

Ledbury NDP Steering Group (SG) agenda and actions

Members: Cllr Phillip Howells (PH); Nicola Forde (NF); Ann Lumb (AL)

Consultants: Bill Bloxsome (BB); Carly Tinkler (CT) Samantha Banks, Herefordshire Council (SB); WP = Working Party

Office: Angie Price (the Clerk, AP)

Action colour code: **Red = still to do**

Meeting 9 - Thursday 3rd December – with Sam Banks	
Present: PH; NF; AL, SB	
<p><u>1. SEA Scoping Report</u> SB asked for feedback on the draft SEA Scoping Report. The report needs to be published for statutory consultation for a period of 5-6 weeks before any consultation on the NDP can take place. The SG agreed to ask Bill Bloxsome whether this report was now accurate and to come back to SB.</p>	SG
<p>2. PH reported that Ledbury Town Council ED&P will be asked to approve and recommend to Council that decisions the NDP SG feels need making between meetings are referred to the Chairman of ED&P for agreement to proceed on the understanding that the next meetings of the WP, ED&P and Council then retrospectively confirm them. If funding is involved then the Chairman of the FP&GP committee should also be referred to for similar approval</p>	
<p><u>1. Review of Project Timeline</u> SB said that the timeline looked realistic. She said that the senior planner from MHDCLG had said that new planning legislation will take at least two years to enact and so any new planning regime would not impact on the current NDP. In terms of HC's review of the Core Strategy adoption of the NDP by the end of the year would be good.</p>	
<p><u>2. Review of draft Settlement Boundary</u> SB pointed out that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the background plan for options 1 and 2 was busy – the plan used for option 3 was better. • the browns used for wildlife sites and housing sites were too similar. <p>She was asked what criteria should be used to include sites inside the settlement boundary. In particular: The railway site: SB advised that this could be within the settlement boundary if there was a mixed use policy allied with it setting out clearly the area for a car park, the area for employment, the access to the platform etc. There could also be an allied 'Transport Improvement Policy' setting out the proposed improvements to the railway station. This would ensure that any development would also deliver the public goods (access to the north bound platform and car park). However LTC needs to carefully look at the complications of delivering a car park for a third party (network rail). The piece of land to south of Bovis site but not included in the development site – agreed need to investigate whether this should be included within settlement boundary as a protected green space.</p> <p>NF asked if this project would be suitable for a Neighbourhood Development Order SB explained that a development order probably would not be useful in this case although she would look into it. The process for a Neighbourhood Development Order is similar to that for</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>SB</p>

Ledbury NDP Steering Group (SG) agenda and actions

Members: Cllr Phillip Howells (PH); Nicola Forde (NF); Ann Lumb (AL)

Consultants: Bill Bloxsome (BB); Carly Tinkler (CT) Samantha Banks,
Herefordshire Council (SB); WP = Working Party

Office: Angie Price (the Clerk, AP)

Action colour code: **Red = still to do**

<p>an NDP so quite a lot of work. She pointed out that it would be easier to include sites initially and remove them if necessary later than to add sites in at a later date- that would require further consultation.</p>	<p>SG/BB</p>
<p><u>3. Consultation</u> Asked for advice about conducting a consultation under Covid restrictions SB said that a social media, web based consultation would be easier, but that hard copies of the plan should be available and each copy rotated and quarantined for 48 hours. Exhibitions can be held with limits on number of people, crowd flow and social distancing indicators. All consultation methods need to be risk assessed against Covid-19 guidelines. Newsletters and local press should be used, posters put up and leaflets delivered to all households. Outdoor stalls would be useful at events and on the market.</p>	
<p><u>4. Allocated sites</u> PH asked for a definition of ‘allocated sites’. SB explained there are three kinds of sites: allocated, committed and strategic. The viaduct site is strategic as it is identified in the Core Strategy. Once the viaduct site has planning permission it will become a commitment; it can only be an allocated site if the NDP has a site specific policy which adds detail to what should happen on the site, for example design detail. Once a site has planning permission an NDP policy cannot subsequently be applied to the site. The Bovis and old cricket pitch sites are therefore ‘committed’, the football pitch site is allocated. Strategic sites do not have specific site boundaries.</p>	
<p><u>5. Draft Outline Zoning Plan/LSCA</u> PH explained that CT will produce a zoning plan looking at Ledbury in 40 years. SB said this was an excellent idea but should not be too detailed – it should be ‘blobby’. Too much detail will elicit a lot of consultation responses. She recommended looking at the Ross-on-Wye NDP which has such a plan in an appendix which is referred to in the body of the report. PH also explained that CT is no longer going to produce a full LSCA but a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study.</p>	
<p><u>Conclusion</u> SB reminded the SG that what is needed is <u>Proportionate Evidence</u> and that the Inspector had not said that the previous NDP was disastrous but that it wasn’t clear what the evidence was for some of the proposals. PH explained the approach which is being adopted to filing on the web and in hard copy to avoid this happening again. SB said you just need to demonstrate that you have looked at other options for each proposal. SB would like to see topic papers when they are fairly complete not at an early draft stage.</p>	