

Progression to Examination Decision Document

Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

Name of neighbourhood area – Walford Neighbourhood Area

Parish Council – Walford Parish Council

Draft Consultation period (Reg14) – 4 January to 16 February 2022

Submission consultation period (Reg16) – 6 July 2022 to 31 August 2022

Determination

<i>Legal requirement question</i>	<i>Reference to section of the legislation</i>	<i>Did the NDP meet the requirement as state out?</i>
Is the organisation making the area application the relevant body under section 61G (2) of the 1990 Act		Yes
Are all the relevant documentation included within the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map showing the area • The Neighbourhood Plan • Consultation Statement • SEA/HRA • Basic Condition statement 	Reg15	Yes
Does the plan meet the definition of a NDP - 'a plan which sets out policies in relation to the development use of land in the whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the plan'	Localism Act 38A (2)	Yes

Does the plan specify the period for which it is to have effect?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
The plan contains no 'excluded development'? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County matter • Any operation relating to waste development • National infrastructure project 	1990 61K / Schedule 1	Yes
Does it relation to only one neighbourhood area?	2004 Act 38B (1and 2)	Yes
Have the parish council undertaken the correct procedures in relation to consultation under Reg14?		Yes
Is this a first time proposal and not a repeat? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has an proposal been refused in the last 2 years or • Has a referendum relating to a similar proposal had been held and • No significant change in national or local strategic policies since the refusal or referendum. 	Schedule 4B para 5	Yes

Summary of comments received during submission consultation

Please note the below are summaries of the responses received during the submission consultation. Full copies of the representations will be sent to the examiner in due course.

Table 1 – comments made by Herefordshire Council departments

Department of Herefordshire Council	Comment made
Strategic Planning	No objections the plan is in general conformity with the policies of the Core Strategy. Conformity table attached n Appendix 1.
Transportation	Objective 3 Point 5.

Department of Herefordshire Council	Comment made
	<p>Benefit from reference to inclusion of sustainable transport facilities in new developments, given that objective iii) page 22 mentions reducing the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Policy WALF 1, point g.</p> <p>Could have included under g) and support and encourage walking and cycling as the mode of choice (to support Obj 5 i and ii)</p> <p>Point g in justification-</p> <p>Would have been nice to see mention of secure cycle parking provision in one or more of these sub paras too (eg h).</p>
Environmental Health (contamination)	<p>Land amounting to approximately 0.45 ha on north side of Leys Hill Lane. The site has historically been used as orchards. Can be subject to agricultural spraying practices which may, in some circumstances, lead to a legacy of contamination</p> <p>Land amounting to approximately 0.65 ha at Arthur's Dingle adjacent to the B4234. No previous historic potentially contaminative uses.</p> <p>Land amounting to approximately 0.8 ha at Lower Field at Orchards Heights. The site has historically been used as orchards. Can be subject to agricultural spraying practices which may, in some circumstances, lead to a legacy of contamination</p> <p>Land amounting to approximately 0.45 ha off Watling Street Proposed development is located within 250 metres of former landfill site (Vine tree Farm). The site's potentially contaminative use would therefore require consideration prior to any development.</p> <p>Land amounting to approximately 0.45 ha south of Cedar Grove, Coughton No previous historic potentially contaminative uses.</p>
Primary Care Team	<p>No direct comment on the plan, but welcomes policy (WALF16) promoting the development of high-speed broadband, mobile communications, and other communications which are of benefit to the provision of healthcare into rural communities.</p>

Table 2 – comments made by statutory consultees

Statutory Consultee	Comment made
Welsh Water / DCWW	<p>The Consultation Statement states that Welsh Water did not respond to the Reg 14 consultation – this is incorrect. Points below have been summarised from the response sent at reg 14 consultation.</p> <p>The Lower Cleeve Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) sewerage catchment extends to serve the settlements of Coughton and Walford. Aside from these areas, the remainder of the Parish is not served by the public sewerage network. Welcomes the inclusion of Policy WALF8.</p> <p>There are no issues in providing those within the Bishopswood area with a supply of portable water with mains available in the respective adjacent roads. There is no public sewage system in this location.</p> <p>The proposed site for Ross on Wye urban fringe - no issues in terms of water or foul sewerage, both mains and public sewers are available.</p>
Coal Authority	<p>Past coal mining features are present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, probable unrecorded coal workings and surface mining sites. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.</p> <p>Surface coal resource is present in the area, although this should not be taken to imply that mineral extraction would be economically viable, technically feasible or environmentally acceptable.</p> <p>No new sites are proposed for allocation in the areas where our records indicate that coal mining features are present at surface and shallow depth.</p> <p>On this basis have no specific comments to make on this document.</p>
Historic England	<p>Previous comments from Reg 14 remain relevant, and considers the plan to be a good example of a community led plan. “We particularly commend the thorough approach taken to identifying the distinctive local characteristics of the varying settlements of the Parish and the emphasis placed on the conservation of their local distinctiveness through good building design. The protection of locally significant buildings, farmsteads and landscape character including archaeological remains and important views is equally to be applauded.</p> <p>The plan has an extremely sound evidence base that includes reference to the Herefordshire Council Historic Environment Record and County Landscape Character Assessment and it reads as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate but very thorough approach to the historic environment of the Parish.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comment made
Natural England	<p>The Appropriate Assessment concludes that the plan has no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC. Natural England agrees with this conclusion.</p> <p>Natural England agrees with the conclusion of the HRA that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of these sites resulting from this plan.</p> <p>We note that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a requirement for nutrient neutrality, in the event that the River Wye is found to be failing to meet its favourable conservation status in the future. Natural England supports this stance and we welcome the future-proofing of the plan.</p> <p>NE welcomes the inclusion of WALF6: Enhancement of the Natural Environment as a positive policy.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>No comments on flood risk at this time.</p> <p>Walford falls in the Lower Wye catchment and the area is not currently failing in its water quality objectives, therefore they raise no concerns.</p>
Sport England	Provided general comments

Table 3 – comments made by members of the public

Member of the public	Comment made
Alan Curtis	<p>Supportive of the NDP, appreciate hard work and time taken.</p> <p>Suggests changing settlement boundary on Church Lane to stop at the dead end sign following the recent decision made by planning committee that the area adjacent to it is open countryside not suitable for building on the grounds of sustainability and major road concerns.</p> <p>There are flooding in these locations and the green fields act as a sponge to absorb water. The area has many springs.</p> <p>Howle Hill is not on mains drains and building in open countryside on green fields would add to flooding issues.</p>
Andrew Corbett	<p>Supportive of the NDP, and the steering groups efforts.</p> <p>In light of the recent Herefordshire Council Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting, as regards application number P204443 (Land adjacent to the Old Kilns, Church Lane, Howle Hill, Ross on wye, Herefordshire). The Committee refused planning permission on this site due to it being outside the settlement boundary and in open countryside and is not a sustainable site for development.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>The site lies outside of the settlement boundary as defined in Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan, as such the site is considered to be in an open countryside location and is not well related to the main built up form of Howle Hill.</p> <p>There would be associated landscape harm in the open countryside, and the sites rural location a lack of local services and poor transport connectivity future residents would be entirely car reliant.</p> <p>Suggest the settlement boundary definition line be moved back to the No Through Road sign that is adjacent to The Old Barn in Church Lane.</p>
Andrew Eyre	<p>Objects to the proposal of site 11R within the Walford NDP.</p> <p>PC have failed to adhere fully to parishioner's concerns and that the weighting used to determine sites was flawed in that it failed to address significant impacting factors, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New road access required, • Utilities and Infrastructure, • Heating and sewage impact • Development will lead off the main highway, not in keeping with existing development and fails to deter further site increase and/or adjoining • Loss of currently profitable arable farming land • Impact of existing access roads • Increased size of Coughton end of Walford Village. <p>Parishioners preference for small sites that run along the road side, in tradition with previous builds and without risk of increasing or adjoining other sites, has been overridden by the Councils' requirement to fulfil its NDP housing commitment.</p>
Anselm and Judith Panes	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>Plot 11 has obviously been targeted by the landowners for a large development. It has been made clear at all of the parish consultations that we don't want a large development.</p> <p>While we know that plot 11 is now proposed for just 5 houses. We have seen in Ross that settlement boundaries agreed in the NDP were later overridden in favour of a much larger development. The parish council have not represented the community position very well.</p> <p>These are the main criteria for keeping the developments small.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AONB • Prime Agricultural land on Plot 11 (and 21 were it to be developed) • Sight • light and land pollution <p>Considerable interest from large landowners to develop Plot 11 and 21.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	Access to Ross from the Walford side is very restricted. Development on Plot 11 looks like it is being designed to give best chance of access to plot 21 (plot 21 being ruled out currently because there is not sufficient access).
Ashley Beddis	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Concern is that on Church Lane which is a narrow dead end is the only way I can reach my sheep. Please could the settlement boundary be brought back to the dead end sign.</p>
Charlotte Patrick	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Makes sense to bring back the settlement boundary line on Church Road, Howle Hill to the dead-end sign because after this sign it is open countryside on a dead-end lane that is not the entrance to the hamlet but on the periphery.</p> <p>The cluster for this area appears as the largest when it is not the centre of the hamlet or part of the main built-up form.</p> <p>Recently a planning and regulatory committee decision has been made that the area adjacent to the current settlement boundary line is not suitable for development in the open countryside due to it being unsustainable on a single track narrow lane with no passing places on a dead end.</p> <p>This part of the hamlet is open countryside and the historical buildings of the church, the school house and the pub have long been residences for many years.</p>
Claire Anthony	<p>Howle Hill Map 1.</p> <p>The settlement boundary down Church Lane appears far longer on paper than the area in reality.</p> <p>Suggest the end of the settlement boundary be moved to the location of The Old Barn: a. Beyond The Old Barn, Church Lane is a dead end narrow winding lane b. The 'no through road' sign is located outside The Old Barn. There is a narrow pinch-point at The Old Barn between the end wall of the cottage d. The hedges at The Old Barn have already been damaged on numerous occasions by vehicles</p> <p>2. The land appears to have been split in 2 with part included within the wildlife boundary & part not. All of the plot is woodland and is used solely for wildlife purposes. Please could the map reflect this. The land in question is a rectangle depicted in white located behind Sunnyside, whilst the rest of the same plot to the right is depicted as woodland.</p>
Clifford John Bush	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>Objecting to building on Plots 11 and 21; as no doubt once Plot 11 can build houses, the agricultural land of Plot 21 will ask for planning permission to build as its adjacent to Plot 11.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>Village cannot sustain large housing developments. Not taken into account the residents objections to any further development in Walford and especially with regards to Plot 11 and 21.</p> <p>Concerned that Coughton Marsh will sustain damage, the draining of land for two reservoirs has already caused damaged to wildlife.</p> <p>Plot 11 has flooded and building on this plot will cause more flooding - Increased sound, light and environmental pollution. Lack of agricultural land, Major health and safety issues by increased pollution. Road cannot cope with more congestion, especially as it has been brought down to one land.</p> <p>Roads in Ross on Wye are becoming more difficult to access and continual traffic jams. Residents have no access to a local shop, dentists or doctors. Ross on Wye cannot cope with the population numbers it has now.</p> <p>Plots 11 and 21 are in an area that have bats and owls, as well as other wildlife. Species must be protected and the impact on the Area of Nature Beauty not be affected.</p> <p>The high volume of developments in Ross on Wye and surrounding areas already, has caused a problem with the infrastructure and therefore should consider the impact of further developments in the village of Walford/Coughton as it simply is not coping now.</p>
David Jordan	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>Objects to separating the parish of Walford. The parish as a whole need's development not just in selected areas. Howle Hill has been split in three, has been proposed to stop development. The proposed boundary lines only cover a few houses.</p> <p>The 2017 AECOM report findings and what is proposed are entirely different, they are an independent body</p>
Diana Owen	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Commends the steering group for time and effort taken. In the case of the Diagram that shows the settlement boundary line for Howle Hill being along Church Road, it would in my opinion and logically sensible, to query why the settlement boundary line is not where the dead-end sign is on Church Road.</p> <p>As beyond this point the lane disappears into open countryside. The Church, the School House and the Pub have all long gone and been turned into private residences and the single lane is for access only to these and the other few properties nearby.</p> <p>The settlement boundary line should be moved back to the road sign depicting that the lane is a dead-end. This section of the Hamlet has not been highlighted for being suitable or sustainable for development and</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	therefore it would make more sense to re-position the settlement boundary line to the dead-end sign.
Frederick Gibbs	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>The development of five houses at Site 11 (R3) in the Coughton settlement. The submission provided for the development of 44 houses; this was subsequently reduced by the landowner to 22, but as the Parish Council accepted arguments by local parishioners that there was clearly no requirement for any development of this size, which would substantially impact to the detriment of this semi-rural area, concerns on impact on Coughton Marsh and the AONB.</p> <p>Concern that the approval of this site for development would have given access from the main road to another Site 21, which had been tendered for consideration by a different landowner, involving a development of up to 60 houses.</p> <p>If 5 houses were approved that the new nucleus of five houses would be regarded as a springboard for further additions, resulting in future bids for more development that would inevitably be insatiable to the point of converting the area into an out-of-town urban sprawl, lacking in any infrastructure.</p> <p>The problem here is that the existing settlements can bear very little further development without the consequence of residents having the nature of their environment being changed from semi-rural to urban. Site 11 was only discussed at an Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting on 7 April 2022, which was called at short notice and therefore lacked much public attendance; this meeting was after the Parish Council had made its determinations in the matter in response to urgent concerns raised by parishioners.</p> <p>The development target can easily be achieved without the site inclusion also, the land in question is of a prime agricultural grade and there is current consternation at our increasing incapacity to be self-sufficient in food production as a nation.</p>
Lewis Geoffrey	<p>Objection to NDP.</p> <p>Plot 11 is prime agriculture land and if you build houses on it where are you going to get land to replace the land lost .You can't as they are not making any more land. Therefore this scheme is not sustainable and should be dropped.</p>
Hannah Francis	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>Need development on a limited scale and over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable the young people of the Parish to be able to afford to stay within the Parish.</p> <p>Development is required in villages/settlements to ensure their sustainability. Walford is classed as an AONB, with such a large scale of housing development, it would spoil our heritage.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>Development on site 11 would cause further damage to Coughton Marsh, the draining of the land for the two reservoirs has already caused substantial damage to the marsh and protected wildlife.</p> <p>Have now voted the development through for a smaller number of houses, having assured the Parishioners in a meeting that they would not approve any development on the Plot, This meeting was well attended with residents from throughout the parish.</p> <p>Development would cause considerable sound, light and environmental pollution to the surrounding properties during development. We have no confidence that planning on Site 11 will not then go through for a larger development that will then give access to a major Landowner to develop parts of his land</p> <p>Further development would cause access in to Ross is becoming more of an issue through Copse Cross Street .</p>
Helen De Pulford	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information on the NDP. The way Holwe Hill has been separated in three parts Is appalling. Howle Hill should include all of the properties and not just a select few.</p> <p>It is not right how Howle Hill and the rest of the parish of Walford have been divided into segregated areas. Development is required in villages/settlements to ensure their sustainability. The parish of Walford needs development across the whole parish, not just selected areas.</p>
Helen Lindley	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>This plan should be refused on the basis that it includes development on plot 11. This plot: 1 Is within the AONB 2 Will result in the loss of Prime Agricultural Land 3 Will risk further damage to Coughton Marsh, and cause substantial damage to the marsh and protected wildlife, 4. Will cause considerable sound, light and environmental pollution to the surrounding properties during development. Light pollution will increase long term. 5 Has already been the subject of much objection due to the fact that there is a lack of confidence that planning will not then go through for a larger development that will then give access to a major Landowner to develop parts of his land. 6 Traffic issues in Ross town will increase as access in to Ross is becoming more of an issue through Copse Cross Street.</p>
James Cole	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding the NDP. Objects the way Walford Parish has been divided up is appalling. The boundaries have been drawn up to stop development, expect for a few sites.</p> <p>As a parish, we need development on a limited scale over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable young people of the parish to be able to afford to stay within the parish.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	Development is required in villages to ensure their sustainability.
Janine Liddle	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>The Parish Council originally rejected a development on plot 11 after considerable local objection around 100 parishioners attended the meeting. The owner of the plot wanted 44 houses, then reduced it to 22 which was rejected in this meeting, resubmitted 3 houses which again the locals objected to as its a large field near a protected habitat. The plans for the 3 houses still give the opportunity for this to go ahead</p>
Jayne Jordan	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>Objects the way Walford Parish has been divided up, the parish needs development as a whole not just in a few selected areas. The parish as a whole needs development, not just in selected areas. Howle Hill has been split in three, has been proposed to stop development. The whole of Howle Hill share the same post code, so surely the whole of this area should be within the building development boundaries. The 2017 AECOM report findings and what is proposed are entirely different, they are an independent body with all of this in mind can you dismiss the findings of the Walford NDP. Walford NDP have been clever and selective where they have advertised their meetings. This was proved by the low number that attended public meetings. No information packs were sent out when they contacted the clerk.</p>
John Kendrick	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Support for the settlement boundary as drawn on behalf of numerous local residents in the Howle Hill area.</p> <p>The Plan should constrain any new residential proposals outside of the current settlement boundary of Howle Hill due to lack of sustainability and also highways access/egress difficulties together with known drainage problems.</p> <p>There are no local facilities with regard to Howle Hill and the settlement boundary should therefore be only drawn around the existing nucleus of dwellings. There are no services whatsoever to support new speculative residential development. Any intrusion in line with long established government guidance into the open countryside should be resisted.</p> <p>The area generally cannot accommodate increased residential pressure.</p> <p>There should be a new Policy which states that new residential development will only be assessed if necessary, on Brown Field or previously developed sites.</p>
John Woolston	<p>Objection.</p> <p>There are too many potential new houses proposed for this area, there introduction will potentially change the nature of the existing village and</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>introduce a population load that local infrastructure (roads and drainage) is unable to sustain.</p> <p>There is a disproportionate number of potential new developments/houses in the Bishopswood area compared to the numbers in other identified areas. If all the developments in this area are realised it will increase the number of houses in this area by around 30%.</p> <p>This is disproportionate in comparison with the increases in other locations. The philosophy behind the development of the plan was to spread the new housing across the whole area.</p> <p>A large element has been focused on Bishopswood, this doesn't follow the spirit of the philosophy. The concentration of development on Bishopswood will exacerbate a number of existing problems.</p> <p>These include: the problems with the junction of Leys Hill with the B4234 which has been the source of a number of representations in the past. Leys Hill is the only access route for much of the construction traffic for these developments. There have been several instances of road blockages, damage to the road and attempts by vehicles that are just too large to use Leys Hill.</p>
Keith Hunt	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>Oppose proposals which will result in large housing developments in Walford. The original submission by the landowner for NDP Site 11 was for 40+ houses. Site 11 is adjacent to Site 21, where 120+ houses were proposed. Site 21 is currently not being recommended by Walford NDP, due to its lack of access to the Walford Road. The revised Site 11 proposal called for 19 houses, after residents voiced strong objections.</p> <p>Walford Parish Council then voted unanimously to reject the proposed 19 houses, and Site 11 was not recommended by Walford NDP.</p> <p>This decision also reflected the survey results conducted by the Parish Council, where 80% of residents rejected the idea of large developments in the Parish. The landowner for Site 11 chose to change the proposal for a second time, and reduced the number of houses to 5. This was passed by Walford Parish Council at an "Extraordinary" meeting, following representations.</p> <p>The access to the Walford Road is the all-important factor here. Regardless of whether Site 11 is approved for 5 houses or some other number, the access, if granted, allows both Sites 11 and 21 to return to planning to try to achieve their objectives.</p> <p>The access to the Walford Road is the all-important factor here. Regardless of whether Site 11 is approved for 5 houses or some other number, the access, if granted, allows both Sites 11 and 21 to return to planning to try to achieve their objectives. If this planning were to be granted, Walford would almost certainly finish up with a large housing</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	development on Site 11. It is also likely that a further large development would take place on Site 21.
Lyn and Fred Mills	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>However please could the settlement boundary line on Church Road be brought back to the dead end sign. We are sure it never used to go as far out as is currently shown. It does make sense to be brought back because the road is a dead end and gradually gets worse before it comes to a stop leading to woodlands and horse bridleways. There have been so many incidences of vehicles causing damage and getting stuck. It is all open countryside and we are very much on the outskirts in this part.</p>
Margaret Bate	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Appreciates all the effort and time they have taken to draft NDP. The area for Church Road extends into open countryside and farmland. Feel that the settlement boundary line should be brought back to the dead end sign.</p> <p>We are not the centre or part of the main built up form of this settlement. The recent regulatory and committee decision reached the verdict that the site next to the settlement boundary line was RA3 open countryside with highway safety issues due to the dead end narrow lane and not suitable for development. It is just not suitable or sustainable to build in open countryside here.</p>
Marion Corbett	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>With regards to Howle Hill; 1) Please remove the word village from the title of Howle Hill village Policies Map to either settlement or hamlet Map. Howle Hill is not a village and has not been identified as a village.</p> <p>It has been throughout the NDP document referred to as either a settlement or hamlet</p> <p>2) A recent planning application (P204443/O) has identified an area of Priority Habitat which is shown on the Magic Map but because the area is under 0.25 hectares the fact it forms a small strip of Ancient & Semi-natural Woodland (ASNW) is not and the Priority Habitats do not feature on the NDP maps for some reason. Therefore now that the ASNW has been identified the NDP would be the appropriate place thus helping to protect and preserve it - WALF6.</p> <p>3) The same recent planning application (P204443/O) via the Council's own ecologist (condensed), has identified that the eastern part of Howle Hill in the Church Road no through road, where the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) also begins, falls within the Bailey Brook catchment of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC); a habitat recognised under the Habitats Regulation. The SAC is notified at a national level as the River Wye Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI). Yet there is no mention of the Bailey Brook catchment only the Castle Brook catchment, please amend accordingly. Also the Walford Environmental Report May 2022, shows Howle Hill has access to mains drainage on the</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>third answer down under River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC: – this is incorrect. Howle Hill has no mains drainage and has no access to mains drainage. The same document states there are no conservation areas within the Parish – see evidence above at 3). The ASNW at 2) above, feature nowhere on these documents, hence it's important that they at least feature on the Parish documents.</p> <p>I suggest a rethink of the settlement boundary in the No Through Road of Church Lane, that covered this site. Removing the boundary completely from this dead end road, with it especially being unsustainable, not well related to the main built up form of Howle Hill and RA3, It's clearly not needed, perhaps taking it back to the Unsuitable for HGVs.</p>
Mark Lindley	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>The plan includes an outline for a reduced number of house on Plot 11. The landowner originally wanted 44 houses, which was then reduced to 22 then reduced again for this smaller development. These sites should be refused on the basis that: 1 They are within the AONB 2 They will result in the loss of Prime Agricultural Land needed to feed the country and reduce carbon production from the importing of food 3 There will be further damage to Coughton Marsh, the draining of the land for the two reservoirs has already caused substantial damage to the marsh and protected wildlife, 4. There is a lack of trust in the Parish Council, who have now voted the development through for a smaller number of houses, having assured the Parishioners in a meeting that they would not approve any development on the Plot. 5. There will be considerable sound, light and environmental pollution to the surrounding properties during development. Light pollution will increase long term. 6 There is a lack of confidence that planning will not then go through for a larger development that will then give access to a major Landowner to develop parts of his land. 7 The NDP committee included an 'independent' Consultant 8 Traffic issues in Ross town will increase as access in to Ross is becoming more of an issue through Cross Street.</p>
Matt Walker	<p>Comment.</p> <p>Policy WALF17: Design and Appearance. Site 11R would respectfully ask that a line regarding construction of dwellings taking into account privacy be added to the policy. Windows should not overlook these properties as the main living areas are to the rear and not the front.</p>
Nesta Hirst	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>Object to any further developments in Walford which would add to the traffic chaos which is Copse Cross Street. Also ingress into Coughton marsh will inevitably lead to loss of habitat and disruption to plant and animal life.</p>
Rachel Llewellyn	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding this matter. The way Walford parish has been divided into segments is absolutely appalling. The way</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>the new proposed boundaries are marked quite clearly shows that these have been drawn up to try and stop development, except for a few select sites.</p> <p>As a parish we need development on a limited scale and over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable the young people of the parish to be able to stay within the parish.</p> <p>Development is required in villages/settlement to ensure their sustainability.</p>
Richard Francis	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding this matter. As a Parish we need development on a limited scale and over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable the young people of the Parish to be able to afford to stay within the Parish.</p> <p>Development is required in villages/settlements to ensure their sustainability. Walford is classed as an AONB, with such a large scale of housing development, it would spoil our heritage.</p> <p>Development on site 11 would cause further damage to Coughton Marsh, the draining of the land for the two reservoirs has already caused substantial damage to the marsh and protected wildlife.</p> <p>We have now voted the development through for a smaller number of houses, having assured the Parishioners in a meeting that they would not approve any development on the Plot, This meeting was well attended with residents from throughout the parish. Development would cause considerable sound, light and environmental pollution to the surrounding properties during development. We have no confidence that planning on Site 11 will not then go through for a larger development.</p> <p>Further development would cause access in to Ross is becoming more of an issue through Copse Cross Street.</p>
Robert Hazelwood	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>Objection against plot 11 for development in Walford. The area is amongst AONB, plus its prime agricultural land so loss of valuable grown produce, taking a relatively quiet village to adding more noise, traffic which the road network isn't capable of adding the extent which this new development would bring with the high number of houses proposed to be built.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife especially to Coughton Marsh and surrounding areas and wetlands. Due to the size of the village there isn't enough infrastructure to cope with more homes and residents.</p>
Mrs S Pratt	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding the NDP. The way Walford Parish has been divided up is appalling. The way boundaries have been drawn up is to stop development, expect for a few sites.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>As a parish, we need development on a limited scale over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable young people of the parish to be able to afford to stay within the parish. Development is required in villages to ensure their sustainability.</p>
Sandra Cole	<p>Objects to NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding the NDP. The way Walford Parish has been divided up is appalling. The way boundaries have been drawn up is to stop development, expect for a few sites. As a parish, we need development on a limited scale over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable young people of the parish to be able to afford to stay within the parish. Development is required in villages to ensure their sustainability.</p>
Sarah Curtis	<p>Supportive of the NDP. Commends work.</p> <p>I note policy WALF6 with regard to Enhancement of the Natural Environment is to include sites identified in the 'Priority Habitat Inventory' There is a special conservation area consisting of a band of deciduous ancient woodlands under 0.25 hectares so are not shown on council maps. This protected habitat area has been identified by Natural England in their inventory as a 'Priority Habitat' under Herefordshire's Biodiversity Plan. These woodlands form an important habitat for the wildlife in this area which include lizards, bats, hedgehogs badgers and the rare white marble butterfly which has been spotted. This area is not shown on MAP 11.</p> <p>Feel it should be afforded the protection that it deserves. Just because this area is not shown on council maps does not mean it does not exist.</p> <p>Map 11 is very difficult to see even with glasses and a magnifying glass. There is also no reference to the Bailey Brook catchment of the River Wye Special Area of Conversation as recognised under the Habitats regulations. This should be included.</p> <p>Bring back the settlement boundary line on Church Road to end at the dead-end sign because after this sign it is open countryside on a dead end lane that is not the entrance to the hamlet but on the periphery. The cluster for this area appears as the largest when it is not the centre of the hamlet or part of the main built-up form. Recently a planning committee decision has been made that the area adjacent to the current settlement boundary line is not suitable for development in the open countryside due to it being unsustainable with poor access on a single track dead end lane. The area being defined as RA3.</p> <p>This part of the hamlet is open countryside and the historical buildings of the church, the school house and pub have long been private residences for many years. It would not be appropriate to build in open countryside and farmland so believe the settlement boundary line should stop at the dead-end sign.</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
Sophie Jessica Curtis	<p>Supports NDP.</p> <p>Road can cope with any more traffic. A recent decision has been made by the planning committee that this area is not sustainable with poor access and therefore not suitable for development. The dead end and there have already been a few near misses and people dice with their lives as they jump into hedges to avoid collisions because there are no passing places and the road is so narrow. The verges have great gouges in them. In winter it is even worse with black ice in places. Recall ambulances getting stuck and as this is a dead end there is no other way out. Once the power lines were taken down by a vehicle and part of the road was shut off for days.</p> <p>This is open countryside and farm land. Can the settlement line be taken back to stop at the dead end sign as after this point the lane gets worse and these are when the traffic problems and damage to properties occur. Eventually you reach a point if you are a large vehicle that you cannot turn around and one incident resulted in huge costly damage to a resident's driveway.</p> <p>Have no bus service here so everyone is dependent on motor vehicles. Being a hilltop location cycling is not an option either to return up a steep hill with shopping and then try and manoeuvre safely through a dead end narrow lane with blind bends. There are no cycle paths or pavements. It just does not bear thinking about.</p>
Tiaunna Ormond	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information regarding the NDP. The way Walford Parish has been divided up is appalling. The way boundaries have been drawn up is to stop development, expect for a few sites.</p> <p>As a parish, we need development on a limited scale over a long period of time. This will ensure sustainability and enable young people of the parish to be able to afford to stay within the parish.</p> <p>Development is required in villages to ensure their sustainability.</p>
Timothy Pople	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>NDP is broadly a good thing, as it should help ensure only appropriate development is allowed. Somewhat surprised to see just how far it is intended to allow development as thought the settlement ended at the Howle Hill end of the lane,</p> <p>The area should be reduced in the no though road added volume of traffic would be both dangerous and totally inappropriate. In particular, the massive increase in delivery vans locally is creating a major hazard to horse riders and any further increase in traffic volume can only make things worse</p>
Tina Allingham	Objects to NDP.

Member of the public	Comment made
	<p>Fully understand the need for more housing and do not oppose the proposed small developments but remain concerned that building small developments on the fields in the village will open the gates for larger ones in the future.</p> <p>Walford has no shop only a pub and a village hall and church with no other amenities, has low light and noise pollution and the diverse wildlife is thriving. Large developments will impact on all areas of village life and will have a detrimental impact on wildlife and the environment.</p>
<p>Tompkins Thomas on behalf of Mr R Cordina and MF Freeman</p>	<p>Supportive of the NDP</p> <p>Continued inclusion of these two sites and reaffirm the benefits that would derive from allocating the land for housing in the NDP and how development here would contribute to fulfilment of the Draft NDP's stated Vision and Objectives and the attainment of sustainable development overall..</p> <p>Recommend that the definition of the settlement boundary for Howle Hill is further amended to include the site that is already beneficiary of detailed planning permission (172215/211348 refers).</p> <p>Note that the site of the nursery has been included and can see no reason why the settlement boundary should not be extended to include MF Freeman's site. Non-inclusion of the site is contrary to Herefordshire Council's stated guidance on the matter as per Neighbourhood Planning Guidance Note 20 – Guide to Settlement Boundaries.</p>
<p>Willow Walshe</p>	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>No notification or information on the NDP. The way Howle Hill has been divided into three separate boundaries is appalling. The boundary of Howle Hill should include all of the properties and not a select few.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council stated in a planning meeting that Howle Hill has been earmarked for development. If you look at the way Howle Hill has been carved up in three separate areas, there is absolutely no way that any development of any kind could take place.</p> <p>In the government white paper it states that towns and cities across the country cannot withstand much more development and that consideration should be given to villages and rural areas. It is not right how Howle Hill and the rest of the parish of Walford have been divided into segregated areas. Development is required in villages/settlements to ensure their sustainability.</p> <p>The parish of Walford needs development across the whole parish, not just selected areas.</p>
<p>Zaven Boyrazian</p>	<p>Supportive of the NDP.</p> <p>Following the recent planning and regulatory decision, the settlement boundary line should be taken back to the dead-end sign. This</p>

Member of the public	Comment made
	committee's decision concluded this area as open countryside unsuitable for development because of its unsustainable and poor access on a narrow dead-end lane. Does not form part of the main built-up form of Howle Hill, and what used to be the pub, the church, and the schoolhouse have been private houses for many years.
Zesta Planning on behalf of Mr David Jordan	<p>Objects to the NDP.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries in the WNDP, and their associated policies, are ineffective as they would not provide for enough housing to meet the Core Strategy requirement for 91 dwellings in the Parish. .</p> <p>Housing Site WALF21a would result in major adverse effects on the AONB which should attract substantial weight and would outweigh the relatively minor benefits arising from the site.</p> <p>This site would not therefore be consistent with the overall aim of the NPPF to promote sustainable development.</p> <p>The WNDP as submitted does not meet the basic conditions, insofar as it would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, it does not have sufficient regard to the NPPF and PPG, and is not consistent with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is recommended that the modifications set out within this representation will be necessary in order to ensure the plan can proceed to referendum. Alternatively, it is recommended that the current version of the plan is withdrawn and re-issued for consultation with an expanded settlement boundary for Howle Hill and the allocation of Land at The Old Kilns, Church Lane, Howle Hill in order to secure the important contribution this will make towards meeting the Parish's housing requirement.</p>

Officer appraisal

All the consultation requirements of Regulation 14 were undertaken by the parish council and all the required documentation was submitted under Regulation 15.

This plan has met the requirements of the regulations as set out in the table above. No concern has been raised from internal consultees with regards to the ability of the plan to meet the required minimum proportional growth contributing towards the deliverability of the Core Strategy. The parish has a minimum proportional growth requirement of 91. As at April 2022, there have been 22 completions and 29 commitments within the parish. The NDP indicates five site allocations which would accommodate a combined 21 dwellings and there is an expected windfall of 18 within the NDP. This is 90 dwelling in total during the plan period.

The plan includes settlement boundaries for the identified settlements of Walford and Coughton, Howle Hill and Bishopswood. This takes into account some existing commitments and proportional growth requirements of dwellings. The plan also allows for windfalls and some capacity within the settlement boundary and rural windfall. Therefore it is likely that Walford NDP will continue to provide opportunities for growth in the plan period.

51 representations were received during the submission (Reg16) consultation period.

- 6 external statutory consultees
- 4 internal service providers at Herefordshire Council
- 41 members of the public.

The internal consultees had no objections to the plan, and mostly provided general and supportive comments to the plan. Strategic Planning have confirmed that the policies within the plan are in general conformity with the Core Strategy

The responses from statutory consultees have raised no concerns regarding the site allocations or objectives and policies contained in the neighbourhood plan.

There have been 41 responses received from local residents 14 are supportive of the NDP, 2 have commented and 25 object. The objections are based on:

- Inclusion of Site 11. The objectors raised concerns of environmental impact to Coughton Marsh, restricted access, agricultural land in use, flooding and pollution concerns, size of development and infrastructure concerns. Inclusion of this site was added this year after an extraordinary meeting at short notice.
- Inclusion of Site 21 with more houses the existing infrastructure unable to support this and concerns of impact on the Wye Valley AONB.
- The separation of Howle Hill in three settlement boundaries, the settlement boundaries cover only a few houses and does not cover the majority of houses
- Separating the parish of Walford, the parish as a whole needs development not just selected areas.
- No local facilities with regard to Howle Hill and the settlement boundary should therefore be only drawn around the existing nucleus of dwellings, there are no services to support development.
- The 2017 AECOM report findings and what is proposed are different to the current proposal
- Disproportionate number of potential new developments/houses in the Bishopswood area compared to the numbers in other identified areas
- Lack of publication and consultation on the plan

There has been several responses suggesting to change the boundary on Church Lane at the dead end sign as the area adjacent is open countryside, poor access and not suitable for sustainable development and to reflect the refusal of planning application 204443.

Also, it is suggested by representations that the definition of the settlement boundary for Howle Hill is further amended to include the site that is already beneficiary of detailed planning permission.

The Consultation Statement details the community involvement undertaken and how issues raised have been addresses as part of the process.

Overall it is considered that there are no fundamental issues relating to this plan which would prevent its progress to examination.

Service Director's comment

Decision under Regulation 17 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

It is recommended that the Walford Neighbourhood Plan **does** progress to examination at this stage.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tracey Coleman". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped 'C' at the end.

Tracey Coleman

Interim Service Director –Planning and Regulatory Services

Date: 30 September 2022

Appendix 1

Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) – Core Strategy Conformity Assessment

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
WALF1: Promoting Sustainable Development	SS1; SS2; SS4; SS5; SS6; RA2; RA6; MT1; E3; LD1	Y	
WALF2: Development Strategy	RA2; RA3; RA4; RA5; H3	Y	
WALF3: Major Development Within the Wye Valley AONB	N/A	Y	
WALF4: Conserving the Landscape and Scenic Beauty of the Parish	SS6; LD1	Y	
WALF5: Protecting Important Views within the Parish and the Settings of its Settlements	SS6; LD1	Y	
WALF6: Enhancement of the Natural Environment	SS6; LD2; LD3	Y	
WALF7: Protecting Heritage Assets	SS6; LD4; RA3	Y	
WALF8: Wastewater Drainage	SS6; SD3	Y	
WALF9: Protection from Flood Risk	SS6; SD3	Y	
WALF10: Sustainable Design	SD1; SS1; SS6	Y	
WALF11: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation	SD2	Y	
WALF12: Highway Design Requirements	SS4; MT1	Y	

Draft Neighbourhood plan policy	Equivalent CS policy(ies) (if appropriate)	In general conformity (Y/N)	Comments
WALF13: Traffic Measures within the Parish	SS4; MT1	Y	
WALF14: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Businesses serving the Local Community	SC1	Y	
WALF15: Contributions to Community Facilities	SC1	Y	
WALF16: High Speed Broadband and Telecommunications	N/A	Y	
WALF17: Design and Appearance	SD1	Y	
WALF18: Housing Development in Walford and Coughton	RA2	Y	
WALF19: Housing Development in Bishopswood	RA2	Y	
WALF20: Housing Development in Howle Hil	RA2	Y	
WALF21: Proposed Housing Sites	RA2	Y	
WALF22: Use of Rural Buildings for Business	E1; RA5; RA6	Y	
WALF23: Polytunnel Proposals	N/A	Y	