

**Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan
2021-2031**

**Consultation
Statement**

[this page blank]

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA DESIGNATION AND ESTABLISHING THE STEERING GROUP	2
3. OPEN DAY CONSULTATION	3
4. RESIDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	4
5. CONSULTATION ON HOUSING SITE AND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY OPTIONS	5
6. CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN	6
7. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION	8

Appendices

1. Regulation 14 consultation material	10
2. Regulation 14 consultation Response Log	18

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to accompany the submission of the Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) to Herefordshire Council (HC), the local planning authority, and to ensure that the relevant statutory requirements are met.¹ The Statement:

- Contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Plan;
- Explains how they were consulted;
- Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by those consulted; and
- Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan.

Format of the Consultation Statement

1.2 The Statement covers the following stages of work on the NDP:

- The initial stages of work on the Plan, covering the designation of the Neighbourhood Area and setting up the Steering Group (section 2).
- Public consultation at an Open Day (section 3).
- Residents' questionnaire survey (section 4).
- Consultation on two housing site options and associated settlement boundaries (section 5).
- The Regulation 14 consultation on the draft NDP (section 6)
- The issues and concerns raised in response to the Regulation 14 consultation, and how they were addressed (section 7).

1.3 In summary, the following principal consultation methods were used in preparing the NDP:

- Formation of a Steering Group comprising Parish Councillors and other parish residents.
- Regular update reports presented to the Parish Council.
- Posting of material online via an NDP tab on the Upton Bishop Parish Council website at <https://uptonbishop.org/neighbourhood-development-plan/>. This includes details of the surveys and other consultations as these were undertaken and reported.
- Posting of NDP consultation material on the parish notice boards, in the parish magazine "The Chimes", and on the Upton Bishop Facebook page and Twitter.
- Printed copies of NDP documents placed in the Crow Hill telephone box² and other locations.
- Questionnaire surveys of residents.
- Open day and evening drop-in events at the Millennium Hall at Crow Hill.
- Consultation on the draft NDP held in accordance with Regulation 14 of the 2012 Regulations.

¹ Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Regulation 15 (2)

² Re-purposed for community use (book swap), with a collection point for completed consultation/survey returns.

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA DESIGNATION AND ESTABLISHING THE STEERING GROUP

2.1 The following steps and actions were undertaken by the Parish Council in terms of initiating work on the NDP:

- Application to HC for designation of the Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Area was made on 5 January 2013. HC carried out consultation on the proposed Neighbourhood Area from 29 January to 12 March 2013. No comments were received, and the application was approved on 18 March 2013.
- Establishment of a Steering Group which included both parish councillors and other members of the community. Residents were invited to take part via requests in “The Chimes” in 2017 and early 2018. The first meeting of the Steering Group was held on 14 June 2018, comprising two parish councillors and seven other parishioners. Regular updates were posted to the Parish Council website at <https://uptonbishop.org/monthly-update/> and Upton Bishop Facebook page and in “The Chimes”, and from May 2019 Steering Group meetings were open to all residents.

2.2 The issues and concerns raised in this initial stage of the plan-making process comprised in summary:

- How best to represent the views and consider the needs of a wide cross-section of residents, the farming community and small businesses.
- How to accommodate development, including new housing to meet the requirements of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy, whilst maintaining quality of life for all in the parish.
- Challenges posed by environmental constraints including foul drainage.

2.3 These issues and concerns centred on the delivery of greater local control over development by making use of the powers available under the Localism Act 2011. They were considered and addressed by:

- Application for Neighbourhood Area designation.
- Seeking and obtaining advice from HC Neighbourhood Planning officers on the neighbourhood plan process.
- The establishment of the Steering Group comprising elected parish councillors and other members, and open to all in the community.
- Deciding to hold a drop-in event to share information and collect community views and opinions at the outset of the process, leading to an Open Day in November 2018, and with a view to then carrying out a questionnaire survey of all households.
- Obtaining grant funding and engaging professional support (initially Data Orchard).

3. OPEN DAY CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The Open Day was held at the Millennium Hall between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. on Saturday 10 November 2018. It was publicised in “The Chimes”. A series of comprehensive display boards were prepared providing factual information and posing questions for discussions on all aspects of community life, including the environment, heritage, housing, economy and employment, and services. The displays can be seen at <https://uptonbishop.org/open-days/>. Members of the Steering Group were on hand throughout to answer questions. Over 200 residents attended out of a parish population of 602 (all ages, Census 2011). Feedback was captured using post-it notes and stickers. Email addresses were collected to aid future communications.
- 3.2 The issues and concerns raised at the Open Day were collated and reviewed by the Steering Group. They comprised in summary:
- The appropriate type, size and location of new housing.
 - Views and concerns around community services, transport/roads, utilities, environment, and local businesses.
 - Issues which fell outside the scope of the NDP such as speeding and traffic calming, the use made of the Millennium Hall field, parking at the church, footpaths, and lighting.
- 3.3 These issues and concerns were considered and addressed by:
- Ensuring that the many matters raised at the Open Day informed the overall scope of the residents’ questionnaire survey, with questions seeking further information on specific points, including on the size, type and planning priorities for new housing as well as on environment and heritage, infrastructure and roads, community services and economic development.
 - Discussing non-land use planning matters which fell outside the scope of the NDP with the Parish Council.

4. RESIDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

- 4.1 A comprehensive residents' survey was undertaken in October 2019, following the Parish Council elections in May and a change of planning consultant necessitated by retirement. In developing the questionnaire, members of the Steering Group took account of issues raised to date, including at the Open Day. Regard was also had to earlier work on the Parish Plan. Key themes for the survey were identified as: vision and objectives, environment and heritage, infrastructure and roads, housing, community services and facilities, and economic development.
- 4.2 The questionnaire asked 17 questions on these topics. Responses were sought against a range of multiple choices, or in the form of free-write comments. There was a further opportunity to add comment on any other matters thought to be relevant to the NDP. The survey concluded with seven questions seeking information on the demographic profile of respondents, including their gender, age, economic activity and length of residence.
- 4.3 Questionnaire packs were hand-delivered to all households within the Neighbourhood Area in October 2019. As well as the survey questions, the pack included a covering letter, a set of frequently asked questions, instructions on how to complete the questionnaire, and a map of the Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Area. All residents of the Neighbourhood Area aged 16 or over were invited to complete a questionnaire. A member of the Steering Group acted as a point of contact to co-ordinate the process, answer any queries from residents, and supply additional copies of the questionnaire if required.
- 4.4 Completed questionnaires were collected by hand up to the end of October. Completed questionnaires could also be dropped-off at the collection point at the Crow Hill telephone box, or direct to a Steering Group volunteer (whose contact details were supplied).
- 4.5 Overall, 278 questionnaires were completed, a response rate of 56%.³ The results were professionally analysed and published on the Parish Council website in the form of two reports, the Results Report and the Comment Listings report. They can be seen at <https://uptonbishop.org/questionnaire/>.
- 4.6 The results were presented and discussed at a public event at 7 p.m. on Tuesday 18 February 2020 at the Millennium Hall. The event was publicised on the Parish Council website and in "The Chimes".
- 4.7 The residents' survey provided a wealth of information for consideration in the preparation of the NDP. Land use and development issues were addressed by the Steering Group and the planning consultant through the formulation of planning policies in the draft NDP. As with the Open Day, the survey highlighted a number of non-land use issues notably road safety and speeding. These have been addressed in the draft NDP as Community Actions.

³ Based on the number of usual residents aged 16 and over in the Neighbourhood Area at the time of the Census 2011 (493).

5. CONSULTATION ON HOUSING SITE AND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY OPTIONS

- 5.1 A Call for Sites was held in October/November 2020 to identify land potentially suitable to allocate for housing. The closing date for submissions was 30 November. The Call for Sites was publicised in “The Chimes”, the Hereford Times parish news section, social media (Twitter, Facebook) and on the parish notice boards. A site submission form was made available as a download from the Parish Council website and on request from the Parish Clerk.
- 5.2 The 12 sites which were submitted were professionally and independently assessed. The Housing Site Assessment report can be seen at <https://uptonbishop.org/call-for-sites/>. Two sites at Crow Hill were recommended as suitable for further consideration. Draft settlement boundaries for Crow Hill and Upton Crews were also provided. It was recommended that public consultation on these proposals should be undertaken to seek community views, guide site selection and inform NDP policy.
- 5.3 The consultation was undertaken by means of a short questionnaire. The survey was designed having regard to the restrictions posed by the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, which limited the scope for face-to-face consultation. Care was given to ensuring all members of the community were engaged including those without internet access. To this end, the questionnaire was hand-delivered to all households in the Neighbourhood Area in late March 2021, with a closing date of 16 April.
- 5.4 The questionnaire asked three questions about the housing site options and the draft settlement boundaries, and allowed for a mix of multiple choice and free-write responses. Completed forms were returned to the collection point at Crow Hill telephone box or by email to the Parish Clerk
- 5.5 A total of 109 survey forms were completed. The results were analysed by members of the Steering Group and published on the Parish Council website (see Housing Needs Assessment Survey at <https://uptonbishop.org/public-documents/>).
- 5.6 The consultation indicated a preference for one of the sites (site B, favoured in 48% of returns) as opposed to site A (25%) or both sites (24%), and support for the draft settlement boundaries (Crow Hill 77%, Upton Crews 82%). The issues and concerns raised may be summarised as follows:
- Site-specific factors associated with the two sites including loss of agricultural land, drainage, traffic and their relationship to settlement form.
 - Lack of services and infrastructure to support new housing.
 - Comments on the settlement boundaries including for land to be included.
- 5.7 Following due consideration by the Steering Group and then the Parish Council in May 2021, the survey feedback including issues and concerns raised was addressed by:
- Progressing the allocation of site B as a site for new housing in the NDP (policy UBP2, Land south of Spring Meadow, Crow Hill).
 - Ensuring that the issues and concerns raised were addressed in the NDP as far as possible.
 - Progressing the draft settlement boundaries in the NDP with minor additions at Crow Hill made in response to consultation comments.

6. CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN

- 6.1 The draft NDP was approved for public consultation by the Parish Council on 7 September 2021. Consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation ran for six weeks and a day from 9.00 a.m. on 20 September 2021 to 5.00 p.m. on 2 November 2021.
- 6.2 The Environmental Report and the Appropriate Assessment Report which had been provided by HC to the Parish Council in August 2021 were also published for consultation.
- 6.3 The draft NDP included a pre-submission consultation and publicity notice, setting out the requisite details of the consultation. The draft NDP, the consultation and publicity notice, a comments form, the Environmental Report and the Appropriate Assessment Report were all posted on the Parish Council website.
- 6.4 Ahead of the start of the consultation period a flyer was distributed by means of an insert in “The Chimes” to households and businesses throughout the Neighbourhood Area. This explained how and where the draft NDP could be viewed and invited comments. Further publicity was given by poster in the parish notice boards and social media. Printed copies of the draft NDP were deposited for inspection at the Crow Hill telephone box, the Parish Church and at Ross-on-Wye library. Printed copies were also available on request from the Parish Clerk.
- 6.5 Comments could be made by hand to the collection point at the Crow Hill telephone box, by post or email to the Parish Clerk, or at a drop-in event at the Millennium Hall on 21 September 2021 between 6.30 p.m. and 9.00 p.m.
- 6.6 A initial list of consultees was provided by HC and then added to by the planning consultant and the Parish Clerk, having regard to the consultation bodies specified in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the 2012 Regulations. The final list is at Table 1. Consultation was by email or letter, sent by the Parish Clerk at the start of the consultation period and explaining where the Plan could be viewed and how and by when to make comments.
- 6.7 The drop-in event on 21 September was designed to give an opportunity for local residents and businesses to seek further details on any aspect of the NDP, and to make comments. The event was publicised in the NDP Regulation 14 publicity material. A set of display boards was prepared and copies of the draft NDP and comment forms were available. The sessions were staffed by members of the Steering Group, other Parish Councillors and the planning consultant. The event was attended by 30 residents and the HC ward councillor.
- 6.8 Copies of the consultation and publicity notice, comments form, flyer, poster and the display material used for the drop-in event are at Appendix 1.

Table 1: consultees on the draft NDP

Organisations
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Diocese of Hereford
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water
Environment Agency
Education Funding Agency
Natural Resources Wales
Herefordshire Nature Trust
Herefordshire Primary Care Trust
Highways England
Historic England
Homes England
National Grid
National Trust
Natural England
Network Rail (West)
Hereford Travellers Support Group
RWE Npower Renewable
Severn Trent Water
The Coal Authority
Woodland Trust
Adjoining Councils in Gloucestershire
Forest of Dean District Council
Gloucestershire County Council
Gorsley & Kilcot Parish Council
Oxenhall Parish Meeting
Kempley Parish Council
Adjoining Herefordshire Parish Councils
Much Marcle Parish Council
How Caple, Sollars Hope & Yatton Group Parish Council
Brampton Abbots & Foy Group Parish Council
Ross on Wye Town Council
Weston under Penyard Parish Council
Linton Parish Council
Local consultees
All those who submitted sites to the local Call for Sites in 2020
The Moody Cow
Upton Bishop Allotments Association
Parochial Church Council
Millennium Hall Village Hall Trust/Management Committee
Ross on Wye Golf Club
Chicory Crops
Other businesses in Neighbourhood Area

7. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION

Issues and concerns raised

7.1 Consultation body responses were received from:

- HC service providers: Neighbourhood Planning, Strategic Policy, Highways and Transportation, and Environmental Health.
- Dwr Cymru Welsh Water.
- Environment Agency.
- Forest of Dean District Council (no comment).
- Gloucestershire County Council (no comment).
- Natural England.
- Weston under Penyard Parish Council.

7.2 Comments were also received from 18 residents. All comments are reported verbatim in the Response Log at Appendix 2. Personal information and company names have been anonymised or redacted. A response is provided to each comment and any necessary amendments to the draft NDP are set out.

7.3 The principal issues and concerns which were raised in the consultation may be summarised as follows:

- HC suggested the inclusion of a nutrient management policy and (in the Appropriate Assessment) recommended that relevant planning applications should be required to be supported by a foul and surface water management strategy.
- The Environment Agency and Natural England raised related issues with regard to the impact of policies and the site allocation in the NDP on water quality in the River Wye Special Area of Conservation.
- HC Highways and Transportation made several technical highway suggestions and sought inclusion of further requirements re active travel, in particular for pedestrian and cycle infrastructure.
- Several residents submitted objections to the proposed housing site allocation at Crow Hill, citing concerns including over traffic/road safety, pedestrian connectivity, lack of services, and drainage.
- Other issues were raised in respect of housing mix, lack of services generally in the Neighbourhood Area, no mention of Phocle Green, broadband, NDP should include more ecological information particularly for the east of the parish, and that a more flexible approach should be taken to the provision of affordable housing in the site allocation policy.

Considering and addressing issues and concerns

7.4 All comments were passed to the planning consultant for review and to provide a recommended response, including amendments to the draft NDP. Table 2 provides a summary of the resulting principal amendments to the draft NDP, in plan order. Full details may be found at Appendix 2.

Table 2: Schedule summarising principal changes made to the draft NDP following consultation

Abbreviations

Consultee	Change made
HC Neighbourhood Planning, Environment Agency and Natural England	Additions and amendments to policies UBP1, UBP2, UBP5 and UBP6 and supporting text re achieving nutrient neutrality and for planning applications to be supported by a foul and surface water management strategy.
HC Highways and Transportation	Additions and amendments to reference strategic policy SS2 and development control requirements, and to policy UBP2, UBP9, Community Action 1 and supporting text re pedestrian and cycle provision.
Resident 1	Update to Table 2 re Housing Market Area Needs Assessment July 2021.
Resident 2 and four others	Amendments to policy UBP2 and supporting text re traffic calming scheme.
Resident 7	Addition to policy UBP2 re allotments.
Residents 12 and 13	Additions and amendments to supporting text to add local detail.
Resident 17	Amendments to policy UBP2 re provision of affordable housing.

APPENDIX 1

Regulation 14 consultation material

Pre-submission consultation and publicity notice

Comments form

Flyer

Poster

Display boards for drop-in event 21 September 2021

Pre-submission consultation and publicity notice

A public consultation on the draft Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan held in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 will start at 9.00 a.m. on Monday, 20 September 2021 for a period of six weeks and one day ending at 5.00 p.m. on Tuesday, 2 November 2021.

Where you can inspect the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan may be inspected:

- On the Parish Council website at <https://uptonbishop.org/neighbourhood-development-plan/>.
- At the Crow Hill telephone box and the Church of St. John the Baptist.
- At Ross-on-Wye Library, Cantilupe Road, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire HR9 7AN.
- On request from the Clerk to Upton Bishop Parish Council, by email to clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org.

Supporting documents are available on the Parish Council website.

How to make comments on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

Comments must be made in writing and include the name and address of the person making the comments. Please make comments as specific as possible, quoting the relevant policy or paragraph number(s). All comments will be publicly available (personal information will not be published).

A comments form can be downloaded and printed from the website, requested from the Parish Clerk, or collected from any of the above locations where the Plan can be inspected.

Send us your comments:

- by hand to the collection point in the Crow Hill telephone box.
- at the drop-in session at the Millennium Hall on Tuesday 21 September 2021 between 6.30 p.m. to 9.00 p.m.
- by post to the Clerk to Upton Bishop Parish Council, Sheepcote, Upton Bishop HR9 7TT.
- by email to the Clerk at clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org.

All comments must be received by 5.00 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November 2021. These will be considered by the Parish Council and will help shape the final Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Public Consultation

MONDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2021 – TUESDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2021

Comments form

Comments must be made in writing and include your name and address. Please make comments as specific as possible, quoting the relevant policy or paragraph number(s). All comments will be publicly available (personal information will not be published).*

Additional copies of this form can be downloaded and printed from the Parish Council website at <https://uptonbishop.org/neighbourhood-development-plan/>, requested from the Parish Clerk by email to clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org, or collected from:

- the Crow Hill telephone box.
- St John the Baptist Church.
- Ross-on-Wye Library.

Send your comments:

- by hand to the collection point in the Crow Hill telephone box.
- at the drop-in session at the Millennium Hall on Tuesday 21 September 2021 between 6.30 p.m. to 9.00 p.m.
- by post to the Clerk to Upton Bishop Parish Council, Sheepcote, Upton Bishop HR9 7TT.
- by email to the Clerk at clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org.

All comments must be received by 5 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November 2021.

Your details:

Name:	
Address:	

Please give us your comments overleaf.

* The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the Privacy Notice on the Parish Council website. It will be used only for the preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Please give us your comments below.

Which part of the Plan are you commenting on? Please tell us the page number, paragraph number, or policy	Are you supporting, objecting or just making a comment?	Comments and/or suggested changes

Do you have any general comments?

Thank you for your comments – please return this form by 5.00 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November 2021.

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

We now have a draft of our Neighbourhood Development Plan – and we want to know what you think

We will be publishing the draft Plan on 20 September. To find out all about it, come along to our drop-in event at the Millennium Hall on **Tuesday 21 September between 6.30 p.m. and 9.00 p.m.**

You will be able to read the draft Plan on-line at <https://uptonbishop.org/neighbourhood-development-plan/>. There will be copies at the Crow Hill telephone box, the parish church, and Ross-on-Wye library. You can ask the Parish Clerk to send you a copy - email clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org.

The draft Plan includes full details of how to make comments – these must be received by **5.00 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November 2021.**

Keith Cornwall Chair
Brian Spencer Vice Chair
Upton Bishop Parish Council

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has now been published – and we want your views.

You can read the Plan and find out how to respond:

- At <https://uptonbishop.org/neighbourhood-development-plan/>.
- By coming along to our drop-in at the Millennium Hall on Tuesday 21 September, 6.30 to 9.00 pm.
- At the Crow Hill telephone box, the parish church and Ross-on-Wye Library.
- By emailing the Clerk: clerk@uptonbishoppcc.org.

**Let us have your comments by 5.00 p.m. on
Tuesday 2 November 2021**

We look forward to hearing from you
Upton Bishop Parish Council

Display boards for drop-in event 21 September 2021

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Preparing the NDP

The draft NDP has been prepared by a Steering Group of Parish Councillors and other volunteers.

Its publication for public consultation marks an important step in the preparation process.

```

    graph TD
      A[Neighbourhood Area designated in March 2013] --> B[Community engagement and informal consultations]
      B --> C[Consultation on the draft NDP - the current stage]
      C --> D[Revisions made in response to the consultation]
      D --> E[NDP is submitted to Herefordshire Council]
      E --> F[Further consultation by Herefordshire Council]
      F --> G[Examination]
      G --> H[Referendum]
      H --> I[NDP is 'made', gaining full weight in planning decisions]
  
```

Now, we want to know what you think. Please let us have your comments by **5 pm on Tuesday 2 November 2021**.

Board 1

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Area

Board 2

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

New houses – how many and what type?

The NDP needs to find land for new housing to meet Herefordshire Council requirements.

To do this, the Plan includes a proposal to build housing on land south of Spring Meadow at Crow Hill.

UPTON BISHOP NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA HOUSING REQUIREMENT 2011-2031		38
Dwellings completed 2011 – April 2021	14	
Dwellings with planning permission at June 2021	15	
Policy UB2 Land south of Spring Meadow, Crow Hill	15	
Windfall allowance	5	
TOTAL HOUSING DELIVERY		49

Housing delivery, Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Area 2011-2031

The Plan also supports housing of a size and type to meet local needs.

The main requirement is for 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom properties, with little need for larger homes.

Houses are also sought for first-time buyers, young families and older people. Live/work units and opportunities for self-build will be encouraged.

Board 3

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Settlement boundaries and site allocation

Board 4

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Community facilities

The draft NDP lists community facilities in the Neighbourhood Area for protection.



© Crown copyright and database rights (2021) Ordnance Survey (100000007). Not to scale.

Board 5

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Special Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites

Sites of local biodiversity or geological importance are identified for protection.



© Crown copyright and database rights (2021) Ordnance Survey (100000007). Not to scale.

Board 6

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Next steps

- Close of consultation: 5 pm on **Tuesday 2 November**
- All comments carefully considered
- Steering Group then Parish Council decides how to revise the draft
- Revised NDP submitted to Herefordshire Council
- Further six-week public consultation
- Independent Examination
- Referendum
- Adoption – NDP then has full weight when Herefordshire Council determines planning applications

Board 7

Appendix 2

Regulation 14 consultation Response Log

Part 1: Comments from consultation bodies

Part 2: Community and other comments

Abbreviations

HC: Herefordshire Council

LPCS: Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 16 October 2015

NA: Neighbourhood Area

NPPF: National Planning Policy Framework 2021

NDP: Neighbourhood Development Plan

NPPG: National Planning Practice Guidance

SAC: River Wye Special Area of Conservation

Part 1: Comments from consultation bodies

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
HC Neighbourhood Planning	NDP	C	<p>Overall the plan is structured and written well, and the objectives and policies set out are clear. In the vision reference is made to hamlets and not villages? Is the hamlets referring to villages such as Upton Crews, Crow Hill? Or specific hamlets such as Phocle Green? Has the PC considered an inclusion of a Nutrient Management Policy in their plan for the River Wye Catchment area?</p> <p>[NB no comments received from HC Development Management, Strategic Housing, Landscape/archaeology/conservation, Economic Development, Education, Property Service, Parks and Countryside, and Waste. Environmental Health (noise and nuisance) had no comments to make].</p>	<p>To clarify the Vision, the reference to ‘hamlets’ should be replaced with ‘settlements’.</p> <p>In respect of nutrient neutrality and associated issues of drainage and river water quality, the comment is pursuant to the Appropriate Assessment of the draft NDP undertaken by HC in August 2021. This made a number of recommendations for additions to NDP policies regarding safeguarding the River Wye SAC and to the need for planning applications to be accompanied by a foul and surface water management strategy. Amendments are to be made to incorporate such references. These amendments are also made in response to the comments by the Environment Agency and Natural England (see below).</p>	<p>Amend the first bullet point of the Vision to read: ‘An active, rural parish with separate settlements ...’.</p> <p>Add to policy UBP1: ‘including demonstrating how foul and surface water is to be managed.’.</p> <p>Add new criterion to policy UBP2: ‘a foul and surface water management strategy is provided in accord with policy UBP5, and the development is shown to be nutrient neutral in accord with policy UBP6.’.</p> <p>Add to policy UBP5 criterion 6: ‘These arrangements are to be demonstrated in a foul and surface water management strategy which must be submitted with the planning application concerned.’.</p> <p>Amend policy UBP6 criterion 2 to read: ‘avoiding adverse effects on the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and species of European importance. Development draining to the Wye catchment must be shown not to have an adverse effect on the SAC. In particular, planning permission will only be granted if clear and convincing evidence is provided which shows that the proposed development would not</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP																								
					<p>increase nutrient inputs to the SAC. This could include the delivery of mitigation measures to make a proposal nutrient neutral. Reference should be made to Herefordshire Council's Phosphate Calculator and associated guidance.'</p> <p>Associated amendments/additions to explanatory text to the policies concerned.</p>																								
HC Strategic Policy	NDP	C	<p>The plan is in general conformity with the policies of the Core Strategy and Strategic Planning therefore raises no objections to this draft NDP.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Draft Neighbourhood plan policy</th> <th>Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)</th> <th>In general conformity (Y/N)</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Policy UBP1</td> <td>Policy H1 Affordable housing Policy H3 Ensuring a range and mix of housing types</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP2</td> <td>H1; H3</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP3</td> <td>H3</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP4</td> <td>SC1 Social and community facilities OS3 Loss of open space, sports or recreation facilities</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP5</td> <td>LD1 Landscape and townscape SD1 Sustainable design and energy efficiency</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments	Policy UBP1	Policy H1 Affordable housing Policy H3 Ensuring a range and mix of housing types	Y		Policy UBP2	H1; H3	Y		Policy UBP3	H3	Y		Policy UBP4	SC1 Social and community facilities OS3 Loss of open space, sports or recreation facilities	Y		Policy UBP5	LD1 Landscape and townscape SD1 Sustainable design and energy efficiency	Y		Comment noted.	No change.
Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments																										
Policy UBP1	Policy H1 Affordable housing Policy H3 Ensuring a range and mix of housing types	Y																											
Policy UBP2	H1; H3	Y																											
Policy UBP3	H3	Y																											
Policy UBP4	SC1 Social and community facilities OS3 Loss of open space, sports or recreation facilities	Y																											
Policy UBP5	LD1 Landscape and townscape SD1 Sustainable design and energy efficiency	Y																											

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP																								
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>SD3 Sustainable water management and water resources</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP6</td> <td>LD1; LD2 Biodiversity and geodiversity LD3 Green infrastructure</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP7</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP8</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP9</td> <td>RA5 – Re-use of rural buildings RA6 - Rural economy Policy E2 Redevelopment of employment land Policy E3 – Homeworking Policy E4 – Tourism</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Policy UBP10</td> <td>LD1 Landscape and townscape SS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development RA6 - Rural economy MT1 - Traffic management, highway safety and promoting active travel</td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		SD3 Sustainable water management and water resources			Policy UBP6	LD1; LD2 Biodiversity and geodiversity LD3 Green infrastructure	Y		Policy UBP7	N/A	Y		Policy UBP8	N/A	Y		Policy UBP9	RA5 – Re-use of rural buildings RA6 - Rural economy Policy E2 Redevelopment of employment land Policy E3 – Homeworking Policy E4 – Tourism	Y		Policy UBP10	LD1 Landscape and townscape SS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development RA6 - Rural economy MT1 - Traffic management, highway safety and promoting active travel	Y			
	SD3 Sustainable water management and water resources																												
Policy UBP6	LD1; LD2 Biodiversity and geodiversity LD3 Green infrastructure	Y																											
Policy UBP7	N/A	Y																											
Policy UBP8	N/A	Y																											
Policy UBP9	RA5 – Re-use of rural buildings RA6 - Rural economy Policy E2 Redevelopment of employment land Policy E3 – Homeworking Policy E4 – Tourism	Y																											
Policy UBP10	LD1 Landscape and townscape SS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development RA6 - Rural economy MT1 - Traffic management, highway safety and promoting active travel	Y																											
HC Transportation and Highways	NDP	C	<p>General development control comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The NPD needs to reference two policies MT1 and SS4 - Developments will need to provide a full 7 day speed and volume survey. Review the impact of the development on the highway network, with the provision of mitigation if required. - Any development which proposed footway improvement would have to be built to HC specification and fully adopted. - If hedgerows are to be relocated for visibility splays, they should be set back 3m from the highway edge to allow for growth without having a detrimental effect on the visibility splays. 	LPCS policy MT1 is already referenced at para. 5.4. Policy SS4 to be added. Para. 5.4 already includes reference to the HC Design Guide for New Developments covering highway technical requirements and further detail is not considered necessary in the NDP, save for adding footway and hedgerow requirements to the	<p>Amend para. 5.4 to include reference to LPCS policy SS4 <i>Movement and transportation</i>.</p> <p>Add to para. 4.14: 'If hedgerows are to be relocated to allow for visibility splays, they should be set back 3m from the highway edge to allow for growth without encroaching on the visibility splays.'</p>																								

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				supporting text to policy UB2P2 (land south of Spring Meadow).	Add to para. 4.15: 'Footway improvements should be constructed to Herefordshire Council specification and fully adopted'.
	Para. 3.8 Infrastructure and roads objective	O	No mention of supporting provision for active travel. Eg: there could be potential to develop a route between Ross and Ledbury via Kempley, other links via Brampton Abbots / Hole in the Wall / How Caple to the north would support a potential future link between Hereford and Ross-on-Wye, while a potential route via neighbouring Weston under Penyard connects to an east – west link between Ross and Newent via Aston. New developments emerging to the east of the A40 Labels - Hildersley section also offer potential for possible future quieter road links to Ross.	It is not possible for the NDP to seek to identify or safeguard routes for active travel between locations outside the Neighbourhood Area in the absence of a wider strategy to that effect. In particular NPPF 106c requires 'robust evidence' to identify and protect routes to widen transport choice and such evidence is not available.	No change.
	Policy UB2P2 and para. 4.15	C	Policy UB2P2 criterion 5, after pedestrians add <i>and cycle</i> . Para. 4.15: should be active travel generally and this should be across the board not just isolated locations. Add cycle to off-road foot paths.	These changes to incorporate reference to cycle facilities are agreed, save for adding reference 'across the board' if this means to other locations other than Crow Hill. Policy UB2P2 refers to a site allocation and it is only necessary, relevant to planning and to the proposed development for access by walking and cycling to be provided to Crow Hill, particularly bearing in mind the lack of cycle infrastructure in the locality to which a feasible connection could otherwise be made.	Policy UB2P2 criterion 5 and 4.15: amend as indicated.
	Policy UB4P4 criterion 3, and policy UB5P5 criterion 5	C	Great to see these included, but these need to be supported by pedestrian and cycling infrastructure provision by developers, particularly along the busier roads - B4224 & B4221. (eg footways and cycleways, active travel etc).	Given the limited scale of development proposed or likely to occur in the Neighbourhood Area over the plan period there is little potential for footway or cycleway provision being realistically	Add after fourth sentence in para. 5.4: 'In particular, the creation and dedication of traffic free routes that enhance the active travel network will be considered favourably.'

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				delivered in conjunction with development, other than as already identified in policy UBP2, and so insufficient justification to make this a policy requirement. However, the suggestion made below in respect of policy UBP10 could usefully be added to the explanatory text to policy UBP5, as an aspirational statement should such opportunities arise.	
	Policy UBP9 criterion 2,	C	off road parking...add and cycle parking.	Agreed.	Policy UBP9, criterion 2: amend as indicated.
	Policy UBP10	C	A suggestion for consideration but could add a 6th here: development and dedication of traffic free routes that enhance the active travel network will be considered favourably.	See response to policies UBP4 and UBP5 above.	See amendment to para. 5.4 above.
	CA1	C	After footway add and cycleway improvements.	There is no objection to this amendment as such, although a revision is needed to the suggested wording to reflect the present absence of cycleways in the Neighbourhood Area.	Amend CA1 to read: '... footway and cycleway creation and improvements, ...'.
HC Environmental Health (Environmental Protection –air, land, water protection contaminated land)	Policy UBP2	C	Regarding the proposed allocated housing development site 'Policy UBP2: Land south of Spring Meadow, Crow Hill' indicated in brown on the 'Plan 4: Settlement boundaries and site allocation' a review of Ordnance survey historical plans indicate the proposed site appears to have had no previous historic potentially contaminative uses.	Comment noted.	No change.
	NDP	C	Developments such as hospitals, homes and schools may be considered 'sensitive' and as such consideration should be given to risk from contamination notwithstanding any comments. Please note that the above does not constitute a detailed investigation or desk study to consider risk from contamination. Should any information about the former uses of the	Contamination is a material planning consideration and is addressed within the NPPF and LPCS policy SD1. Proposals coming forward as planning applications will be considered under the	No change.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			proposed development areas be available I would recommend they be submitted for consideration as they may change the comments provided. It should be recognised that contamination is a material planning consideration and is referred to within the NPPF. I would recommend applicants and those involved in the parish plan refer to the pertinent parts of the NPPF and be familiar with the requirements and meanings given when considering risk from contamination during development. Finally it is also worth bearing in mind that the NPPF makes clear that the developer and/or landowner is responsible for securing safe development where a site is affected by contamination. These comments are provided on the basis that any other developments would be subject to application through the normal planning process.	existing planning policy framework. No further reference is needed in the NDP.	
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	NDP	S	Given that the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been prepared in accordance with the Adopted Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy we are supportive of the aims, objectives and policies set out. We particularly welcome the provisions of Policy UBP5: Development Requirements, specifically criterion 6 which seeks to ensure there is adequate wastewater provision to service new development. Whilst there is a very small public wastewater treatment works (WwTW) serving 'Birtletons' in Upton Crews, there is no further public WwTW within the Neighbourhood Plan area and as such any new development (including the proposed allocation 'Land south of Spring Meadow') will require private wastewater treatment. With regard to servicing the allocation with a water supply, there should be no issue in servicing this site though we will provide further comments as and when consulted on any future planning app.	This support for the NDP and the information provided is welcomed.	No change.
Environment Agency	NDP	O	I refer to your email of the 9 September 2021 in relation to the Regulation 14 Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). We have also received a separate consultation from Herefordshire Council with the associated Environmental Report and Appropriate Assessment (AA). I acknowledge the EA Pro Forma you attached with your email. It is noted that Upton Bishop falls within the Lower Wye catchment area and, although this area is not failing its water quality objectives at present, an AA has been undertaken in light of recent comments from Natural England. As confirmed within the AA document the most significant issue within the River	The site allocation proposed in the NDP is not contrary to the LPCS. Rather it is being made in order to help meet strategic housing requirements and at Crow Hill, one of the settlements identified as a main focus for proportionate growth. A site allocation is necessary in order to provide certainty that the housing	See amendments above to policies UBP1, UBP2, UBP5 and UBP6 in response to comment by HC Neighbourhood Planning.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>Wye (including Lugg) catchment relates to water quality and the potential impact of policies and site allocations within the NDP.</p> <p>We would question the statement within the AA which states that there will not be a significant effect on the integrity of the River Wye (including River Lugg) SAC when the mitigation and avoidance measures have been taken into account, especially as there is no clarity on what these measures will comprise relative to the Neighbourhood Plan area. Section 7.13 confirms that there are currently no plans for integrated wetlands within the Lower Wye catchment. Therefore, as submitted, it is not clear whether the Plan allocation (Crow Hill) is supported by an effective, robust evidence base focusing on 'deliverability', particularly as there are no specific identified solutions or mitigation but rather a reliance on emerging potential options that have yet to be fully developed or quantified.</p> <p>The AA confirms that compliance with Policy SD4 of the adopted Core Strategy is required and that no allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan will be granted planning permission unless they also satisfy the criteria of this Policy. However we would question the idea of progressing with allocations within the catchment that may be contrary to the Core Strategy as there is no current certainty that the allocation is deliverable and can accord with Policy SD4.</p> <p>Section 8.9 of the AA states that 'the NDP would benefit from some additional wording in some of the allocation policies regarding the need for a foul and sewerage management strategy, as there are not main facilities within the parish. This would enable the considerations of drainage to be taken fully into account prior to any applications being granted'. However, at this time, and as detailed above, we would question the approach of allocating sites and then relying on further assessment at the subsequent planning application stage in the absence of certainty that they can be delivered without impact on the Catchment. Should this approach be taken, and planning permission is refused where development does not contribute to achieving nutrient neutrality, this may lead to stalled applications and uncertainty around what and when development could come forward.</p> <p>We would also question the robustness of the wording of Policy UBP6 (Landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity) which states that development proposals should '<i>avoid likely harm to the River Wye and Dymock Woods Sites of Special Scientific Interest unless the public benefits of the proposed development clearly outweigh the likely impacts on the conservation status of the Site concerned and on the national network of protected Sites</i>'.</p>	<p>requirement will be met.</p> <p>Moreover, as NPPG explains 'allocating sites and producing housing policies demonstrates that the neighbourhood plan is planning positively for new homes, and provides greater certainty for developers, infrastructure providers and the community.'</p> <p>Amendments to the site allocation policy and other NDP policies are proposed above to address nutrient neutrality and the associated issues of drainage and river water quality, in response to the Appropriate Assessment. It is considered that these amendments are clear and unambiguous as to the basis on which planning permission may or may not be granted in respect of these matters. Such criteria-based policies can be applied consistently and with confidence by decision makers. The approach maintains a degree of flexibility which allows scheme options to be explored at the design and planning application stages. It also avoids the dangers of over-prescription which can lead to a policy quickly becoming out-of-date. This is particularly relevant in the case of the evolving guidance to developers on how to achieve nutrient-neutral development.</p> <p>Taking into account the work being progressed by HC with partners to</p>	

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>Note: Government Guidance notes that adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development. It states that sufficient detail should be provided to give clarity to all parties on if/when infrastructure upgrades will be provided, looking at the needs and costs (what and how much). The NPPG refers to “ensuring viability and deliverability – pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan making and decision making”. Plans should be “deliverable”. As stated above, leaving or deferring such matters to the planning application stage may not be appropriate, given the above. NPPG advises that a reasonable prospect of delivery should be ensured as part of effective plan making. You should therefore justify and be confident/satisfied that your approach is reasonable and effective.</p> <p>The AA document does confirm that Herefordshire Council are investigating a wide range of mitigation measures and working with partners to resolve the current water quality issues within the Wye and Lugg catchments. We are aware that Herefordshire Council are investigating the potential for integrated wetlands to assist in the reduction of phosphate levels within the catchment with a view to helping free up some growth in the Wye and Lugg catchment. This is linked to the Nutrient Management Plan (NMP), which is currently under review, and a development contribution scheme. Whilst we are aware of this work, and have recently commented on a planning application for the first of such wetlands, the extent of these proposals, and the how these benefits are quantified in relation to the volume of allocations across this, and other, Neighbourhood Plans, has yet to be fully developed. However, as previously stated, there are currently no plans for integrated wetlands within the Lower Wye catchment.</p> <p>You should therefore be satisfied, in consultation with Natural England, that mitigation is a viable and deliverable and that you have reasonable certainty to take forward the Policies and site allocation in the plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above it would appear the at AA document (August 2021) is making recommendation for some amendments to the NDP and that, until these amendments have been made, it cannot be concluded that there will not be any likely significant effects on the integrity of the River Wye (including River Lugg) SAC and Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC. Moving forward it may be that specific options could be provided locally or in the catchment and/or planning contributions (linked to what is being potentially progressed) could be sought to assist delivery of nutrient neutrality or betterment measures in the Neighbourhood Plan area(s). This could link to the revised NMP as part of a suite of environmental projects or</p>	<p>provide wetlands in the wider catchment, it is considered that the proposed allocation site is developable over the plan period in that it is in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that it will be available and capable of being viably developed.</p> <p>The suggestion that measures to achieve nutrient neutrality in a given Neighbourhood Area are set out in the respective NDP is not practical or feasible. The preferred approach is a catchment-level solution as is being progressed by HC and their partners.</p>	

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			improvements and may be achieved through a supporting evidence base specific to the Neighbourhood Plans within the Catchment.		
Forest of Dean District Council	NDP	C	No comments to make.	Comment noted.	No change.
Gloucestershire County Council	NDP	C	No comment.	Comment noted.	No change.
Natural England	NDP	O	<p>The Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan allocates housing sites that are within the catchment of the River Wye (the site on Land south of Spring Meadow, Crow Hill).</p> <p>Natural England notes that Herefordshire Council, as competent authority, has undertaken an appropriate assessment of the proposal in accordance with regulation 63 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). Natural England is a statutory consultee on the appropriate assessment stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.</p> <p>Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for any adverse effects, it is the advice of Natural England that it is not possible to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the sites in question.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation has been noted. However, mitigation is required to consider non-mains drainage requirements, if the villages within the proposed settlement boundary cannot be connected to mains drainage.</p> <p>The Appropriate Assessment relies upon strategic mitigation provided in policy SD4 of the Herefordshire Core Strategy and the Nutrient Management Plan, in order to reach its conclusion that there are no adverse effects on integrity. However the application of the Dutch Case means that these plans cannot be relied upon as strategic mitigation, as they do not provide sufficient 'certainty' that river targets can be met.</p> <p>For future information, when dealing with Appropriate Assessments, the correct terminology is adverse effects on integrity rather than likely significant effects. It is recommended that this be used in future Appropriate Assessments.</p>	<p>This comment is in part a response to the Appropriate Assessment of the draft NDP which was undertaken by HC in August 2021. Regarding the NDP, amendments are proposed above in response to the Appropriate Assessment to address nutrient neutrality and the associated issues of drainage and river water quality. It is considered that these amendments are clear and unambiguous as to the basis on which planning permission may or may not be granted in respect of these matters.</p> <p>The Appropriate Assessment refers to other mitigation measures in addition to LPCS policy SD4 and the Nutrient Management Plan (which are those acknowledged in the comment). One of these measures is the inclusion of a policy on nutrient neutrality in the NDP. This is now achieved through the proposed amendment to policy UBP6 set out above. This amendment will give clarity on this matter, such that decision makers</p>	See amendments above to policies UBP1, UBP2, UBP5 and UBP6 in response to comment by HC Neighbourhood Planning.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				will be able to apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.	
Weston under Penyard Parish Council	NDP	C	This is just to confirm that Weston under Penyard Parish Council do not intend to comment. We wish you every success with your endeavours.	Comment noted.	No change.

Part 2: Community and other comments

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
Resident 1	NDP	C	We need affordable social housing NOT executive homes. We need homes for village people not dormitories for commuters. We have considerable drainage problems in the village. If we are to build on this scale we need to be able to dispose of waste water properly.	The proposed site allocation will provide some affordable housing and policy UBP3 emphasises the requirement for smaller (2- and 3-bedroom) properties. Since the NDP was drafted an updated Housing Market Area Needs Assessment has been issued by HC. Table 2 should be updated accordingly. The provision of suitable private waste water treatment will be needed to service development and is a requirement of policy UBP5 (criterion 6). This will need to be demonstrated in a foul and surface water management strategy which must be submitted with the relevant planning application.	Update Table 2 and supporting text as necessary as per the latest Housing Market Area Needs Assessment July 2021.
Resident 2	Policy UBP2	O	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drainage. Septic tanks (no mains sewerage). 2. Pavements (none). 3. Increased traffic pollution and speeding. 4. Expert planning needed to involve wildlife and protection of our trees and the environment. 5. The kite flies above Felhampton Farm near the pond. This rare bird of prey will be disturbed. <p>Upton Bishop is a small spread out village with very few facilities open to all residents. There is <u>no</u> school, health care facilities (G.P.) and <u>play area</u> for the over 8's. There is a big risk of flooding from houses built on this field. The same point was made by our [REDACTED] who objected to the planning by Leeward House (P191187-O). Article in the Hereford Times referring to flooding and overflow drainage into his pond!</p> <p>With planning as envisaged in the village we need to be in negotiation with not only the planners but architects and contractors. Local people who have</p>	The site south of Spring Meadow has been identified through a local Call for Sites, Housing Site Assessment and public consultation on site options. In respect of drainage, proposals on the site will need to comply with policy UBP5 which (as to be amended) requires development to provide acceptable arrangements for the treatment of waste water, this to be demonstrated in a foul and surface water management strategy which must be submitted with the planning application concerned. If this cannot be achieved, planning	Amend criterion 5 to policy UBP2 to read: 'pedestrian and cycle connectivity to village facilities is maximised and a traffic calming scheme to the B4224 is provided. These provisions are to be proposed and delivered as part of the development.'. Add to para. 4.15: 'In addition, there are concerns about the prevailing traffic speeds along the B4224 at the site frontage. This is inside the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit which begins to the south,

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>lived here many years are more than aware of the many problems of building on a green belt.</p> <p>(A) important to wildlife (B) Drainage (C) Loss of fields and facilities (D) Loss of trees and hedges. (A) and (D) <u>Trees and hedges</u> are home to many species of wildlife. When their habitat is disturbed they try to establish themselves elsewhere. Hence a plague of rats looking for a new home e.g. work on the old parish hall. Protection for the old and established trees needed (oak). (B) <u>Drainage</u>. There is no mains drainage in the village. All homes and buildings are linked to septic tanks. The increase in rainfall from climate change is a <u>BIG</u> problem, as there is nowhere for the overflow/excess water to go. More problems when they fail. The roads are particularly bad in this area. POT HOLES and bad surfaces. Once again the question of drainage pops up as very often the roads flood in several places but in particular by the Crow Hill cross roads. (C) Such a pity to lose as much green space. The village hall and grounds are very rarely used by all the villagers. <u>No</u> playground for the over 8's with no space set aside in the grounds to play football, cricket or rounders. With the proposed increased in housing comes families and cars. The village needs to address the lack of pavements and speeding cars. Nearest school is Gorsley Goffs which is already over-subscribed. The children who are not able to go the above school are given places at Lea Primary or Weston-under-Penyard. These schools are not served by a bus directly so private transport is used adding to pollution and congestion in narrow lanes and outside schools at drop off and pick up times. IF THE VILLAGE IS TO EXPAND THEN ALL THE POINTS I HAVE MENTIONED NEED THOROUGH INVESTIGATION AND TALKED ABOUT WITH VILLAGERS AND THE UBNDP. NEW HOUSES BRING NEW FAMILIES SOME FROM CITIES AND TOWNS WHO MOSTLY DON'T UNDERSTAND LIVING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE IS DIFFERENT AND NEEDS TO BE <u>PROTECTED</u>.</p>	<p>permission will not be granted. Crow Hill has been identified as a location for proportionate housing growth in the LPCS taking into account village services and the allocation is pursuant to this. The policy requires pedestrian connectivity to the village to be maximised and identifies a possible off-road option at para. 4.15 which will need further consideration in scheme design. The site is within the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit and a traffic calming scheme for this section of the B4224 will be required as part of the development to address the issue of excessive traffic speeds. This is in addition to the Community Action which is proposed to continue to address the issue of traffic speeds more generally in the Neighbourhood Area. Biodiversity matters are addressed in the policy with the retention of hedgerow and planting of new hedgerow, and will also be considered through policy UBP6.</p>	<p>beyond Lower Ryelands. Traffic calming measures along the B4224 between the Crow Hill crossroads and the entrance to the village (including the site frontage) should be proposed as part of the development in order to manage traffic speeds to at or near the signed 30mph speed limit. These footway, cycleway and traffic calming measures should be included in the planning application and are to be delivered by the development.'</p>
Residents 3 and 4	Chapter 2	O	<p>The plan states there is a local bus – but this does not serve a direct route to the county town of Hereford. Also, times are useless for work, school or college etc. NB Because of the hopeless bus service and the inability to cycle (even walking is difficult due to lack of pavement) residents current and new will have to drive to access basic facilities.</p>	<p>The limitations of the public transport provision are noted in para. 2.11.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
		O	Cycling is not possible in the village as too dangerous. Also the hills are too steep and roads too narrow. This cannot be stated as a sustainable green initiative.	See responses to comments above by HC Transportation and Highways.	No change.
	Policy UBP1	O	Phocle Green is not in the village envelope to take some of the burden for housing – this is not fair. It should be included.	Phocle Green is not identified as a settlement to receive housing growth in the LPCS and so cannot be identified as such in the NDP.	
	Policy UBP4	O	Upton Bishop has no school, shop or post office, so the NDP should clearly state these are <u>absent</u> . Also The Moody Cow is not a pub, but a part-time Michelin restaurant. The NDP should remove that we have a local pub facility.	The NDP sets out the facilities available in the Neighbourhood Area. Policy UBP4 protects the use of the building, not the operator. The retention of accessible local services such as public houses is a national planning policy requirement (NPPF para. 84).	No change.
Residents 5 and 6	Policy UBP3	C	The need for houses and to keep alive the Parish we should be looking for 2 bedroom and not 4/5 bedroom houses priced for the working young.	Policy UBP3 emphasises the requirement for smaller (2- and 3-bedroom) properties. However there remains a need for larger properties so an outright prohibition is not feasible.	No change.
	Policy UBP4	C	The Millennium Hall must become the Village Centre for sports and education of country life for everyone and not just a money making project for the few.	The Millennium Hall is listed as a community facility for retention in policy UBP4. Management of the facility is not a matter for the NDP.	No change.
	NDP	C	The Millennium Hall is for the use of the Parishioners of Upton Bishop first and foremost. Underused!		
Resident 7	Para. 4.10	C	Add 10 allotments to the 15 houses.	This is a reasonable requirement although it should be subject to viability and confirmation of the existence and extent of demand at the time a planning application is prepared. This will inform the number of allotment plots	Add new criterion to policy UBP2: 'provision is made for land and car parking for allotments subject to viability and an assessment of demand.' Associated addition to explanatory text.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				proposed, which it would be premature to specify in the policy.	
	NDP		I would like to thank the NDP as "it" (the report) looks good and professionally done.	This support for the NDP is welcomed.	No change.
Resident 8 and 9	Community Action CA7 Communications and broadband	C	May I suggest that a fibre broadband survey is undertaken. ■ were originally a Fastershire partner. It now seems to be ■. Their records are wrong. E.g we now have fibre to the home (FTTH) via ■ @ 70Mbps using Ookla speed test software. ■ seem to think that we do not have fibre broadband. The PC needs to address the Fastershire strategy of FTTH roll-out and ensure that ■ focus on properties that do not yet have FTTH.	This is a matter for the broadband providers to respond to, not the Parish Council.	No change.
	NDP	C	An excellent and well researched and presented document. Having been involved in the previous Neighbourhood Plan I was pleased to see it referenced. Well done all concerned.	Comment noted.	No change.
Resident 10	Policy UBP2	O	Site suggested opposite Powells Croft. Far more suitable all round.	The selection of site for allocation has been informed by the public consultation on housing site options held in April 2021. This showed a preference for the land south of Spring Meadow over that opposite Powells Croft.	No change.
			I am objecting to having houses at the back of Spring Meadow. There is no pavement on that road, it is a very fast road although there is a 30 mph sign. Its not a bus route road. Also none of us on our little cul de sac want any more houses/neighbours. We've been here 26 yrs and like it the way it is.	The site south of Spring Meadow has been identified through a local Call for Sites, Housing Site Assessment and public consultation on site options. The policy requires pedestrian connectivity to the village to be maximised and identifies a possible off-road option at para. 4.15 which will need further consideration in scheme design. The site is within the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit and a traffic calming scheme for this section of	No further change (see amendments above re traffic calming).

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				the B4224 will be required as part of the development to address the issue of excessive traffic speeds. This is in addition to the Community Action which is proposed to continue to address the issue of traffic speeds more generally in the Neighbourhood Area.	
Resident 11	Policy UBP2	O	Simpsons field opposite Powells Croft far more suitable.	The selection of site for allocation has been informed by the public consultation on housing site options held in April 2021. This showed a preference for the land south of Spring Meadow over that opposite Powells Croft.	No change.
			A very fast road, not suitable for more houses. There is a condition on the land at the back of Spring Meadow that can't be built on for 4 yrs plus [REDACTED] actually own 20 ft of that land not [REDACTED] as is registered with the Land Registry and [REDACTED] are aware of this. So if planning is applied for this will obviously come to light.	The site is within the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit and a traffic calming scheme for this section of the B4224 will be required as part of the development to address the issue of excessive traffic speeds. This is in addition to the Community Action which is proposed to continue to address the issue of traffic speeds more generally in the Neighbourhood Area. The restriction referred to will expire before the end of the NDP period. It is not clear from the information given in the comment how the query with regards to landownership would impact on the delivery of the site. The information provided in the Call for Site submission is that the site is in	No further change (see amendments above re traffic calming).

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				a single ownership with a likely timeframe for development of 6-10 years.	
Residents 12 and 13	NDP	C	<p>Overall the principles enshrined in the opening statements seem to have been picked up well in the detail so we would not want to object to the document now, but believe it should be clarified and or improved as follows:-</p> <p>There is something of a bias towards the western and northern parts of the Parish with little mention of eastern areas of the parish for example Tanhouse. (Perhaps that is a good thing since it is all open countryside, but then so is Phocle Green which receives considerable attention). The elephant in the room is however climate change and the policies that the NDP could apply to reduce our carbon footprint. It is ironic that with a submission deadline for our comments coinciding with the start of COP26 there is no mention of climate change up front and as a policy influencer.</p> <p>There are other issues which need to be included or need more attention.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is little mention of the incised single track lanes that are a distinctive part of the parish and are acknowledged as one of the historic features of the landscape. 2. There is little reference to the historic farmsteads of the parish and their associated listed building status including important farm buildings in relation to development policy. For example on barn conversion or the break-up of collections of farm buildings by conversion to other uses whether residential or non-agricultural commercial operations. 3. There is no mention of the Golden Triangle of wild daffodil interest – this area together with the adjoining parish of Kempley has the biggest remaining area of wild daffodils in England. 4. There is no mention of wildlife corridors as a valuable means of conserving isolated protected sites which cannot survive in isolation and need routes between other locations to maintain the health and survival of existing populations both of endangered species and their habitats. The hedgerows of Tanhouse are a good example providing a wildlife corridor between Queens Wood and Lynders Wood. These hedgerows are also a major breeding habitat for the endangered dormouse which is protected by international legislation, but its habitat is largely ignored in planning decision making in Herefordshire. <p>There are a number of factual errors or omissions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.) Para 2.11 there is a station at Ledbury with connections to Hereford and Birmingham. 	<p>It is agreed that responding to climate change should be added to the Vision and objectives; this will set the stage for plan policies to promote sustainable design (policy UBP5) and the re-use of existing buildings (policy UBP9).</p> <p>Single-track lanes: reference to be added.</p> <p>Historic farmsteads: reference is included at para. 5.3, together with a reference to the Herefordshire Farmsteads Characterisation project. LPCS policies RA3 and RA5 deal with the re-use of rural buildings including permitting economic or otherwise residential development, and their provisions do not need repeating in the NDP.</p> <p>Golden Triangle: this is referred to in the NDP Review of Ecological Information, which notes Upton Bishop's location adjacent to the so-called Golden Triangle of parishes (Newent, Kempley and Dymock) which are famous for wild daffodils. Reference is also made to bluebells. A reference to these locally-important species will be included in the NDP.</p>	<p>Add to last bullet point in the Vision: ' , and to mitigating and adapting to climate change'.</p> <p>Add to Environment and heritage objective: ' ; and to encourage sustainable design measures in new development and the re-use of existing resources.'.</p> <p>Add reference to incised single-track lanes in chapter 2.</p> <p>Add reference to wild daffodil and bluebell as locally-important species in chapter 2 and para. 5.14.</p> <p>Include reference to Ledbury railway station in the fourth sentence of para. 2.11.</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			b.) Paras 4.8 and 5.18 reference to Manor Road should read Manor Lane. This is of particular importance and is an example of Herefordshire Council being sloppy in its language – a lane – especially a single track lane, is very different from a road.	<p>Wildlife corridors/hedgerows: reference is included in policy UBP6 criterion 5 in the context of the Herefordshire Ecological Network with supporting commentary at para. 5.15. The significance of hedgerows (which are Habitats of Principal Importance) is recognised and emphasis given to their retention in policy UBP6 criterion 4 and para. 5.16. Dormouse and other species are assessed in the NDP Review of Ecological Information and at para. 5.14.</p> <p>Factual errors/omissions: a) Ledbury to be added to para. 2.11. b) the road in question does appear to be known as Manor House Road (see HC's on-line Highways and public rights of way map) and so is identified correctly in the NDP.</p>	
	Chapter 2 Environment		<p>There is little mention of the findings in the Ecology Report where Tanhouse Lane is highlighted in the report as being the location of internationally protected species – most bat species and the dormouse as well as many other threatened species of birds, animals and plants, for example owls, kites, buzzards, peregrine, bluebells, orchids, amphibians and snakes and most mammals. The BRC records are three years out of date and should not be relied on as the only base data here. Such diversity highlights the importance of the eastern and southern part of the parish for wildlife and the need to make sure that wildlife habitat is not impacted by development.</p> <p>Also as already mentioned there is only one reference to the wild daffodils which form part of what is now the largest remaining location of the wild species in England. The fields and verges of Church Lane and Tanhouse Lane are part of the Daffodil Walks to celebrate the Golden Triangle each spring. 2.12 refers to <i>'it's character'</i> as if this is a description of Upton Bishop, it is in fact a repeat of the description for the whole of the South Herefordshire and Over Severn National Character Area which covers an extensive area beyond</p>	<p>Protected species: policy UBP6 refers to protected species throughout the Neighbourhood Area and the supporting text references the NDP Review of Ecological Information. The Review represents proportionate and robust evidence.</p> <p>Daffodils: see response on Golden Triangle above.</p> <p>2.12: amend to clarify that the quoted description is for the whole National Character Area, and include reference to the</p>	<p>Protected species: no change.</p> <p>2.12: amend as indicated.</p> <p>2.13: add footnote as indicated.</p> <p>2.14: add Queen's Wood to the examples of ancient replanted woodland.</p> <p>2.18: incorporate reference to local flooding issues on Church Lane and Tanhouse Lane in the second sentence.</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>this parish with different landscape characteristics. Upton Bishop is but a part of this wider area and I would say is not typical of this broad description as it is not lowland and not mainly arable with mixed farming, rather it is largely located on the ridge being the watershed between the Wye and Severn Valleys and is a mix of arable and pasture ie under mixed farming. Being part of the watershed between the Wye and Severn Valleys defines the nature of the local environment and the Wye valley itself. So the statement that the parish is pleasant lowland landscape gives a rather uncharacteristic impression of at least the eastern and southern parts of the parish.</p> <p>2.13 I believe that the Wye Valley AONB does include a small part of the NW of the parish – this needs checking.</p> <p>2.14 This should mention Queens Wood which is in part within the Parish and has many special conservation sites close to the parish boundary.</p> <p>2.18 there are local flooding issues on Church Lane and Tanhouse Lane which should be mentioned as these lanes can become impassable during flash flooding and can cause residential damage. These small streams run down from the ridge east into Kempley Brook and thence to the Leadon forming part of the Severn catchment.</p>	<p>Wye/Severn watershed and to mixed farming as defining landscape characteristics.</p> <p>2.13: two small areas of land in the parish west of the A449 are in the AONB, comprising 192 m² at Coppice Farm and 85m² at The Burnt House. These appear to be historic features of the parish boundary which otherwise follows the A449, like the AONB boundary. Reference to this will be made in a footnote to para. 2.13.</p> <p>2.14: agreed.</p> <p>2.18: agreed.</p>	
	Chapter 2 Economy	C	2.25 This is not quite right as there are areas of pasture in the east for example in Tanhouse and Tedgewood. The NDP needs to reflect the whole of the parish not just the western part of the Parish.	Amend to refer to arable and pasture farming.	Amend as indicated.
	Vision and objectives	C	<p>3.1 the fact that the parish has so few services means it is not a sustainable location for development. With such emphasis now on Climate Change it would surely be meaningful to make this statement upfront.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bullet point on biodiversity could be better phrased to <i>'Protect the Neighbourhood Area's landscape character and views, and its biodiversity through the protection of habitats and species.'</i> • The bullet on rural business development needs some adjustment to make it clear what <i>'rural businesses means'</i>. Without defining what rural businesses means it could lead to a possible interpretation of 'businesses located in rural parts of the parish' rather than what it is assumed is meant- 'businesses associated with rural activities'. At the moment the NDP seems to commit the Parish Council to actively considering development for example of factories or retail sheds eg ■■■, in rural locations. This is not a facetious point - this is important when the proximity of junctions 3 and 4 of the M50 are considered and the increased number of applications for commercial activity on rural 	<p>Services/sustainable location: Crow Hill and Upton Crews have been identified in the LPCS as "locally sustainable" settlements, in part on the basis of the services available. The NDP has to conform to this strategic provision.</p> <p>Biodiversity: suggested wording agreed.</p> <p>Rural businesses: given the qualifications included in this bullet and in the terms of policy UBP9, no further specification is required.</p>	<p>Services/sustainable location: no change.</p> <p>Key issue biodiversity: amend as indicated.</p> <p>Key issue rural businesses: no change.</p> <p>Vision: no change.</p> <p>3.3: no change.</p> <p>3.5: amend to read:</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>farmland around these junctions is taken into account. This is a threat to the nature of the parish from creeping development where for example there are already the following businesses - a warehouse and transit facility on the southern side of junction 3 of the M50 with links to the northern exit/entrance at Junction 3 and similarly an events seating operation, plus two container storage facilities with a third currently in application.</p> <p>Vision Bullet point 2 is meaningless and widely open to interpretation – it needs refining</p> <p>Objectives 3.3 What does ‘Community Actions’ mean? 3.5 this could be wildly interpreted to mean support for almost any commercial venture in the ‘service sector’ – as a minimum it needs qualification and omission of the word maximise, but preferably a rethink to indicate scale and proportionality. 3.6 This needs rephrasing to make more sense and recognise that not all protected habitats and wildlife benefit from public access. <i>I suggest ‘Environment and heritage; to protect and enhance the natural and built environment - our buildings of historic or architectural interest; our open spaces landscapes and views including open access via the public footpath network; and a diverse and healthy natural environment its habitats and species.’</i></p>	<p>The NDP does not commit the Parish Council to supporting development of factories or retail sheds in rural locations.</p> <p>Vision The Vision was supported by 92% of respondents to the residents’ survey.</p> <p>Objectives 3.3: Community Actions are previously explained at para. 1.7. 3.5: amend by removing reference to services and rephrase so as to better align with policy UBP4. 3.6: agreed.</p>	<p>‘Community facilities: to support the retention of community facilities and appropriate new provision.’</p> <p>3.6: amend as indicated.</p>
	Para. 4.16	C	<p>This needs rebalancing since the location is not sustainable in the usual application of the word – so it needs explaining somewhere – see earlier comment. Without such a definition or explanation there is a gap in policy here that could lead to many more speculative planning applications for this area.</p>	<p>See response to Vision and objectives above. The LPCS has determined that the settlements of Crow Hill and Upton Crews are suitable locations for proportionate housing development. Speculative planning applications are best managed through the designation of settlement boundaries which are set out in the NDP for both settlements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	Policy UBP4	C	<p>See my earlier comments. It is too strong to say ‘<i>will be supported</i>’ there needs to be some qualification even if only by adding ‘<i>usually</i>’ to read, ‘<i>will usually be supported</i>’. Similarly in 4.22 there is too wide a commitment. This</p>	<p>It is unclear why further qualification is sought, given that the scope of this policy is itself</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			needs a qualification otherwise the most awful provision is supported by this commitment which cannot be right.	clear, is set within LPCS policy SC1, and is already subject to the qualifying criteria specified in the policy. Moreover, any material considerations which may arise would always be taken into account in planning decisions.	
	Policy UBPS	C	<p>Policy 3 needs amendment as obviously buildings must comply with building regulations so this should be omitted.</p> <p>Policy 4 should not include reference to street lighting – it has already been identified that residents value dark skies. Where building regulations require street lighting, for example on larger developments, why is there need to mention <i>undue impact</i> – surely there should be <i>no</i> or <i>minimal</i> impact?</p> <p>Policy 5 again reference to <i>undue impact</i> is a hostage to fortune because it is so open to interpretation – it needs clarification.</p> <p>Policy 6 what are '<i>acceptable arrangements</i>'? Acceptable to whom?</p> <p>5.3 This is perhaps where more could be said about change of use of farm buildings</p> <p>5.5 refers '<i>to an acceptable level</i>' without any definition – who determines what is acceptable? The Parish Council?</p>	<p>Criterion 3: this does not attempt to circumvent national technical standards but to encourage good practice (which may go beyond building regulations on a voluntary basis).</p> <p>Criterion 4: 'undue' introduces flexibility, in this instance potentially enabling lighting which may be justified for security or highway safety reasons.</p> <p>Criterion 5: 'undue' again introduces flexibility. Since there will generally be some impact on character and biodiversity from, for instance, the formation of a new access, the phrasing ensures this can be assessed and a view taken of its acceptability (to the Parish Council as a consultee on planning applications, and to the decision maker i.e., HC as the local planning authority or an Inspector/Secretary of State in respect of appeals).</p> <p>Criterion 6 and para. 5.5: acceptable to the Parish Council as a consultee and to the decision maker.</p>	No change.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				Para. 5.3: see response on this issue above.	
	Policy UBP6	C	<p>What does geodiversity mean in this context? If it is reference to maintaining access to important geological sites then why not say so?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 3 Since these areas are in open countryside why is there special reference to them? The mention of exception of public benefit is a risk of changing national guidance and I do not think this should be modified by local reference. Point 5 has the reference to wildlife corridors but there is no earlier reference - see my point above. <p>5.7 refers to 'lowland landscape' which as already pointed out does not represent the eastern or southern part of the NDP area.</p> <p>5.8 sounds good but I am not sure what it adds. It would be better stated as an objective.</p> <p>5.16 The Ecology report made mention of Tanhouse as an area of importance for protected species but there is no mention of Tanhouse at all in the NDP. Also there is an odd juxta position between reference to development and sites and locations of important species and habitats, when almost all of these wildlife locations are in open countryside outside the settlement boundaries. Surely there should be a clear statement that development is not expected in these areas and will not be supported. The reference to 'requiring a buffer' between these sites and any development needs clarification since clearly such buffers would be expected to be on a substantial scale in order to be needed against development limited to the settlements given the current identified important wildlife locations. This seems to be a confused section and needs some more work – it is better than current guidance but could be much better related to the earlier identified development locations.</p>	<p>Geodiversity: this is the accepted term for 'the range of rocks, minerals, fossils, soils and landforms' as defined in the NPPF Glossary.</p> <p>Criterion 3: the effect of this provision is to bring NPPF 180b into the development plan (it would otherwise remain a material consideration, albeit one stated in national planning policy). An amendment is made to better align the policy wording with NPPF.</p> <p>Criterion 5: see response above. The supporting commentary is at para. 5.15.</p> <p>Para. 5.7: remove reference.</p> <p>Para. 5.8: this paragraph locates policy UBP6 in the wider framework of planning policies on these topics.</p> <p>Para. 5.16: the measures listed in this para. are from the NDP Review of Ecological Information and provide explanatory guidance as to how landscape and biodiversity may be protected, conserved and enhanced in achieving policy UBP6. A range of development proposals may arise outside Crow Hill and</p>	<p>No change, except for: Amend policy UBP6, criterion 3 to read: 'avoiding adverse effects on ... '.</p> <p>Para. 5.7: delete 'pleasant lowland'.</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				Upton Crews in the countryside. For instance: rural exception housing or other dwellings coming forward as exceptions under LPCS policy RA3; rural economic development; renewable and low carbon energy generation, such as solar farms; or agricultural and forestry development. Hence, the measures listed are relevant across the Neighbourhood Area.	
	Policy UBP7	C	Most of those identified are westward views from the high ridge in the east of the area. However there are other views for example from Kempley Lane westwards and many local smaller vista views from footpaths which are equally as important in the context of the public footpath network created under the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act which took visual beauty into account in opening up the countryside – I think more work is needed on this aspect.	There are undoubtedly many views available from public footpaths in the Neighbourhood Area. However, those identified in policy UBP7 reflect the results of the NDP questionnaire survey which canvassed opinion on this topic.	No change.
	Policy UBP8	C	5.19 It is important that there is no suggestion that Upton Crews be identified as a village otherwise in years to come future planning updates will slip into that language. Reference to <i>two villages</i> needs to be changed. This is easily corrected as follows:- <i>'The differences between Upton Crews and Crow Hill are recognised in the Local Plan Core Strategy where the two settlements are in separate.... They are also evident in the settlement boundaries defined in this NDP The distinctive characteristics of the two settlements as physicallyPolicy UBP7 will ensure thatseparate identities of the two settlements....'</i>	Amendments to avoid using the word 'village' in the context of Upton Crews are agreed.	Amend para. 5.19 as required.
	Policy UBP9	C	Policy 4 presumes development in the open countryside – why? If this is related to agricultural diversification why not say so. There should be no policy of accepting new commercial development in the open countryside on greenfield sites beyond farm diversification. This is compounded by the last statement suggesting only that <i>'wherever possible....'</i> suggesting a new factory or office location could be acceptable on a green field site sometimes. This needs amendment to say greenfield sites will not be acceptable for business development. This would not run counter to the Core Strategy as reflected in NDP paras 6.3/4/5	Policy UBP9 is in line with the national planning policy that sites to meet local business needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements (NPPF para. 85).	No change.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
	Policy UBP10	C	One problem that the community is already grappling with is the impact from change of use from agricultural to industrial use and the difficulty of identifying when that transition takes place so leading to development incrementally almost out of control. There needs to be some comment about strategic approach to limiting constant expansion and the need to limit development that would be more suitable for industrial park location. 6.8 deals with this for new development but there is a need to have a policy for expansion of existing operations.	This point could be addressed by an amendment to para. 6.8 to clarify the scope of the policy.	Amend para. 6.8 second sentence to read: 'The above policy is intended to ensure that agricultural and forestry development including proposals arising from the expansion of existing operations is undertaken sensitively...'
	Chapter 7 Delivering the NDP		7.3 is a strong statement which would better be qualified such by adding ' <i>will usually support</i> '. 7.4 it would be best to add ' <i>as set out in this NDP</i> ' otherwise this policy is open to interpretation by developers that they believe their plans to be advantageous to the NDP area even though it runs counter to the NDP itself. 7.5 It would be best to also envisage the need for new policies outwith the impact of time and being out of date. Therefore ' <i>or needs addition to deal with new issues</i> ' should be added after 'out of date'. As this is a Neighbourhood Plan to be endorsed by the community, surely the community should be consulted on updating the document, and residents should be able to request review and updating perhaps on a cycle of review say every 3 years? It would not be democratic for the Parish Council to work with Herefordshire Council to change a document agreed by the community for application in this neighbourhood. This is particularly important given the following section on Community Action which specifically excludes community action from the NDP itself.	These suggested changes to paras. 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5 are agreed. It is up to the Parish Council to decide when to review the NDP, and whether to seek wider community views on whether to undertake such a review; this does not need referencing within the NDP itself.	Amend paras. 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5 as indicated.
Resident 14	NDP	S	I support the proposal as displayed in the exhibition at the Millennium Hall on 21 st September 2021.	This support for the NDP is welcomed.	No change.
Resident 15	Policy UBP1, Settlement boundaries	S	This element of the plan will in my view be important in controlling development so that it is sympathetic to the character of the village.	This support for the NDP is welcomed.	No change.
	NDP	C	The advisor was informative and gave confidence to the management of the process.	Comment noted.	No change.
	NDP	C	I look forward to the NDP progressing quickly and being finalised. It is needed asp.	Comment noted.	No change.

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
Resident 16	Policy UBP2	O	<p>We have lived at Spring Meadow for almost 25 years and we love living here. We have wonderful views and its so peaceful. I oppose policy UBP2 because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any houses on this land will be right behind our house and will spoil our views towards May Hill etc and our peace and quiet. 2. there are no amenities in the village for more residents and children – no playground or school. 3. no shop/post office. 4. lack of public transport. 5. no public footpath on the B4224 which is a dangerous road due to speeding vehicles even though it's a 30 mph speed limit. 6. there is no mains sewerage in the village. 7. the pub isn't welcoming to locals. 8. in 2020 [REDACTED] objected to the planning application for 9 homes on land between Leeward House and the Millennium Hall saying "the scheme was too big for the village". Yet, when there was a call for sites for housing by NDP the field south of Spring Meadow was allocated for around 15 dwellings. This field belongs to [REDACTED]. So he is prepared to have houses on there even though the drainage and possibly sewage run off will be on his land down towards his pond (this was another of his concerns). What a hypocrite! 	<p>The site south of Spring Meadow has been identified through a local Call for Sites, Housing Site Assessment and public consultation on site options. The policy includes a criterion which requires development to respect views across the site as far as practicable. Crow Hill has been identified as a location for proportionate housing growth in the LPCS taking into account village services and the allocation is pursuant to this. The policy requires pedestrian connectivity to the village to be maximised and identifies a possible off-road option at para. 4.15 which will need further consideration in scheme design. The site is within the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit and a traffic calming scheme for this section of the B4224 will be required as part of the development to address the issue of excessive traffic speeds. This is in addition to the Community Action which is proposed to continue to address the issue of traffic speeds more generally in the Neighbourhood Area. Proposals on the site will need to comply with policy UBP5 which (as to be amended) requires development to provide acceptable arrangements for the treatment of waste water, this to be demonstrated in a foul and surface water management strategy which must be submitted</p>	<p>No further change (see amendments above re traffic calming).</p>

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
				with the planning application concerned. If this cannot be achieved, planning permission will not be granted.	
Resident 17	Para. 4.12	S/C	<p>Please add the words “UP TO” in front of 40%. This gives more local control and makes affordable housing more likely to be built.</p> <p>Thank you for the excellent NDP. I wanted to make just one comment and edition if I may? I read the document and it is very good and allows more control by local people through the Parish Council. My suggestion is with regard to the wording in Paragraph 4.12. In this paragraph it determines that 40% of new homes must be affordable under policy H1. This is a policy which has actually prevented the amount of affordable homes needed from being built as it adds to the cost of the development prohibitively. It also removes the Parish Councils ability to determine actual local need. My suggestion is that the wording is changed to “up to 40%”. This makes it more likely to be delivered and allows the Parish Council more flexibility. I believe it is also the Government guidance too. Thank you very much.</p>	This comment in respect of local need, cost and flexibility could also be addressed by making the amount and type of affordable housing which is to be provided subject to evidence of local housing need and to an assessment of viability.	<p>Amend policy UBP2, criterion 2 to read: ‘up to 40% of the dwellings are provided as affordable housing which is to be available in perpetuity for those in local housing need. The amount and type of affordable housing is to be informed by a local housing need assessment and by an assessment of viability; and’.</p> <p>Amend first sentence of para. 4.12 to read: ‘... which sets an indicative target of 40% affordable housing provision subject to assessment of local housing need and viability.’.</p>
Resident 18	Policy UBP2	O	Generally I laud the Neighbourhood Development Plan, save for the proposed idea to build 'around' 15 new houses on a *greenfield site south of Spring Meadow, on the B4224, opposite my home. If built, this will totally eliminate the wonderfully rural view to Felhampton and May Hill, which for some reason was not included in the Upton Bishop Key Views, that I, my neighbours and residents of Spring Meadow currently very much enjoy. I am extremely concerned about the waste disposal from such a development. There has been considerable annoyance caused by the overflow from the sewerage site at Powells Croft over the years, and I feel that this is something that should be very seriously thought about. I am delighted that speed calming measures are being considered., as vehicles travelling up and down the B4224 to and from the Crow Hill crossroads frequently travel at high speeds, well over the stipulated 30 mph. There have already been some narrow escapes, and	The site south of Spring Meadow has been identified through a local Call for Sites, Housing Site Assessment and public consultation on site options. The policy includes a criterion which requires development to respect views across the site as far as practicable. Proposals on the site will need to comply with policy UBP5 which (as to be amended) requires development to provide acceptable	No further change (see amendments above re traffic calming).

Consultee	NDP ref	Type C = Comment O = Object S = Support	Comment received	Response	Amendments to draft Upton Bishop NDP
			<p>were the 15 house development to take place, the chances of a horrible accident would be very much greater.</p> <p>*I see in an article in The Daily Telegraph of 8 October 2021 that there are calls that in the forthcoming Planning Bill greenfields should have further protection from development.</p>	<p>arrangements for the treatment of waste water, this to be demonstrated in a foul and surface water management strategy which must be submitted with the planning application concerned. If this cannot be achieved, planning permission will not be granted.</p> <p>The site is within the Crow Hill 30mph speed limit and a traffic calming scheme for this section of the B4224 will be required as part of the development to address the issue of excessive traffic speeds.</p> <p>This is in addition to the Community Action which is proposed to continue to address the issue of traffic speeds more generally in the Neighbourhood Area.</p>	