

Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation visits or meetings report form 2018-2021

Date and time of meeting	Form completed online during week commencing 29 th March 2021
Name of organisation with which held	Malvern Hills AONB Partnership
Persons attending from the organisation (with job roles and relevant further contact information)	Form completed by Paul Esrich CMLI, Manager, Malvern Hills AONB Partnership Tel: 01905 845057 PEsrich@worcestershire.gov.uk >
Persons representing the Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party	Form prepared and sent to Paul by the NDP Steering Group with the questions arising from the publication of late draft versions of 1 st public consultation documents proposed to be used for the first phase of the Ledbury Neighbourhood Development plan revision and seeking AONB feedback on the matters that relate to its interests. Documents sent by email with this form were versions 8 of the 'Issues report', 'Issues leaflet' and 'Issues questionnaire' and also the current draft version of Topic paper 1 – Design Guide for any subsequent input to the questions below relating to the Issues report consultation.
Where held (physical meeting location or online)	Completed in person by Paul Esrich and returned by email to the SG.
Agenda – key items to discuss	These questions relate to the 'Issues and options V8.2' document sent by email with this form: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the 'Kennels Farm' site north of the railway station and which it is proposed should be developed to provide east platform access with car park and probably small business units be included in the boundary, and what thoughts do the AONB (on the edge of which area the site is located) have on this idea? 2. Given the 2015 SHLAA comments it is suggested we need a logical reason not to include the Kennels Farm and in fact the other land blocks up to the Beggars Ash junction within the settlement boundary. What is the AONB position on this thought?

Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation visits or meetings report form 2018-2021

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The issues paper proposes not to include Ledbury Park in the settlement boundary area, which could be seen as an anomaly being in Conservation Area and the AONB, but not in the Settlement Boundary since it is felt this provides enough protection against potential development. What is the AONB position on this? 4. Does the AONB have a view of proposed small business unit development included in the settlement boundary on the corner site opposite the Full Pitcher, also a possible location for a hotel and a new combined tri-service area? 5. What is the AONB view on the three settlement boundary options being put forward for consultation? Are these adequate for the options (mixed thoughts on this, Sam Banks has advised that the paper includes enough options in her view, but it has been suggested a 'no boundary' is not an option? 6. Any thoughts on the green infrastructure proposals, in particular for the conceptual future green space 'corridor' from the AONB and down behind the current Bovis site to the Dymock Road, providing a possible development buffer between Ledbury and Parkway. 7. Any thoughts on the proposed design guide content. 8. Any other comment?
<p>Summary of discussion</p>	<p>Q1. The site in question is within the AONB. As such national and local planning policy must be applied in relation to it – including the fact that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty (para 172 of the NPPF). The AONB Unit has heard an argument for development on this site to improve platform access, in particular for those with reduced mobility, possibly with limited car parking to serve such users. We would wish to see a full option appraisal to justify such development, for example, could such provision not be met by a lift or ramp service from the existing platform? The extensive development of the site to provide business units and significant</p>

Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation visits or meetings report form 2018-2021

	<p>car parking does not seem appropriate or consistent with the AONB designation or with para 172 of the NPPF which states that 'The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.' The same para also states that planning permission for major development should normally be refused. The Unit believes that the siting of such development would be best directed to other areas that have higher capacity. In the interests of being a sustainable settlement and recognising that the majority of users of the train station in the town will live within walking and cycling distance of it, the Unit believes that the focus should be on supporting access to the station by these means, rather than creating large new car parking provision, especially not within the AONB.</p> <p>Q2 We would expect Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (LSCA) work to show that areas within the AONB have a high value arising from the AONB designation and to reflect the sensitivity to development of these areas relative to others within and around the town. See also reference above to meeting national and local development plan and management plan policy in relation to the AONB. This should/could provide the basis for excluding them from the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Q3 Presumably land excluded from the settlement boundary is land ineligible for development/where development is discouraged, therefore excluding the Ledbury Park area from the settlement boundary would seem to be logical.</p> <p>Q4 We have not had a chance to assess the proposed/suggested development in this location. However, this appears to be an important gateway to the town. Whilst the principle of development in this location is likely to be acceptable any proposed change would need to safeguard key views and the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>Q5 From the Unit's perspective the important point is that options proposed safeguard the AONB and its setting. We favour a settlement boundary to provide clarity.</p> <p>Q6 Providing sustainable and attractive routes from Ledbury into the surrounding countryside is obviously important for the people of Ledbury. Spreading the load of this</p>
--	---

Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation visits or meetings report form 2018-2021

	<p>pressure is important to help safeguard nature and protect the AONB so there should be multiple options for access from different parts of the town into the surrounding areas. Safeguarding the countryside of coterminous areas by ensuring that these are well managed is also important. The benefits that come to local people from this access is a public good and should be funded as such. Opportunities for making use of developer contributions to help provide and manage access in these areas should also be explored.</p> <p>Q7 Sorry, haven't had a chance to look at this yet.</p>
<p>OK to publish report with all information or if it needs to be anonymised (point out what the inspector will need to see key evidence like this in some way)</p>	
<p>Estimate of numbers effectively represented by the consultation (eg. employees in company, number of members of the group)</p>	
<p>Conclusions and recommendations</p>	
<p>Confirm consultee agrees this is an accurate reflection of the meeting.</p>	<p>Name of person agreeing: Paul Esrich</p> <p>Name of person representing NDP: Cllr Phillip Howells</p> <p>Date confirmed: 8th April 2021</p>