

**Report for the Community Consultation
on Brilley Neighbourhood Development Plan
15 January 2016**

45 people attended the consultation event, of whom 4 live outside Brilley but are involved with Brilley issues, either owning land in Brilley or as Parish Councillors.

Therefore 41 residents (19%) out of 214 people on the 2015 electoral register attended.

Residents from 24 houses out of 122 attended. 11 households from within the proposed Settlement Boundary.

6 individual residents living near the church and 13 residents living near the village hall attended.

45 forms were completed, though not all forms were fully completed. Therefore, results are given based on the number of answers to each question.

1. Do you agree with the proposed Settlement Boundary for Brilley? (Responses – Yes or No)

36 out of 45 agreed with the proposed Settlement Boundary (SB) – 13 who live within the SB (4 by the church, 9 by the village hall)

Of those who disagreed – 7 live within the SB (2 by the church, 5 by the village hall)

Comments:

- I am a traveller and disagree with property ownership and boundaries!
- It would make more sense if the boundaries for sites 1 & 3 were extended to include the entire fields
- As I understand it this has been decided. I see no reason why the settlement boundary can't be the perimeter of Brilley – if 9 development sites are windfall (spread about) then why not include all the land
- You have delineated 2 settlements and this is because Brilley is not a single village but a widespread collection of houses, old and new and farms. Adding houses in these areas is attempting to construct an artificial sense of village. You are only doing this because you have been told to build houses, not because the village needs expanding
- Brilley is a scattered community with several clusters of houses throughout and crosses boundaries. It does not have a village centre. Any house building should be individual houses scattered through the parish to reflect the current nature of the village (x2)
- Why when this parish is the largest in Herefordshire do we insist on restricting development to only a small portion. Makes no sense!
- There are a number of small settlements within the parish eg Cwmmau access road and a cluster of properties along the A438

2. Do you live outside the Settlement Boundary or within the Settlement Boundary?

Within the Settlement Boundary x 21

Outside the Settlement Boundary x 20 (+4 from outside Brilley)

If you live within the Settlement Boundary, are you close to the Church or close to the Village Hall?

Close to the Church x 6

Close to the Village Hall x 15

3. Do you agree with the Vision and Objectives? (Yes or No)

37 out of 45 agreed with the Vision and Objectives – 15 who live within the SB (5 by church, 10 by village hall)

Comments:

- Too many for Brilley (x2)
- Essential that response to the Plan clearly defines a) what kind of people the village needs to attract & b) what kind of facilities are lacking to accomplish the above (ie. access to schools, public transport)
- I don't think we need to increase public transportation – so few people use it so infrequently that the return on the investment wouldn't be worth it. School buses are the exception, obvious they need to be provided
- Again, part of Brilley's charm is its widespread nature, so there is nothing village-like to protect. There is nothing for young families or children – they bus to school, there are no play facilities etc. the danger is that people retire to Brilley, in the new houses, and it won't add anything for those already living in the area, new families etc.
- There are a number of small settlements within the parish eg Cwmmau access road and a cluster of properties along the A438
- 16 (and 9) is far too many houses when you consider there are only 25 houses in the settlement boundary; no services (bus, school etc) in Brilley so new houses should be in Kington or Hereford; no jobs!!; no infrastructure (mains sewage etc). My property already effected by other properties sewage – septic tanks
- 16 houses is far too many based on existing settlement – an extraordinary increase; services in Brilley are not available to support the community – no transport/bus service, shop, school etc; already experiencing problems from previous building issues with run-off and septic tanks
- Brilley has no facilities – no transport, no shop, no school, no doctors etc – whether considering young people or elderly. Already has water flow and sewerage problems from houses that have been built

4. Do you agree with the Policies? (Yes or No)

42 out of 43 who gave an answer agreed with the Policies – 19 who live within the SB (6 by the church, 13 by the village hall)

1 person who lives by the village hall disagreed with the Policies

Comments:

- For sites 1 & 3, BR1e Impacts on road safety and BR1f Adverse effect on neighbouring and residential amenity
- Again I think this whole development idea is artificially imposed on this spread-out community. I don't think this area is the best for what is proposed – lack of school, local facilities (shops, work etc)
- But I don't think the proposals meet the policies! In particular BR3 – the proposals suggest a number of houses vastly inappropriate for the current density of housing. 16 and 9 houses far too many for a current settlement of 25
- But policy BR3 – the policy is sound but 'it has an appropriate density in context with the immediate surrounding area' is the issue. The proposed increase in density is NOT in context
- BR3 policy sounds OK – but section d is a problem re density
- We agree with the policies providing the density of houses is correct. The sheets on the board suggest that there are 31 houses when there are about 23 (x2)

5. Which Option for site allocation for development do you think should be included in the NDP document? *Please mark only the Option you are voting for*

Option 1 – Site 1 for 9 houses – off Pentre Lane – 13 voted for this option – 9 who live within the SB (9 by the village hall)

Option 2 – Site 2 for 9 houses – opposite Brunley Close – 15 voted for this option – 4 who live within the SB (4 by the church)

Option 3 – Site 3 for 9 houses – Forge Field – 1 voted for this option – who lives within the SB (by the church)

Option 4 – Any 2 sites for 9 houses in total

If you marked Option 4, please tell us which 2 sites and how many houses on each site (to total 9)

9 people voted for Site 1 and Site 2 – (4 people want x4 on S1 and x5 on S2; 3 people want x3 on S1 and x6 on S2; 1 person wants x2 on S1 and x7 on S2; one person did not mark how many)

3 people voted for Site 1 and Site 3 – (2 want x5 on S1 and x4 on S3; one person did not mark how many)

1 person voted for Site 2 and Site 3 – (x5 on S2 and x4 on S3)

1 person voted for all 3 sites – (x2 on S1, x5 on S2 and x2 on S3)

Of the 6 people living by the church

- 4 want x9 on S2
- 1 wants x4 on S1 and x5 on S2
- 1 wants x9 on S3

Of the 15 people living by the village hall

- 9 want x9 on S1
- 2 want x4 on S1 and x5 on S2
- 1 wants S1 and S3 but did not mark how many
- 3 did not vote

Comments:

- Houses split between sites 1 & 2, to retain as much as possible character of historical centre with its stone buildings
- Cannot agree to such a number anywhere. 16 or 9 is far too many for Brilley
- It is very difficult to make a decision – none of the sites are really appropriate for development – site assessment scores reflect this. The number of proposed houses needs to be altered to better fit the land/community
- None of the sites seem appropriate, checking scores – and 9 houses on a site!!

6. Any other comments?

- Development should not be close to the church
- Good cake!
- I think it important to preserve the integrity of the built environment as well as the 'natural' landscape. Brilley is fortunate in having a small but integrated nucleus: church/ former vicarage/ school and schoolhouse/ old forge / graveyard. New development could not be in keeping with this
- Wouldn't want to exclude more possible windfall sites (x2)
- I was part of the previous 'enquiry' so – will anything happen?
- Thank you for your work on this proposal – although I disagree with the whole idea of settlements, village etc, I do appreciate all the effort and care you've been putting in

- No employment, no public transport, no mains sewage, no demand, no local support. We moved from London to Brilley to get away from development and house building!!!
- There is a large field on the lower side of the road between the two settlement areas which would be suitable for a development of a number of houses without impacting on the existing settlement area (x2)