

Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan

Response to Regulation 16 representations

Introduction

1. The Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was submitted by Upton Bishop Parish Council (the Qualifying Body, QB) to Herefordshire Council on 15 March 2022. A consultation in accordance with Regulation 16 was carried out by Herefordshire Council from 25 March to 6 May 2022. The NDP progressed to examination on 13 May 2022.
2. The QB has been given the opportunity to respond to representations made at the Regulation 16 stage. The QB wishes to respond to:
 - Representation by National Highways that traffic assessment should be undertaken of proposed development.
 - Representation by Herefordshire Council Transportation regarding highway and transport matters.
3. The QB's responses to these representations are set out in the schedule overleaf. The opportunity to respond is appreciated. The QB has no comment to make on the other representations.

3 August 2022

Responses by the QB to selected representations to the Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 16 consultation

Abbreviations used

HC:	Herefordshire Council
LPCS:	Local Plan Core Strategy
LPA:	Local Planning Authority
NPPF:	National Planning Policy Framework
NDP:	Upton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Draft January 2022
NPPG:	National Planning Practice Guidance
PROW:	Public right of way
QB:	Qualifying Body (Upton Bishop Parish Council)

Summary of representations	QB response
<p>Representation by National Highways</p> <p>An assessment should be undertaken of the impact that the development proposed at Crow Hill may have on the local and strategic road networks and on the Traveller’s Rest M50 J4 junction.</p>	<p>The QB notes the representation refers to development “sites” at Crow Hill. For the avoidance of doubt, there is only one proposed site allocation at Crow Hill.</p> <p>The QB considers the point being made is already suitably addressed in the development plan as a whole. In particular LPCS policy MT1 requires development proposals to demonstrate that the strategic and local highway network can absorb the traffic impacts of the development without adversely affecting the safe and efficient flow of traffic on the network or that traffic impacts can be managed to acceptable levels to reduce and mitigate any adverse impacts from the development. Reference to the need for a Transport Assessment to be undertaken where necessary is also included in the NDP (para. 5.4), and site-specific highway and transport matters are addressed in the site allocation policy UBP2 and supporting text. These policy provisions will ensure that the traffic implications of the development proposed by policy UBP2 will be fully understood without the need for further requirements in the NDP.</p> <p>However, if the Examiner concludes that a modification is required in light of the representation, the QB suggests this could be done by replacing criterion 6 to policy UBP2 as follows:</p> <p>“6. the implications of the proposal for the local and strategic road networks are demonstrated in a Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application and which is to include consideration of any impacts anticipated on the Travellers Rest/M50 J4 junction; and</p>

Summary of representations	QB response
	<p>7. pedestrian and cycle connectivity to village facilities is maximised and a traffic calming scheme to the B4224 is provided. These provisions are to be detailed in the Transport Assessment and are to be delivered as part of the development;”</p>
<p>Representations from HC Transportation (a) Development Control</p> <p>No policy on highway matters e.g. traffic calming, extended speed limits, footway and cycle links, upgrade to PROWs.</p>	<p>The QB has developed the NDP on the basis that the plan should contain policies relating to the development and use of land; and that whilst wider community aspirations may be included, they should be clearly identifiable as not being part of the statutory development plan. The NDP does address transport improvements where these are related to development and the use of land. For instance, policy UBP5 requires proposals to take every available opportunity to promote walking and cycling. In the case of the site allocation, particular care has been taken to ensure transport implications are addressed in respect of pedestrian and cycle connectivity, traffic speeds and traffic calming (policy UBP2 and para. 4.15). Otherwise, the NDP sets out clearly-identifiable Community Actions to address traffic and transport matters which are outside the scope of the NDP.</p> <p>Whilst the QB considers this approach is correct in terms of the land use and development scope of the NDP, there are significant local concerns about the amount, speed and type of traffic using roads within the parish. If the Examiner were to consider that additional NDP policy provision would help address these concerns, the QB would welcome a suitable modification being made to the NDP.</p>
<p>Footway and cycleway connections should have appropriate crossing points and be away from carriageway.</p>	<p>These are technical highway requirements which fall to be addressed in highway design guidance, not the NDP. However, the NDP includes suitable references to such guidance (para. 5.4). In respect of the Crow Hill site allocation, it requires footway and cycleway improvements to be constructed to HC specification (para. 4.15).</p>
<p>Traffic management and calming should be provided on all routes into the village.</p>	<p>See response above to HC Transportation re no policy on highway matters.</p>
<p>Engagement with highways at pre-application stage is advised on large sites.</p>	<p>This is a procedural matter better addressed through HC’s pre-application process rather than in the NDP.</p>

Summary of representations	QB response
<p>(b) Active Travel</p> <p>The objective for infrastructure and roads should support provision for active travel e.g. between Ross and Hereford, Ledbury and Newent.</p>	<p>It is agreed that reference to supporting provision for active travel could usefully be included in the objective for infrastructure and roads. This would complement other plan statements such as at para. 5.4 which indicates that proposals for the creation and dedication of travel free routes to enhance the active travel network will be considered favourably. The QB is not in a position to identify or safeguard routes for active travel between locations outside the Neighbourhood Area in the absence of a wider strategy to that effect or a defined route.</p>

Upton Bishop Parish Council
3 August 2022