

Date	No	Comment from	Topic	Comment	Response/Follow up	Action Taken
15.3.21	1	Cllr Harvey	Issues and Options draft	<p>This introduction needs to be rewritten to explain about the NDP update process, what the update is doing to address the important shortcomings in the adopted plan and to explain what this issues and options consultation is all about.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the shortcomings of the adopted plan were simply listed so people can see what the rest of the document is going to cover and for them to be listed in the order in which the follow-on sections tackle each point ... perhaps also in priority order, so people dive straight into the issues recognised as most important to get fixed.</p> <p>These should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlement boundary • Employment land • Community Facilities/Infrastructure – inc Healthcare and Sports • Lawnside as the identified retail growth point but also as an area for regeneration and redesign. Might need a separate development plan on a longer timescale? Discuss. • Town Centre boundary and Retail Core designations • Protected areas – re-protection of greenspace identified in UDP but lost in Core Strategy – query future status of Masefield's Meadow. Protection within settlement boundary of areas NOT for development – Ledbury Park, Sports Facilities, location of future canal basin and visitor centre, Green gaps between Ledbury and Wellington Heath to the north and Ledbury and Parkway to the south. Safe walking/cycling route to Wellington Heath and to 	For the public document this will be re-written and simple. Too much detail in suggested re-write. Agree simple list of issues	done
	2		settlement boundary option 2	<p>Why is this being put forward as a credible option when it was thrown out by the previous examiner as being in contradiction of the NPPF requirement that an NDP is positively prepared?</p> <p>Evidence has previously been submitted to the planning inquiry on the Gladman Dymock Road site by the same consultant we are now employing to undertake our own landscape work which indicates that some further development to the south, to include a designated green gap would be feasible without having damaging landscape impact. How do we address this inconvenient truth?</p> <p>The previous examiner told us that we cannot 'allocate' sites which already have planning permission. Without site allocations we are unable to seek the protection of para 14 of the NPPF even with an NDP less than 2 years old.</p> <p>Why are you proposing this option when it is in direct opposition to advice we have already received regarding land allocations?</p>	Amend Option 2 map to take out references to allocations which are confusing and explaining that this is an option but not a good solution and why. Ask Samantha Banks and Bill Bloxsome opinion about reference to examiner's comments.	in progress
	3		settlement boundary option 3	<p>This boundary option is better but it has other things wrong with it, in that it seeks to be too prescriptive as to land use in some areas.</p> <p>i) Viaduct site – why stipulate where the employment land is to go on this site when the area immediately adjacent to the canal tunnel under the embankment is closest to the station and town trail for sustainable travel access, and is in the shadow of the embankment making it the worst place to put houses, and it also has an ancient stream coarse running down through it to the river? Why not propose that a greater proportion of the viaduct site remains designated for employment – say the land to the east of the saved route for the bypass extension? Put this as an option to people. There could be a smaller housing development along the route of the canal making the best of the views to the viaduct and the Wall Hills.</p> <p>ii) Why is it proposed not to include Ledbury Park in the settlement boundary and to make it an area protected from development? It is in the conservation area and in the AONB, why is it not considered part of the town?</p> <p>iii) Why is there not proposed to be protected land between the Little Marcle Road and the Hereford Road – i.e. protecting the setting of the ancient hill fort of The Wall Hills?</p> <p>iv) Why is the lower sloped area between the station and Beggar's Ash to the east of the Bromyard Road not included in the settlement boundary when it was identified as developable and deliverable in the Core Strategy SHLAA and it is likely to bring forward a nicer site for housing than a significant portion of the viaduct site?</p> <p>v) Why is there not an option to extend the allocation of land for sporting use round Leadon House to the Ross Road so that there is an alternative option for site access which is not controlled by Heineken?</p> <p>vi) Why is the land on the Barratts site which is blighted by industrial noise from housing development, and the triangle at the roundabout junction not proposed as an option for quiet employment use classes? Or to be designated as new allotments or as a Community Garden?</p> <p>vii) Why is the already identified, low landscape impact area to the south of the Barratts development not included in the settlement boundary as a genuine land allocation to include land for provision, in due course, of a two-form entry primary school? These land allocations to the south MUST come with a requirement for a bridge crossing of the bypass to connect with Shepherd's Close and the footpath/cycleway network through the Deer Park to the High School and the rest of Ledbury.</p> <p>viii) Why is land with high landscape impact to the east of the Bovis site not included in the settlement boundary and protected from development?</p>	<p>i) Viaduct site has now been given the go-ahead.</p> <p>ii) Ledbury Park has not been included in Settlement Boundary because BB has advised that this would make it vulnerable to development.</p> <p>iii) - this has been protected in Green Infrastructure section – BB to confirm what protection Green Infrastructure gives</p> <p>iv) Beggars Ash/Bromyard Rd – for next NDP</p> <p>v) No demonstrated need for more sporting land than has been identified. This not considered as option as Core Strategy says access off Little Marcle Road. . NICK FISH TO CONFIRM LAND HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BUT NOT BIG ENOUGH and CONTAINS BIODIVERSE POND – AND ANY OTHER REASONS?</p> <p>vi) Barratt's land and triangle of land are being proposed for employment but AGREE add in options for allotments and community garden.</p> <p>vii) For future NDP</p> <p>viii) High sensitivity land east of Bovis – within Green Enhancement Zone but not in settlement boundary as BB recommended this would make it vulnerable to development. CHECK WITH BB</p> <p>vix) Remove Masefield Meadows from GI – address issue in next NDP.</p> <p>MAP TERMINNOLOGY NEEDS TO BE SIMPLIFIED AND AMENDED INCLUDING REMOVING INAPPROPRIATE REFERENCES TO ALLOCATIONS AND PUT IN KEY TO COLOURS USED.</p>	vi) done all others items in progress

2262

4	Settlement boundary questions	These both need to be changed and additional options included as mentioned above.	Amend questions in Light of changes above. Ask people to rank preferences	
5	structure of report	Can we structure the report according to issues rather than geographical locations - because some issues - like employment - could have several different locations where options for solutions could be sited.	Yes re-title section 3 Employment and Recreation	Done
6	Land for new Business	<p>This should be about employment growth, which can take place on new land or can involve encouraging more densely concentrated employment use of existing land. Currently this latter point isn't being considered by the plan. The reason for having the employment class uses listed for the 3ha of land on the viaduct site was to focus on higher value higher density employment use classes for this area close to the station.</p> <p>The opportunity is there to have the ambition for the Homend Trading Estate beside the station to move into this use category and to take advantage of its proximity to the station and transport links to Hereford/NMiTE and the EZ to the west and to B'ham/Oxford/London to the east.</p> <p>The land blocks by the station occupied by the coach company, Bradfords builders' merchants and the upholsterer also have scope to move to these use classes and benefit from connectivity to the viaduct site, town trail and rail links.</p> <p>Additionally the Kennel's Farm site has scope for ground level eastbound platform access (big issue), additional parking (County Transport Strategy) and new business incubator units, farm shop, station visitor facilities (loo/refreshments) (all in County Economic Development Strategy)</p>	<p>Densification of existing employment sites is not being considered in this revision - should be in next NDP</p> <p>Kennel's Farm site is included in 4.2 - BB to confirm reasons why it shouldn't be within settlement boundary.</p>	
7	3.1	<p>Para 3.1 Look - the main thing about this land block is that it was identified in the Core Strategy as the replacement employment land for the town when the viaduct site was flipped from employment to mixed use. The land block assessed was clearly identified in the SHLAA, the land owner (Heineken) stated at examination that they were happy for their land to come forward for employment use and the core strategy left it to the NDP to allocate the precise land area. The which was not done - so that now needs to be fixed. Alongside that, this area is agreed by Herefordshire Planners to be the ideal location for additional land to be allocated for sporting use. One block of agricultural land was in use for temporary sports fields when the original SHLAA was done, so this falls outside of the employment land allocation and can be reallocated for sporting use straight away.</p> <p>The options to be discussed are around how much of the land previously identified for employment use would be better allocated for sporting facilities, and therefore how much additional agricultural land should be allocated for employment and possibly also for future sporting provision under the updated NDP.</p> <p>It is possible to provide a 'plan B' for access to the employment and sporting land allocations by extending the land allocation to the field abutting the Ross Road opposite the new Cricket Ground on the Leddington Lane junction.</p> <p>This is something worth asking the public about - should teh NDP allocate sufficient land for sporting provision to allow for future demand for growth?</p> <p>If so, how far should that allocation go.</p>	<p>On evidence we have the site behind Leadon House is not appropriate (see response 3.v) above . The access from the Little Marcle Road gives access to the employment land and the recreation land and will allow funds from the Market Towns Investment Plan to be used if the project is approved. The Ross Road would only access the recreation facilities, PH CHECK WITH PLANNERS. BB TO PUT REASONING IN TOPIC PAPER 3</p>	
8	3.2 Land for playing fields	<p>In 2015 the Core Strategy Playing Field Strategy identified that Ledbury had a significant shortfall in provision for outdoor facilities. That shortfall has only increased with the additional unplanned housing development approved for the town. Let's keep it simple and state clearly what has previously been identified as the shortfall, what is now the assessed shortfall and what is needed as a realistic allocation to take the NDP provision out as far as the end of the current Core Strategy - i.e. 2031. Junior Football and Rugby both need additional space to the space they currently share on the Ross Rd playing fields. Adult Football also needs a new home if the existing ground on New Street is to be brought forward for housing development, as the landowner would like.</p>	YES clarify/re-write for public document	done
9	3.2 last three sentences	<p>Is all this text really necessary? If there is a 'preferred option' location please can we have that explained in planning terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colocation with existing sporting playing fields for shared use of changing and social facilities • Topography of land • Sport England qualifying criteria for 'Sports hub' • Access • etc 	YES simplify for public document	done

10	Question 2a	Question 2a is redundant. That need has already been identified. The public don't need to be asked to agree with it. It is a fact. A useful option question would be about the extent of the land allocation for sport (enough to address current shortfall, or sufficient to allow for future growth) and the provision of an alternative access point for both sport and employment land uses for the block between the Ross Road and Little Marcle Road.	Q 2a is necessary to show the examiner that the public has agreed this is a priority for this revision of the NDP. Question about future need is for next NDP. The current proposals build in some capacity for future growth by specifying an all weather pitch.	
11	Question 2b	No. This isn't an option question this is asking for support for a solution you're proposing (presently) without justification. If you must ask a question, ask about whether the public preference is for facilities to be collocated in a sports super-hub or distributed.	Re-write question stating 'to get support from Sport England any facility needs to provide for adult and junior football - do you agree this should be sited on the indicated site off the Little Marcle Road?'	done
12	Question 2C	Ledbury is identified in the Core Strategy as having an under-provision of amenity green space. Personally, I think this is incorrect because I'm not sure the assessment included the woods behind the town which are heavily used by local people for walking/cycling. However, I'm not one for looking a gift-horse in the mouth if the planners are saying more green space is needed. The Ledbury Sports Federation did an assessment of other sports' needs back in 2016 which could be used to find out what people's preferences were for expanding existing sports or introducing new ones. If the NDP had a vision for Ledbury 'A great place to Live, Work and Play', say, then positioning Ledbury as somewhere where people come to enjoy recreation and sport might mean it's valid to ask whether there are new recreational facilities which would be welcome and would complement the town's existing provision.		
13	3.3 Accommodating employment and sports needs	This presupposes that sports facilities are utilising employment land and therefore the location of the sports facilities. Is this suitable for an options consultation?	Yes this is pre-supposed	
14	3.3 ref Heineken Factory	The existing Heineken site is a location where it is possible to significantly increase the number of jobs located on an existing employment land footprint. Currently Heineken have reduced job numbers by 100 on their site by moving their entire bottling facility to Hereford. The site is presently extremely under-utilised and could deliver many more jobs that it presently does if other employers or employment uses were allowed on the site. Separately there is an existing AD facility presently dedicated to Heineken and only in operation for a fraction of the year which could be utilised by other local drinks based biomass producers. Additionally this facility could provide heat and power to the adjacent employment site if it were being managed in a joined-up manner. There's the opportunity for a question on more efficient use of AD/biomass and compostable waste management locally which would be useful. Especially when the Gloucestershire composting facility is just 5 miles down the road at Preston's Cross.	Yes we've consulted with Heineken and they're happy with this proposal. Anaerobic digester – Heineken are considering but this is outside the time-frame for this revision.	
15	3.3	If you increase the density of employment on existing land footprints you reduce the need to find replacement land for any employment land reallocated for sporting use.	Outside the remit of this revision for the next NDP	
16	3.4	There are also undeveloped land blocks on the Lower Road Trading Estate which would be equally suitable.	Agreed - but this plan is looking at the requirement in the core strategy for new employment. The next NDP should consider existing employment land.	
17	Questions 3	3d) Increasing the density of employment uses of existing employment sites in the area of the station, Lower Road and Little Marcle Road?	Ask Bill Bloxsome (BB) if we can encourage a brownfield first approach to address this?	
18	4.1	Quite inadequate. We have been criticised during the viaduct planning inquiry for not proposing an access off the Hereford Road to this site. This consultation should seek to reprotect the route of the bypass road extension through to the Bromyard Road which was given as the primary access to this site until removed from the Core Strategy at Examination. The mix of development on this site could be revisited as an option in this consultation, given that so much of the site is in the shadow of the embankment or close to noisy industrial development. Unplanned development which is already taking place to the south of the town, and recent flooding events bring the most appropriate mix of development on this site back into question.	Viaduct site has been given the go ahead	

2264

19	4.2	Not just the mode of travel but also Ledbury's connectivity to NMiTE in Hereford and to centres of employment along the Cotswold line and up into Birmingham	Too much detail for Issues and Options paper - Add this detail into Topic Paper 2	
20	4.2	Should mention that the county Transport Strategy identifies strategic need for additional car parking at this location. There is also a need for ground level access to the eastbound platform for passengers and for the provision of platform services – refreshments and toilet facilities as a minimum.	Add Detail in Topic Paper 2	
21	Question 4	What does this mean? Is it really saying anything useful? Suggest to delete. Suggest option to improve access and provide additional parking and station facilities to the eastbound platform. Alternative option is to have all trains stopping to drop off and pick up passengers only from the current westbound platform and abandon use of eastbound platform altogether. This accords with plans under consideration to provide a section of new track in the Stoke Edith area to enable dynamic passing of trains on that section of the line, thereby negating the requirement for trains currently to 'pass' in Ledbury station by making use of both sections of track there.	Re-write question Options for railway platform access outside the scope of this plan. Add detail into topic paper 2	question re-written detail still to be added to topic paper
22	5.1	Does the language used here need to be quite so confusing ... former ... latter ... what?	This is a technical report - will be simplified in public document	
23	5.1	No. This is a silly suggestion and runs contrary to planning advice to contract town centres and to retain tight and defensible retail core. 3 out of town supermarket applications have been rebutted successfully without the need to include either Tesco or Coop within a designated Town Centre and there's no need to change things now. The supermarkets are where they are – within easy walking distance of the town centre for shoppers parking at these locations and wishing to make linked trips. The existing definition of the town centre (not subsequently endorsed by the NDP) should be included in the NDP as recognised. It's extension should not be offered as an option in this consultation. The adopted NDP stupidly extended the primary and secondary retail shopping area and made silly suggestions about the retail uses to be encouraged in the secondary areas. That does need addressing. The secondary areas should be contracted to remove their extensions up the Worcester Road, along the Southend, and the section beyond Market Street into Bridge Street. The run of retail frontage shouldn't go beyond Isaacs and Carey's on The Homend either. Or past The Feather's coaching access and The Talbot on New Street. All the alleys on the west side of The Homend should be secondary retail.	Planners suggested the town centre be extended to include the 2 supermarkets as they have a symbiotic relationship with the town centre (ie people using those supermarkets use town centre shops too).	
24	Q5a	Please remove this as a question	Question 5a - AGREE REMOVE and Suggest new question covering 3 options: a) The current map showing shop frontages b) The current map removing Worcester Road and other questionable retail areas to be identified c) Proposal including the 2 supermarkets	Done
25	Q5b	Is there a good reason to do this? If the distinction between primary and secondary is no longer relevant in planning terms – then by all means remove it – but the question should be about the option of contracting the retail core and the benefits this brings for the town.	Check on new designatins and rephrase question	Done
26	5.2 Lawnside and Market Street	Why are you not making it clear that the Core Strategy identifies Lawnside as the retail growth point for the town and that the NDP needs to address this issue or rebut it? There is no need or reason to conflate development in these two areas in a single question.	Core Strategy suggests this as a retail area, circumstances have changed and the swimming pool has been refurbished. Outside the remit of this NDP Topic Paper 2 to rebut idea of this as area for retail BB	
27	5.2	(Market Street) This is not a shopping area and is not mentioned in the Core Strategy. It is presently the concentrated location of the town's healthcare and nursing facilities. The adopted NDP tried to allocate space in the Market Street area for older persons housing without providing any evidence to substantiate the need for this or the suitability of the location or the willingness of the landowner. Other than that it was an excellent suggestion. This issue may well be overtaken by events, but Q7 is still useful. This question opens up the opportunity for such facilities to be located on either the Lawnside or Market Street sites.	Rename this section town centre regeneration and community services	Done
28	Q6	What does this mean? The original community-led NDP group proposed that there was a separate development plan for the Lawnside Road area which needed more detailed discussion and planning with local stakeholders than they felt was able to be achieved in the timescale they were working to in getting the original plan adopted. Ha! Anyhooooo – that doesn't mean their idea isn't still a sound one if you are going for the still sporty 2022 timeframe for the update of the current plan. Lawnside needs looking at in the round and its development being extended to include the social housing flats in the area, the BT telephone exchange which can shrink to a much smaller footprint containing only the core copper and fibre connectivity, and the commercial premises, community hall, fire and ambulance stations and old youth centre		

29		5.3 sentence 3 = inefficient and fragmented	I'd be careful saying this if I were you, because it isn't.	Check medical services meeting report and amend if necessary.	In progress
30		6.1 Green infrastructure	It needs stating that all the protection of Ledbury's green infrastructure provided by the Herefordshire UDP was lost in 2015 when the Core Strategy was adopted and this needs to be reacquired as part of updating the adopted NDP. First – please will you consider all the areas protected under the NDP and decide which of those you wish to re-protect. The Core Strategy talks in general terms about green corridors and enhanced green infrastructure but it doesn't tie it down and the NDP needs to do this detailed work.	Explanation is in Topic Paper 4	
31		Green Corridors and enhancement zones Fig 6	This is just too confusing to try to get on a single map. Split it to deal with the green spaces and wildlife corridors that currently exist and need re-protecting. Separately show the enhancements to those corridors and the new areas proposed for protection on another map.	YES split fig 6 into 2 maps one with Herefordshire Council GI and one with both.	in progress
32		6.3 first sentence	What does this mean ... we can only meet the objectives for these green spaces by accepting development within them? That's how it reads.	Re-write	Done
33			Need to consider designating space to the north of the town for a woodland wetland to slow flash flood water on its way to the river.	Detail in Topic Paper 4	
34		LSC1	Give it the name local people know it by – The Town Trail	AGREED	done
35		LSC1	replace 'where' possible with 'whenever' possible	AGREED	done
36		LSC1 add at end of 1st para	... and providing improved connectivity to the Town Trail	AGREED	done
37		LSC2 suggest 1st sentence re-write	The Riverside Walk goes from the car park on the Ross Rd up to the Hereford Rd Roundabout and includes footpaths also on the eastern side of the bypass throughout that route.	AGREED	done
38		LSC2	You should mention this extending to provide a safe, off-road footpath/cycleway connection to the Allotments at Burton's Lane.	AGREED	done
39		LSC3	Should mention the Lake behind the church too which is a wildlife haven.	Consult with owner	
40		LSC4	I think you are totally missing the wildlife corridor provided by the watercourse that comes down through Robinson's Meadow and New Mills and joins the Leadon between the Homebase and Little Marcle Road roundabouts – it's on Google Maps.	No it's in Fig 9	
41		LSC5	Isn't it also important to reference the need for a protected green gap between Ledbury and Parkway with safe walking links between the hamlet and the town as well as connections over the Bullen to Eastnor and beyond. It looks like Ledbury Park might be included in this corridor but I think it may need also to be protected space within the settlement boundary.	Detail in Topic Paper 4 under LSC5 and LEZ3, which refers specifically to maintaining a green gap between Ledbury and Parkway. BB add reference to this green gap in the Issues paper under 'A new Local Enhancement Zone	Done
42		LEz1	Good! (re footpath and cycleway)		
43		LEZ1	Great! (re Wellington Heath green gap)		
44		LEZ1	Woodland wetland etc. possibly up as far as the new Storesbrook Bridge, maybe with ponds etc for possible wetland/recreational amenity along past the allotments to the bridge. (re flood control measures)	Detail is in Topic Paper 4	
45		LEZ2	Good yes – but its not going to be clear to the public what this means unless it is better explained.	Public document will make it clearer	
46		LEZ3	If this is high ground above the Bovis development – then good.		
47		Protected Green and open Spaces	This is a bit confusing after the last section – can it be better separated and explained?	RENAME: Green Space within the Town	Done
48		fig 7	Not a clear enough distinction to be obvious on the map. Perhaps the areas need to be yellow instead.	Fig 7 - take off references to previous protection, and different colours so that proposal is just that all the green spaces identified are protected.	in progress
49			as above		
50			No. This is just too confusing. You're suggesting Masefield's Meadow is protected – that should be a question, I think. It might be something easy to agree with, but it's too significant and central not to be at least considered for other uses. You've got the closed churchyard included and the cemetery – which are both protected already and although they are green spaces, do they fit this description? But you've not got the Walled Garden park area and not the Upperhall Lake haven. I'm not sure that the two school sites fit this category although both are open and green. What happens when the primary school is extended to meet the needs created by the viaduct site and southern developments and when the JMHS site is built on to extend classroom provision, as is planned?	Remove Masefield Meadows - previously proposed as biodiverse green space but no evidence of this. Walled Garden should be included. Upperhall Park owner to be consulted. Schools, church yard and cemetery should remain as they do provide GI benefits - variously - flood mitigation, trees, public amenity, biodiversity at the moment. Add to question 9a - 'Are there other green spaces you think should be included?'	in progress
51		Q10	Nice open question		

Feedback on draft Issues and options paper for SG meet 26 on 16 March 2021

52		Q11	Good		
53		Design guidance	This is very waffley. Can it be rewrded to say it is important to embed design preferences in policies in the body of the NDP so that they can be enforced as part of the town's planning policy framework.	YES RE-WRITE AS SUGGESTED	Done
54		7.1	No – it was a member of the community-led NDP group who did this. LTC did not actually do anything except accept it. Probably kind to give credit.	Add in and 'local volunteers with professional expertise'	
55		7.1	English - re-write - 2nd sentence	YES RE-WRITE	Done
56		7.1	Careful – appendices aren't policies and can and will be ignored.	Suggest remove references to appendices	Done
57		7.1	What!?!?! Can you not ask for assistance from the worthies at the Civic Society to put some intellectual grunt behind this and alongside the continued good offices of Paul Neep?	Not proposing a design guide to go with this NDP. We are proposing as stated to integrate design preferences into policies in the NDP. Paul Neep has commented on Topic Paper 1 where the proposals are listed. Propose a design guide be prepared before the next NDP.	