IS1-L01 <b>Your ref:</b> <b>Date:</b> 16 November 2022</p> <p><b>FAO: Jenny Green</b></p> <p>Dear Jenny</p> <p><b>HUNTLEY REG 14 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b></p> <p>I refer to your email of 6<sup>th</sup> October 2022 with regards to the Huntley Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) draft.</p> <p>It is important that NDPs within the area offer robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p>It is understood that the emerging Forest of Dean Local Plan (2021-2041) will replace those policies in the Current Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk:</b> I note that almost the entire Huntley NDP area is within Flood Zone 1. There are, however, several ordinary watercourses present within the plan area. These various watercourses have associated Flood Zones 3 and 2 (the high and medium risk zones respectively), however, please note that other potential development areas may be at flood risk given the presence of 'ordinary watercourses' which are un-modelled based on the scale and nature of the stream and receiving catchment (less than 3km<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><b>Site Allocations:</b> We note the inclusion of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) evidence base to the draft NDP and the decision to not include any allocations within the NDP due to an existing allocation within the FoDDC Local Plan.</p> <p>We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment on flood risk at this time. You are advised to utilise the Environment Agency guidance (attached) which should assist you moving forward with your Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of 'fluvial' flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with the Councils drainage team as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). It is noted that pluvial</p> <p>Environment Agency Hafren House Welshpool Road, Shelton, Shrewsbury, SY3 8BB. Customer services line: 03708 506 506 <a href="http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency">www.gov.uk/environment-agency</a> Cont/d..</p> <hr/> <p>flooding has been considered within the draft NDP although there is no reference to fluvial flood risk matters.</p> <p>We would not offer detailed bespoke advice on Policy but advise that you ensure conformity with the adopted Core Strategy and, in consideration of the emerging Forest of Dean District Council Local Plan, during Plan reviews.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p> <p>Pluvial Flooding added</p>
Historic England	email	<p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the Pre-Submission Version of the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>This would appear to be our first involvement with the preparation of the Plan and we welcome the opportunity to identify and comment on matters of interest to us. Our attention tend to focus primarily on Plans where sites are proposed to be allocated for development as these have the greatest potential for impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>We note that your Plan intends no site allocations and there are therefore few comments we would wish to make.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support.</p> <p>Policy C1 amended</p>

		<p>We note and applaud the value placed by your community on the area's distinctive historic environment, and the range of policies the Plan proposes to promote its preservation and enhancement. We particularly identify the Huntley Design Guide and Landscape Character Assessments and the positive role these will play in helping to achieve those policy objectives. On a specific point of detail, we note reference in policy C1 on Local Community Facilities (p42) to a schedule of facilities deemed protected by "National Heritage". It is not clear what is meant by this term as it doesn't readily relate to statutory definitions. If it is meant to indicate that the facilities in question are protected by virtue of them being nationally designated heritage assets then this would be a more appropriate form of words.</p> <p>On the basis of the Plan as a whole we can also confirm that we have no objection to the view that a full Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.</p> <p>We congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of its Plan</p>	
Natural England	email	<p>Date: 29 November 2022  Our ref: 408492  Your ref: None</p> <div data-bbox="1685 594 1857 764" style="text-align: center;">  </div> <p>Liz Tustin  Huntley NDP Steering Group  <a href="mailto:tustinliz89@gmail.com">tustinliz89@gmail.com</a></p> <p><b>BY EMAIL ONLY</b></p> <p>Dear Ms Tustin</p> <p><b>Huntley Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 &amp; SEA &amp; HRA Screening</b></p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 3 October 2021. I apologise for the lateness of this response.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Screening Request: Strategic Environmental Assessment</b>  It is our advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan.</p> <p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening</b>  Natural England agrees with the report's conclusions that the Huntley Neighbourhood Plan would not be likely to result in a significant effect on any European Site, either alone or in combination and</p> <div data-bbox="1685 789 1857 957" style="text-align: center;"> <p>Hornbeam House  Crewe Business Park  Electra Way  Crewe  Cheshire  CW1 6GJ</p> <p>T 0300 060 3900</p> </div>	<p>Thank you for your comments  No action required</p>

therefore no further assessment work would be required.

**Neighbourhood Plan**

Guidance on the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans, in light of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended), is contained within the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#). The guidance highlights three triggers that may require the production of an SEA, for instance where:

- a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development
- the neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan
- the neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan.

We have checked our records and based on the information provided, we can confirm that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect.

We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected by the policies / proposals within the plan. It remains the case, however, that the responsible authority should provide information supporting this screening decision, sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected.

Notwithstanding this advice, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary.


Please note that Natural England reserves the right to provide further comments on the environmental assessment of the plan beyond this SEA/SA screening stage, should the responsible authority seek our views on the scoping or environmental report stages. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make.

For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

Yours sincerely

Hayley Fleming  
Senior Adviser  
West Midlands area team

The Coal Authority	email	  <p>200 Lichfield Lane Berry Hill Mansfield Nottinghamshire NG18 4RG</p>  <p>Tel: 01623 637 119 (Planning Enquiries) Email: <a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a> Web: <a href="http://www.gov.uk/coalauthority">www.gov.uk/coalauthority</a></p> <p><u>For the Attention of: Ms J Green, Chair of Huntley Parish Council</u> Forest of Dean District Council</p> <p><b>[By Email: <a href="mailto:enquiries@huntley-ndp.org">enquiries@huntley-ndp.org</a> ]</b></p> <p>24 October 2022</p> <p>Dear Ms J Green, Chair of Huntley Parish Council</p> <p><b><u>Huntley Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission</u></b></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>Yours sincerely</p> <p><b>Christopher Telford BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI</b> <b>Principal Development Manager</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Protecting the public and the environment in mining areas</p>	Thank you for your comments No action required
Gloucestershire Highways	email	See GCC response above	
National Highways	email	<p>Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to comment on the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission Version.</p> <p>As you will be aware, National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining, and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance comprises of the A40.</p> <p>As mentioned within the submission, the formal role of the NDP is the setting of planning policies which deal with land use and development. Current traffic issues experienced within the Parish boundary of Huntley cannot be addressed through the land policies of the NDP but can be expressed as Community Actions to be undertaken or led by Huntley Parish Council. National Highways is keen to ensure that policy takes account of transport and land use planning to be closely integrated.</p> <p>The NDP supports the development of long-term plans for managing road safety, traffic volumes, traffic speed and HGV movements, including measures such as effective speed cameras and speed limit reviews. We welcome these policies. We are also supportive of policy TI1, which include aims to minimise traffic congestion and to encourage different modes of travel to the private vehicle, including active travel (E.g., walking and cycling) and public transport. As well as associated environmental and health benefits, such measures can help reduce pressure on the SRN and help ensure its safe and efficient operation. We have noted your proposed policies and are satisfied that they are unlikely to lead to development which will have a significant impact on the SRN.</p> <p>Please note however that these comments do not prejudice any future responses National Highways</p>	Thank you for your comments and support. No action required

		may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.	
UK Health Security Agency and Office for health improvement and disparities	email	<p>Thank you for sending us your Neighbourhood Development Plan. As the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) are not a statutory consultee, we would not normally comment on this type of planning application unless there are specific chemical &amp; environmental hazard concerns which have the potential to impact on the health of local communities. Impacts on public health from local air quality, noise and contaminated land fall under the remit of the local authority and it is their responsibility to decide whether or not to comment on these aspects of the planning application. The planning authority may wish to contact the local authority public health team for matters relating to wider determinants of health associated with this proposal.</p> <p>If the local authority has any specific queries relating to potential impacts on public health from chemical &amp; environmental hazard exposures, then they are welcome to contact us for advice.</p>	No action required
National Grid	email	 <p>Central Square South Orchard Street Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3AZ</p> <p>T: +44 (0)191 261 2361 F: +44 (0)191 269 0076</p> <p>avisonyoung.co.uk</p>  <p>Our Ref: MW/ 15B901605</p> <p>14 November 2022</p> <p>Huntley Parish Council <a href="mailto:enquiries@huntley-ndp.org">enquiries@huntley-ndp.org</a> via email only</p> <p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p><b>Huntley Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation October – November 2022 Representations on behalf of National Grid</b></p> <p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p><b>About National Grid</b> National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p><b>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</b> An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/">www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</a></li> </ul>	Thank you for comment. No action required

Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.

Avison Young (UK) Limited registered in England and Wales number 6382509.  
Registered office, 3 Brindleyplace, Birmingham B1 2JB. Regulated by RICS

---

**AVISON  
YOUNG**

**Distribution Networks**

Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below:  
[www.energynetworks.org.uk](http://www.energynetworks.org.uk)

Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting:  
[plantprotection@cadentgas.com](mailto:plantprotection@cadentgas.com)

**Further Advice**

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if not already included:

**Matt Verlander, Director**

[nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com](mailto:nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com)

Avison Young  
Central Square South  
Orchard Street  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE1 3AZ

**Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner**

[box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com](mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com)

National Grid  
National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick, CV34 6DA

If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us.

Yours faithfully,



**Matt Verlander MRTPI**  
**Director**  
**0191 269 0094**  
**[matt.verlander@avisonyoung.com](mailto:matt.verlander@avisonyoung.com)**  
**For and on behalf of Avison Young**

Severn Trent Water

email

ST Classification: OFFICIAL COMMERCIAL

WONDERFUL ON TAP



20 October 2022

Our ref: Huntley 1

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022 to 2026  
Regulation 14 Pre-submission Draft**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, we have some specific comments to make on your plan. Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.

**Position Statement**

As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments on the impacts of future developments and to provide advice regarding policy wording on other relevant areas such as water efficiency, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), biodiversity, and blue green infrastructure. Where more detail is provided on site allocations, we will provide specific comments on the suitability of the site with respect to the water and sewerage network. In the instances where there may be a concern over the capacity of the network, we may look to undertake modelling to better understand the potential risk. For most developments there is unlikely to be an issue connecting. However, where an issue is identified, we will look to discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Where there is sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead, we will look to complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity.

**Policy BE2 – Building Design for New buildings and Extensions**

Severn Trent is supportive of the inclusion of SuDS, rain gardens and green roofs to be included in new development design. We encourage you to include wording that states that surface water should be managed in line with the drainage hierarchy. Suggested wording includes:

*New developments shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in*

Thank you for your comments and information provided.

Policies BE2, BE3, C3, NE1 have additional wording as suggested.



accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, whereby a discharge to the public sewerage system is avoided where possible.

---

ST Classification: OFFICIAL COMMERCIAL

#### **Policy BE3 – Promoting Sustainability**

We are supportive of what is currently included in the policy, however we note that Water Efficiency has not been included. It is important that new developments are built with water efficient design. The provision of potable water is an energy intensive process and it has been shown that use of water within households forms a significant contribution to energy usage. Reduction in consumption in water, through water efficient design is therefore a significant contributor towards sustainability. Suggested wording includes:

*New developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, incorporating water efficiency and re-use measures and that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, not exceeding 110 litres/person/day.*

#### **Policy C3 – Green Space**

We are supportive of your Green Space policy and we understand the need for protecting Green Spaces, however open spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation schemes to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space through biodiversity and amenity benefits. Suggested wording includes:

*Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.*

#### **Policy NE1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment**


We are supportive of the inclusion of wording that 'development should avoid damage to the drainage and ecological value of the network of watercourses associated with Ley Brook and Huntley Brook' as well as the addition of planting trees and street planting to reduce flooding risk. We encourage the inclusion of wording to encourage retrofit SuDS which supports both flood risk reduction and environmental benefits.

#### **Policy E2 – Agricultural Development**

We are supportive of the inclusion of sustainable drainage proposals to manage surface water and avoid risk of pollution and soil erosion.

For your information we have set out some general guidelines and relevant policy wording that may be useful to you.

General guidance removed

		<p><b>Water Supply</b></p> <p>For the majority of new developments, we do not anticipate issues connecting new development, particularly within urban areas of our water supply network. When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site-specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. If significant development in rural areas is planned, this is more likely to have an impact and require network reinforcements to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p><b>Developer Enquiries</b></p> <p>When there is more detail available on site-specific developments, we encourage developers to get in contact with Severn Trent at an early stage in planning to ensure that there is sufficient time for a development site to be assessed and if network reinforcements are required that there is time to develop an appropriate scheme to address the issues. We therefore encourage developers to contact us, details of how to submit a Developer Enquiry can be found here - <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/new-site-developments/developer-enquiries/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/new-site-developments/developer-enquiries/</a></p> <p>We hope that this information has been useful to you and we look forward to hearing from you in the near future.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p> <p>Rebecca McLean</p> <p>Strategic Catchment Planner</p> <p><a href="mailto:GrowthDevelopment@severntrent.co.uk">GrowthDevelopment@severntrent.co.uk</a></p>	
Bruton Knowles on behalf of a Landowner	Email	<div style="text-align: right;">  </div> <p><b>1. Introduction</b></p> <p>1.1 This representation is submitted by Bruton Knowles on behalf of Mr E Duberley and is being made to the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan (HNDP).</p> <p>1.2 The HNDP is currently out on its public consultation when representations are invited. This consultation period ends on 21 November 2022.</p> <p>1.3 The Parish of Huntley is located in the Forest of Dean District. As such, the HNDP needs to be prepared in accordance with the Forest of Dean Local Plan which includes the policies set out in the Core Strategy Plan published in 2012 and the Allocations Plan which was adopted in 2018. The Local Plan is currently being reviewed with a draft plan anticipated mid-2023.</p> <p>1.4 The HNDP has to meet basic conditions which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having regard to National planning policy.</li> <li>• Being in conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</li> <li>• Contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.</li> <li>• Being compatible with EU obligations and Human Rights.</li> </ul> <p>1.5 This representation welcomes the housing need evidence which has been gathered and has been included within the HNDP as well as the recognition given to the role that Huntley plays within the District Plan's settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>1.6 There is however, concern that the HDNP does not include a housing allocation within the HNDP to help with meeting local housing requirements. This representation makes the case for the inclusion of land at Woodend Farm as a housing allocation in the HNDP. The site is developable and deliverable and is located on the edge of Huntley.</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter.</p> <p>Policy HM2 was discussed at a meeting with FoDDC Planning Team. In order to comply with the Basic Conditions, the NDP has to conform with the current Local Plan. It was agreed that this policy will be updated as soon as the updated Allocation Plan or equivalent or the Local Plan has been adopted.</p> <p>HM1 does allow new housing within the settlement boundary and planning permission for five windfall dwellings has been granted in the last 12 months.</p>

## 2 Review of HNBP

- 2.1 The following aspects of the HNBP are welcomed as detailed below.
- 2.2 The HNBP's Vision seeks to ensure that Huntley offers a range of high-quality homes fulfilling local needs.
- 2.3 The HNBP aims to provide new housing which satisfies local strategic growth requirements, fulfils local needs and utilises the opportunities offered by new development to provide and improve community facilities, transport and other infrastructure needed in the village.
- 2.4 The HNBP's housing objectives seek to
- provide the amount of housing required by the Forest of Dean Local Plan.
  - provide the type and size of housing required to meet local needs and are suitable for people of differing incomes at various stages of their lives.
- 2.5 The HNBP recognises that:
- The Core Strategy at Policy CSP.5 Housing sets out that some housing will be provided within settlement boundaries of villages, including affordable housing and a mix of house sizes and types including those suitable for an ageing population.
  - Huntley is identified as a service village in the Forest of Dean Core Strategy (Policy CSP.16), a settlement with a range of local services where new small scale development opportunities are supported.
  - The Forest of Dean District Council's Allocations Plan includes a policy map for Huntley which *'includes a tightly drawn settlement boundary'*. In addition, the Allocations Plan allocated 0.7ha of land off Tibberton Lane, Huntley to provide up to 12 dwellings and associated open space. This area of land is known as Land adjacent the Poplars, Huntley (AP87) and is located in the old golf course car park. A planning application for 11 dwellings has since been approved on the site in April 2021.
- 2.6 The HNBP includes evidence of local housing need as follows:
- The Gloucestershire Local Housing Needs Assessment 2019 found that within the Forest of Dean, the tenure and size of additional units required to meet the predicted annual housing need is just over 7,000.
  - A Housing Needs Survey was carried out in Huntley in Spring 2022. The aim of the survey was to collect housing information to determine future local housing needs. This identified a need for a minimum of 20 new homes to meet the current housing need in Huntley.
  - The HNBP community consultation in August 2021 and the Community Survey both identified a

desire for two- and three-bedroom dwellings to meet the needs of younger people and families.

Representation

Page 3



In addition, the need for the provision of suitable housing for older people was also identified allowing existing residents to stay in the community, enabling downsizing and the release of existing homes for family occupation.

- New affordable homes were also identified as being required within Huntley

2.7 Despite this recognition of a local housing need in Huntley, the draft HNRP does not include, at this stage, an allocated site to help with meeting this need. Instead, the HNRP states that:

*'Huntley Parish Council has not included additional housing allocations in this NDP as the current Local Plan has already allocated the development at The Poplars. The current FoDDC Local Plan is being reviewed and it is not yet known if any housing development will be allocated to Huntley. Therefore, within 6 months of the new Local Plan being 'made', the housing policies and allocations within this NDP will be reviewed and updated to align with the new plan.'*

2.8 According to the Forest of Dean District Council's (FoDDC) website the new Local Plan is not expected to be examined until Autumn 2024 with adoption anticipated in 2025. As such and as per the HNRP, a new allocation will not likely be identified in Huntley until around 2026.

2.9 It is also recognised that in the Local Plan Review, the Preferred Options, commented on Huntley as follows;

*"Huntley population about 950- medium size but with limited facilities, potentially accessible location- fewer constraints than some locations but limited services, may have scope for additional development"*

2.10 As such it is expected that Huntley will continue to have role in the revised Local Plan in meeting local housing growth requirements.

2.11 In the interim period, the draft HNRP is relying on Policy HM1 to deliver *'Small-scale housing development within the Huntley settlement boundary'* to meet its local housing requirements. This

representation raises concern over the ability of this policy to deliver this small-scale housing growth. No evidence has been prepared to demonstrate that the settlement boundary has the capacity/opportunity to deliver the identified housing need of a minimum of 20 new homes and this is further exacerbated by the HNPP's own acknowledgement that the settlement boundary for Huntley is 'tightly drawn'. This creates uncertainty over whether the identified local housing needs can be met within the settlement.

2.12 Furthermore, it is noted that the HNPP is being prepared at a time when the District Council continue to have a 5 year housing land supply deficit. The latest Forest of Dean Housing Delivery Note 2021/2022 shows the Council can only demonstrate a housing supply of 3.46 years.

2.13 In this situation, paras 11 and 14 of the NPPF are of relevance.

Representation

Page 4



2.14 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF provides guidance related to Neighbourhood Plans and states that where the presumption at paragraph 11d applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply:

- The neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made
- The neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirements
- The local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites
- The local planning authority's housing delivery is at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.

2.16 Given the FoDDC cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and the draft HNPP has not identified an allocated site to help meet identified housing needs then in this context an NDP will only attract limited weight in the determination of planning applications.

2.17 To overcome this happening, and to ensure that the HNPP has a role to play in the future direction of housing growth at Huntley, it is recommended that the HNPP allocates a housing site, at this stage in the process, and does not wait until adoption of the review Local Plan.

2.18 This will also ensure that the HNPP accords with Policy CP55 of the Core Strategy which, in its justification, states that *'it is essential to provide sites that are available for new dwellings at the right time. This means being able to demonstrate that there is at the present time sufficient identified and immediately available land for five years' worth of housebuilding and that land sufficient and capable of being developed also exists for a ten and fifteen year supply'*

2.19 Land at Woodend Farm provides a developable and deliverable site which is located on the edge of Huntley and is available to help meet the identified housing needs of the Parish. This representation seeks inclusion of this site as a housing allocation within the HNPP.

### 3. Land at Woodend Farm, Huntley

- 3.1 Land at Woodend Farm forms a sustainable site which is located on the western edge of Huntley.
- 3.2 The site has been assessed positively through the District Council's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) ref 22003 and included as a developable site.
- 3.3 The site is owned by Mr Duberley on behalf of whom this representation is being submitted. Woodend Farm includes 20 ha of land, however, this representation is only looking to promote an area of 3.9ha, located closest to existing development. Please see the accompanying site location plan.
- 3.4 The site forms a greenfield site currently in agricultural use which lies on the edge of the sustainable settlement of Huntley and is well related to the built form given its location opposite the local school and next to the Business Park.
- 3.5 The site benefits for a vehicular access to the north off the A40 and another access to the east off the A4136.
- 3.6 There is a public right of way crossing the site know as Huntley footpath 30.
- 3.7 Huntley has a number of local facilities which are in walking distance of the site. These include a convenience store and petrol station, local pub, school, business park and village hall. There is also a commercial estate located adjacent to the settlement which has just been redeveloped providing local employment opportunities. The provision of housing will help to strengthen and support these services.
- 3.8 There are bus stops located on both sides of the carriage way close to the accesses to both sites. The bus stops are located 125m to the west of the smaller site and 65m to the east of the larger one.
- 3.9 Huntley also has good existing transport links given its location on the A40 which gives direct access to both Gloucester and Ross on Wye.
- 3.10 There are no specific landscape designations covering the site.
- 3.11 The site is located in flood zone 1, which means it has a low probability of flooding.
- 3.12 The submitted site is of a suitable scale which is proportionate with the size of Huntley and is available to meet the local housing needs of the area.
- 3.13 The site will meet the thresholds and will trigger the provision of affordable housing

### 4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The HNPD recognises that Huntley has unmet local housing needs.
- 4.2 That said, the HNPD does not, at this stage, include a housing allocation to help meet this local need.
- 4.3 In addition the settlement boundary is tightly drawn which in turn limits the opportunities to accommodate small scale growth as directed by Policy HM1 of the HNPD.
- 4.4 Furthermore, the FoDDC is unable to demonstrate a 5 year Housing Land Supply.
- 4.5 In line with the NPPF, this deficit in supply and the fact that the HNPD is not allocating a site reduces the weight given to the HNPD in the assessment of planning applications.
- 4.6 To ensure a plan led approach is in place to guide the future growth of Huntley it is recommended that an allocation is included within the HNPD.
- 4.7 Land at Woodend Farm represents a deliverable and developable housing opportunity which has received positive assessment through the District Council's SHELAA.
- 4.8 This representation therefore seeks inclusion of Land Woodend Lane as a housing allocation within the HNPD to provide up to 90 houses.
- 4.9 This will help ensure that the HNPD meets the required Basic Conditions and will form a sound plan.
- 4.10 Thank you for this opportunity to make comments on the HNPD which we trust will be given full consideration.



Friday drop in at Huntley Village Hall	Hand delivered	We are pleased that the village hall is considered important and an asset to the village and hope that more activities can be based there. The hall should be a focal point of the village	Noted No update required
Resident	Posted	There is no provision for schools, primary or secondary, doctors surgeries or shops. Where are people going to work? Transport will have to be by car adding to more congestion. Think climate change. The pollution level will have been raised enormously. Plant trees instead. Build on brownfield sites close to existing habitation with facilities.	The NDP is not encouraging or supporting a new development site. If a site is allocated under the new Local Plan, and consideration has not been given to school capacities, and other services, the Parish Council may object to the planning application. No action taken
Resident	Posted	<p>I think the presentation of the Policy points in shaded green boxes a good idea that makes it clear to see the outcome of the surveys and questionnaires and existing legislation. However, some detail is lacking that is important. For example, on P.26 "HM1" it reads "The proposed development (should take) account of the size of the site and its location in the parish." At his point, the criteria that need to be taken into account regarding site and location should be noted. Otherwise it is open to any interpretation.</p> <p>Similarly at "TT1" on p. 75, "adequate parking provision" should specify what is considered adequate.</p> <p>There is great emphasis on cycle and pedestrian access but at the moment the main pedestrian/cycle routes around the village are not easily navigated due to ill fitted kissing gates that are an obstacle. Even the removal of the one by The Fairways did not help greatly as there is still a gate to open. There will not be true accessibility until this issue is sorted.</p> <p>I don't know if this draft just sets out the content and that the layout and visual appearance will be enhanced before final publication, but it would be improved by better, clearer divisions between the sections to show beginning and end of one topic; use of different sized fonts would make it clearer to indicate different sections; and tables/charts should not be split between two pages as it makes them difficult to read.</p> <p>The layout of the photos could be more creative and artistic. At the moment the pictures are just rectangles stuck on the page; using them as a backdrop to a page of text or overlaying several on a page would be more visually attractive and engaging.</p> <p>Along with this sheet I also enclose a typographical error sheet, and a comment sheet on some errors in the draft for your consideration.</p> <p>P.23-24 Re The Poplars development. This cannot be changed now, I suppose, as permission has already been granted, but this is a prime example of why an NDP is needed. There is permission for 6 out of the 11 properties to be 3 beds and for one to be 4 beds. The housing register shows that there is a need for 5 x one bedroomed and 6x two bedroomed properties and no need for a four</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>P26 Density added P75 removed adequate</p> <p>The Steering Group obtained quotes for the layout and design of the NDP to make it look more visually pleasing. As these quotes were in excess of £2000, it was deemed unaffordable and not a good use of the Parish Council finances.</p> <p>We did not receive any offers of help with the layout from residents, and so the Steering Group concentrated their efforts on the content.</p> <p>P25 Information regarding income obtained from Office for National Statistics.</p> <p>P26 definition added P38, 40 noted P43 added Fig 19 replaced by one more explanatory Fig 20 noted P79. Any planning application for masts will be assessed for suitability.</p>

		<p>bedroom house. Such a shame that this development is not going to reflect the housing needs of Huntley parish.</p> <p>P.25 There is an assumption that the income level of families wishing to move to Huntley is low/middle range. Has this been investigated and proven? Also, the calculation of mortgage affordability as multiples of gross income is not the way lenders work now. This section only takes account of one income per household when the majority of families now exist on two incomes.</p> <p>P.26 What is the definition of a “rural exception site”?</p> <p>P.38 Re Litter. Litter is not necessarily caused by residents not recycling, but from passing traffic!</p> <p>P.40 Couldn’t the photo of the church show it with a sign that is level?</p> <p>P.43 Why is the fact that children travel to Gloucester to school not reflected? The fact that the catchment area school is Newent is omitted.</p> <p>P.64 Fig 19 names Great Adams Wood but it is not coloured green to show that it is a key woodland habitat as mentioned on P.63.</p> <p>P.67 Fig 20 doesn’t add anything to the previous statement or make sense.</p> <p>P.79 Re siting of masts This should be expanded to give designated/no go areas.</p>	
Resident	Posted	<p>I have reviewed the draft Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan and would like to thank all those who have been involved in preparing it.</p> <p>I support modest future developments provided that they reflect and respect the scale and nature of the village (i.e. minor developments that are in keeping with the draft NDP and the Design Guide).</p> <p>I support the policies stated in the Huntley Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>I offer the following comments on the current draft NDP document:-</p> <p>p.11 - Reference to “Enclosure Act 1957” – should this be “1857” ?P.35 - Policy BE2 – “Plot and density” – having drawn attention to the negative attributes of development density of more than 20dph elsewhere within the documentation, perhaps this statement could be made stronger by referencing or restating Design Guideline 01b ?</p> <p>P.42 - “Education” mentions “top 3 secondary schools” but lists four schools</p> <p>P.44 - Policy C2 – I believe that “sighting” should read “siting”</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support.</p> <p>NDP corrected and BE2 updated.</p>
Resident	Posted	<p>HMI, HM2 – I fully support these</p> <p>BE1, BE2, BE3 – I support these but am concerned by the lack of enforcement. We need FoD commitment to enforce the rules.</p> <p>C1 – The Allotments are also protected by the Enclosure Act</p> <p>Pg 42 – I think it is wrong that the Surgery was withdrawn due to lack of support. My understanding is that the NHS requirements made it impractical and that the regulations on facilities/sanitation are even greater now – so a purpose built dedicated facility is needed.</p> <p>C3 – Could Adams Wood also be considered ? Does it already have some protection ?</p> <p>NE1, NE2 – also preventing the removal of hedges</p> <p>TT1 – can we add that road widths to be sufficient to ensure visibility when cars are reversing out of driveways</p> <p>Overall – I applaud the work which has been done and hope this can be taken forward and recognised.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support.</p> <p>C1 amended</p> <p>P42 text amended</p> <p>C3 Adams Wood does not meet the criteria but is protected as woodland</p> <p>NE1, NE2, TT1 amended</p>
Resident	Posted	<p>C1 Facilities. Since moving to Huntley in 1973 we have lost a post office. Local shop and weekly visits to the village hall by Mitcheldean Surgery. The playgroup has also gone. Our concern is that an increase in population will place greater demands on the facilities we do have.</p> <p>Appendix K. Bus services have also decreased. Unfortunately because drivers are warned, we feel that these traffic surveys are not accurate. From our observation when walking through the village, we rarely see anyone driving at 30mph. We need a deterrent. Is it not possible to increase the speed limit distance to the end of the petrol station as vehicles are allowed to accelerate at a time when others are slowing down to go into the garage forecourt ?</p>	<p>Noted. National Highways decide on speed limits based on accidents reported.</p> <p>No action required.</p>



Resident	Posted	<p>Policy HM1</p> <p>1. Why does the policy promote 40% of any development &gt; 5 to be affordable housing when the Gloucestershire Local Housing Needs Assessment 2019 proposed a figure of 30.9%? Where did the 40% figure arise from?</p> <p>2. It would be good to include a requirement that any housing development must include "connectivity" to the rest of the village i.e. new footpaths, cycleways etc to enhance the development of Huntley as one village. TT1 requires "Safe pedestrian and cycle links are provided to connect the development to facilities and transport links" Consider amended wording "Safe pedestrian and cycle links are provided to connect the development to ALL facilities and transport links, where feasible" ?</p> <p>Policy C1 / C2</p> <p>1. There should be a link with HM1 that new housing developments (dependent on size) must include investment in local community facilities. C1 &amp; C2 state that developments for new community facilities will be supported (but not linked specifically to new housing proposals). There should be a statement somewhere that says that new housing developments will not be supported unless they include the appropriate level of investment in relevant existing and new community facilities.</p> <p>Who decides if a development proposal is deemed to go against the proposed NDP policy? There are a lot of generic statements (understandably) concerning suitability of, detrimental impact to, proportionate to etc etc. Who decides and what would the process be to contest any development on grounds of transgressing the Huntley NDP.</p>	<p>The Forest of Dean Core Strategy states 40% affordable housing. The NDP has to comply with the Forest of Dean Local Plan</p> <p>TT1 amended</p> <p>Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority to enter into an agreement with a landowner as part of granting of planning permission. The contributions can be used for the provision of services and infrastructure such as highways, recreation, education, health and affordable housing. FoDDC is legally accountable for Section 106 monies and will decide on how and where it is spent. Huntley Parish Council do not make the decision, however, it can have an input. Facilities and Services that are required and have been identified in the NDP, and evidenced through public consultation will help the decision making. Therefore we cannot amend C1 and C2 as suggested.</p> <p>FoDDC planning team assess planning proposals and their compliance with the FoD Core Strategy and Huntley NDP. Huntley Parish Council can comment on any planning proposal, and once the NDP is adopted, will be able to contest any development if it has not taken due regard to the NDP.</p>
Resident	Posted	<p>I have read through the draft NDP in its entirety and applaud everyone involved in its production to this point. When the time comes for the referendum I will be supporting the policies and the plan.</p> <p>Looking through Appendix J provided a stark reminder of the need to protect our public transport links within the district. These will need to remain at current levels for those occupying any new homes to have viable sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Given the current stage of the Huntley NDP, I believe that the recent publication of the SHELAA was disrespectful to the process and has failed to give material consideration to views already expressed by parishioners of Huntley.</p>	Thank you for your comments and support. No action required
Resident	Posted	Having read the draft Huntley NDP I fully support the content and policies. The Plan has been careful to present a balanced view and recognises that development will happen, however, the plan presents strong evidence as to how this development should be achieved.	Thank you for your comments and support. No action required
Resident	Posted	<p>Page 29 SHLAA</p> <p>It is sad we are at risk of seeing developments that would have such a negative impact on the area. Should some of these proposed sites be accepted and developed on, in particular site ref 22003 'land SW of Huntley business park' and site ref 22069 'land at Ross Road/Newent lane', it will only be bad news for the area.</p> <p>Please consider the residents who live there already, who have chosen to live or stay because of the rural peace, natural landscape, and for the quiet village life. This shouldn't be lost because a few see a quick payday by building on green fields. It is our responsibility to preserve and protect our natural land for future generations, how will they enjoy a new build estate with houses piled on top of each other?</p> <p>Huntley is already at risk of being built upon right through to Gloucester, which in itself is a shameful proposal, and these suggestions worryingly signal the start of a slippery slope. Houses do need to be built, but we should not be cramming hundreds into any green space going and these estates should not be swallowing up small communities that are already there. There is Gloucester and the surrounding areas should someone want to live in an urban jungle.</p>	Noted. The NDP is not allocating any sites for development. No action required

		<p>The site near Huntley business park in particular would stick out like a sore thumb, it would absolutely not be in-keeping with the landscape and would bring irreparable harm to the habitat of animals living in and near the woods. We are lucky to live in an area with such diverse, fascinating and in some cases rare wildlife, we should be protecting, not encroaching on their habitat. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to accommodate thousands more houses, people, and cars. The A40 and A48 are the only 2 roads into Gloucester, as it stands all it takes is one set of traffic lights or one accident to add an hour onto a journey, what will happen with hundreds more cars? In addition, Ross-On-Wye, Newent, Mitcheldean and the wider Forest are connected by small single carriageway roads and lanes. These are already popular routes used by walkers, horses, cyclists, and cars, how will the roads cope with even more use? It is simply not designed to. It's also worth pointing out the strain on local schools and GP surgeries, already struggling, is only going to be exacerbated by further housing estates.</p> <p>These proposals are disappointing, I hope they do not go any further.</p>	
Resident	Posted	<p>HM1 – I agree, new housing should provide the needs of the village and not the developers  HM2 – New development should be within the Settlement Boundary  BE1 – Our historic environment must be protected. Once lost it can never be recovered.  BE2 – New design/development must be sympathetic to surrounding development. Drainage is an issue now and should not be exacerbated  BE3 – Given recent energy price rises and possible shortages, sustainability is paramount  C1 – We do lack community facilities, therefore existing ones must be protected.  C2 – New facilities should support the needs of the village and their uptake from parishioners  C3 – Our green spaces were hugely important during Covid  NE1 – Our natural environment is key to our existence and wellbeing  NE2 – Again wildlife is part of the chain that allows us all to exist  NE3 – I agree, light impacts on humans and wildlife as well as using vital energy sources  TT1 – We have all seen the effects of on-roading parking; excess speeds through the village  E1, E2 – Fully agree  E3 – Local employment to be protected  E4 – Homeworking will be the future  E5 – Broadband etc must be improved  TM1, TM2 – We live in a beautiful area and so we should share it. This should not however, be at the expense of residents</p>	Thank you for your comments. No action required.
Resident	Posted	<p>It is regarding the rented accommodation between the junction of Frogmore Road and Tibberton Lane. These properties are not maintained by their Landlord in keeping with properties in Huntley. I feel this is not acceptable for the occupiers. In addition, there is no parking places for these properties hence they have to park their vehicles on Tibberton Lane. Consequently, for people having to drive from Huntley down Tibberton Lane they find their vision obscured. This problem needs to be addressed before there is an accident. Is the above your responsibility or can you pass this information to those that can deal with the same.</p>	Passed to Parish Council to address No action required
Resident	Posted	<p>Having read the NDP, I have no adverse comment about policies. Well written and I give it my full support.</p>	Thank you for your support. No action required
Resident	Posted	<p>Appendix I – In 2020 hedgehogs were placed on the 'red' list as vulnerable to extinction by the International Union for Conservation and Nature. I think its important to note that Huntley provides ideal habitat for the hedgehog. We have hedgehogs breeding with photo evidence of young in our garden. On one morning, our neighbour saw 5 different hedgehogs.  P36 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet – add incorporate new provision for wildlife.  On the new development checklist perhaps it could be included that boundary fences/walls should have 13cm square holes to enable hedgehogs to travel through gardens / residential spaces.  BE2 – use of render on buildings should only be where it is appropriate i.e. to complement adjacent buildings. If it is a dominant material it should be of high quality and be of a type resistant to rapid</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support.  Data is provided by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE). It relies on public reporting and so maybe you could report hedgehog sightings in order to get their presence in the area recorded.  P36 updated  BE2 noted</p>

		deterioration that is all too common on new builds (for example The Fairways). It is a big and expensive job to remove or repaint – often left undone leading to poor visual impact. I support this plan and the Parish Council are to be commended for this excellent piece of work.	
Resident	Posted	<p>P29 SHLAA These comments concern the recently proposed development sites SHLAA 2022 – 22003 (Land to South West of Huntley Business Park) and SHLAA 2022 – 22069 (Land West of Newent Lane). that have been added to the FODCC Local Plan.</p> <p>We do not support the proposed development site above for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 22003 - The site is listed as being 20.38ha in size. This fails to account for land in private ownership of which there are three residencies who own varying proportions of the land identified. Furthermore, a private dwelling, Woodend Farmhouse, is included within the boundary of the area identified, suggesting this as being potentially developable. Consequently, the depiction of the size and makeup of the area is factually inaccurate.</li> <li>2) 22003 &amp; 22069 - The areas are located outside of the settlement boundary. Priority should be given to development areas located within the settlement boundary.</li> <li>3) 22003 &amp; 22069 - The areas are actively grazed and are a historic feature of the village. Their destruction would go against the principles of the NDP.</li> <li>4) 22003 &amp; 22069 - Development should occur with the minimum of intrusion on the existing surrounding green space. Retention of the landscape is a top priority and retaining important views and amenity space is central to the NDP. Developing the land is not consistent with this ambition</li> <li>5) 22003 – the area is located in undulating landscape at the foot of Huntley Hill and Brights Hill and would be particularly affected by development. Any development would serve to negatively impact the landscape and surrounding scenery, both in terms of appearance and use. This is not consistent with Huntley residents’ ambition of maintaining a healthy, safe and pleasant environment for its residents to live, learn, work and play in, as highlighted in the NDP.</li> <li>6) 22003 &amp; 22069 – The proposed sites do not relate well to the village. The sites lie away from and in the case of 22003, separate to Huntley village. As such, any new development would not support the principle of linking new sites with existing paths, streets, circulation networks and patterns of activity.</li> <li>7) 22003 &amp; 22069 – Development on the sites would lead to additional traffic, and air and traffic pollution. This would negatively impact the unique character of the area including, quiet lanes, isolated dwellings and historic landscape features including multiple PRoWs and Ley Brook.</li> <li>8) We believe there are better alternatives closer to the village for example, the old golf course which provides level land with good access to the A40, with potential to provide a GP surgery, etc. Development here would provide further opportunity for progressive planning strategies that seek to reduce road speeds and pollution in the village and encourage active transport / use of public transport.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Policy HM2 does not encourage or support a new development site. No action taken</p>
Resident	Posted	<p>P29 SHLAA - I do not support the proposal of the land south west of Huntley business park. The Woodend Farm land contains a number of developed dwellings with reasonable restriction on appearance and maintenance of the original character. To have taken steps to preserve the environment and then create a housing estate makes little or no logical sense. This includes conservation requirements. It is actively used for grazing and forms an area between housing and forest at the western side of Huntley. This western side was, I believe, commented on</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Policy HM2 does not encourage or support a new development site. No action taken</p>

		<p>by the Secretary of State when the Newent lane proposals were last made and subsequently rejected, indicating it should not be altered.</p> <p>I believe there are better alternatives. that it appears have already been considered</p> <p>The old golf course, which has a minor flood risk and the natural entry point from the A40 that can be rectified as is done on many new developments. It would fit well into the existing village housing.</p> <p>I also believe that the land to the south of the A40 is the most logical. It is flat, the entrance to any housing would be on the A40 with good visibility in both directions. It offers the opportunity for a facilities area; Surgery, shops etc</p>	
Resident	Posted	<p>P29 SHLAA - ID 22003 - Land to the South West of Huntley Business Park</p> <p>This email relates to the aforementioned site as being identified as a possible site for housing development within the Huntley NDP.</p> <p>The purpose of this email is to confirm that my husband and I are the owners of 4.75 hectares of the land identified within the plan (which doesn't fall under the ownership of the primary land owner, (name withheld). Our plot forms the majority of the land outside of the (landowner's) ownership.</p> <p>We wish to confirm that we will not oppose this site as being suitable for development and are happy for our land to be included. Please kindly bear this in mind when considering any objections. We are happy to provide you with a map identifying our boundaries should you so require. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Policy HM2 does not encourage or support a new development site.</p> <p>No action taken</p>