

4a. I am uncertain as to the intended scope of the Cherished Views on the Policies Map, Policy HE3 and Appendix D. They appear to have been interpreted by Representation HNP-005 (Taylor Wimpey) as having relevance to the development of the Gilston area/ Village 7 etc. See page 3 of their representation. Policy HE3 could, of course, only constrain development in the neighbourhood plan area. I would be grateful for comments.

NPG Response

Agreed a policy for Cherished Views is only relevant in the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area. Views 4,5 and 6 are all within the Hunsdon Area. Village 7 which Savills' clients, Taylor Wimpey, seek to develop is wholly outside the Hunsdon Area. It is within the Gilston Area which has a separate Neighbourhood Plan. Savills seem to think they are relevant to their clients but it is not clear why unless their clients' proposals will damage these cherished views. Although views can extend over planning policy boundaries, they carry no weight outside the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. Savills make reference to the Landscape and Visual Impact Statement, part of their clients' Outline planning application. The LVIA is 175 pages and itself one of hundreds of documents in the OPA The figures which show the views in the LVIA are somewhere else and difficult to find- the whole thing is of considerable complexity and as yet has no standing, for the OPA has not been determined. If it is of any relevance Savills could have been specific in their references to documents to support their arguments because without that it is impossible for the NPG to follow them, never mind assess their validity or possible relevance to this NP.

Views 4, 5, and 6 are described in Policy HE3. A review of that description and a comparison with the Policies Map show shows an error on the Policies Map where the symbol for View 6 is pointing north (the default direction for the mapping software) whereas the description describes a view to the south west. The description is correct, and the map symbol is wrong. This can be put right. In fact it would be clearer if the policies map showed the views within the Hunsdon Area with some form of conical symbol .

4b. Traffic Impact—In paragraph 9.12, 2nd sentence: what proposals are there, or could there be, in the neighbourhood plan area? How could the plan have any influence over roads proposed by the highway authority, or any roads proposed outside the NP area? It would seem necessary to delete this sentence.

NPG Response-Noted

4c. Also on Policy HT1—paragraph 1 refers to **major or new development: which is intended? In any event, as representations suggest, the matters referred to here are quite outside the scope of a TIA (see definition in NPPF). Any comments please**

NPG Response
Delete “or new”

4d. Appendix A—is Briggens Park a registered park? Is there any registered park in the NP area? Should not the non-designated heritage assets listed in Policy HHC 2 be listed in Appendix A?

NPG Response

Briggens Park is a Registered Park. This is the only Registered Park in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. It is mentioned specifically in paragraph 7.31 and 8.19 and noted in Appendix A. It was Registered in 2009 and is Grade II – see Historic England reference:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001705>

It is not on the Policies Map. This may have been an oversight.

Hunsdon House Park and Hunsdonbury Park are “Locally Important Historic Parks”.

Non-designated Heritage Assets listed in Policy HCC2 are not included in Appendix A as that is a record of buildings already Listed, the scheduled monument and the registered park.

However, the cross reference to it in the text seems to have disappeared and we suggest that in HHC1, part III, add at end of first sentence “all of which are specified in Appendix A” And that the heading in Appendix A is retitled “Designated Heritage Assets” and it is noted there that “Non-designated assets are specified in Policy HHC2”

FOS 19.05.22