

**NDP public consultation draft leaflet and questionnaire LTC committee edits April 2021  
Incorporating LTC Council comments of 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2021 and NDP Working Party comments of 27<sup>th</sup>  
April 2021 for edits before production of final versions.  
(To go with notes of SG meeting 34 of 29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> April 2021)**

No	Who	What	Comment	Response	Action
<b>Council meeting</b>					
1	Cllr Harvey by email	Q'naire Q1	Boundary Options: I still contend that you are only offering one genuine option for the public. You may think this is OK, but let's not kid ourselves or the public that there are more choices here than there are. I look forward to discussion of this in council?	After discussion agreed that Council would accept the advice of Sam Banks, Bill Bloxsome and the SG that these 3 appropriate options being offered	No change
2		Q2a	Redundant question. The need is already empirically proven. If you're seeking public support for that proven need, then isn't it better to ask for that?	Agreed after discussion to keep the question but add words at the end after 'high priority ...' to read: '..... for this update?'	DONE
3		Q2b	(Also raised by others) - the colouring on Fig3 isn't clear enough to show the new sports land proposed.	Agree and going to change the colours with more prominent dots or cross lines on all maps as required	DONE
4		Q2d1	Redundant question. What's the alternative – less than 1 site? The allocation of employment land is a requirement. The other questions explore where and how that might be achieved. Either delete the question altogether or alter it to ask whether there is public support for the Little Marcle Road land block as outlined in Fig3.	Agreed after discussion to keep question but change from: 'Advancing one or more sites ....' to 'Advancing more than one site – make changes in line with see also Tony Evans and Griff Holliday's comments below.	DONE
5		Q3a	Change wording to read something like: 'Should the option to provide an additional access off the Hereford Road to the viaduct housing development be preserved for the future?'	Agreed	DONE
6		Q3b	Change wording to say "Do you support development of ground level eastbound platform access, improved platform services and additional off-road car parking at the station?"	Agreed	DONE
7		Q4a	Blue and green options should be removed as options. You do not explain the consequences of expanding the definition of the town centre for people and businesses affected.	Agreed after discussion to keep the options after acceptance that planners had recommended we	4 options are being offered to give people an opportunity to consider what balance

				look at these options and that a result, Cllr Bannister as Chair ED&P had requested the question and options be included	there should be between a tight town centre and an extended one which includes quite a lot of housing.
8		Q4b	You are asking about removing the distinction between shopping frontages, but you are not proposing to contract the shop frontage area to at least that defined prior to the current NDP or even smaller. Most towns are protecting their retail core by ensuring that it remains tight and concentrated. This consultation does nothing to improve the protection of the retail core of the town.	Agreed after discussion and after acceptance that planners had recommended we review this issue given the change in retail outlet definitions, to keep the question but change by adding the words 'planning terms' between 'should be no' and 'differentiation'	Agree add 'in planning terms' between that and there DONE
9		Q5ai	Fig6 colour and outlining too pale to be seen clearly on the map. Text in leaflet should refer to Fig6 in first sentence, otherwise it's confusing to read about blue and green areas. Questioned colour blind reading of red and green.	Agreed on maps – review all maps for colours and outlining as already stated. Cllr Bannister who is colour blind said he otherwise had no problem with the colours.	Yes agree make colours stronger if we can (this is a Herefordshire Council map) DONE However, not changed leaflet text referring to figure 6 in first sentence (see 12 below)
10		(Issue raised by the Clerk at the WP meet) Leaflet	Clerk requested all maps be sent to the office before publication on the website in particular to check and confirm there are no illegal website accessibility issues	Agreed	NF to send to Clerk as soon as possible. (Added to the consultation project plan)
11		4a	Issue 4a – add summary of pros and cons from the issues paper as for the settlement boundary	Agree add summary of reasons from Issues and Options paper. AL to write.	DONE
12		Section 5	Note to move text in leaflet - should refer to Fig6 in first sentence,	Move up ref to fig6 into the first sentence of 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	NO; reviewed wording and it doesn't make sense
13		Maps and plans copyright	Move 'Maps and Plans' note on copyright to page 11 after issue 7 note to give more space for the map on page 12	Agree move	DONE
14		Size of maps	To answer points raised on concerns about size of maps and detail hard to see, add a	Agree - As explained at the meetings it was	DONE

			note after the 'Maps and Plans' copyright note to say: For a link to look at bigger versions of the maps which can be zoomed in for more detail, go to 'Section 9.0 Maps and Plans' on the supporting documents page of the NDP website using this link: <a href="https://www.ledburytowncouncil.gov.uk/en-gb/neighbourhood-plan/supporting-documents">https://www.ledburytowncouncil.gov.uk/en-gb/neighbourhood-plan/supporting-documents</a>	always the intention to refer respondents to the maps on the website in order to zoom on the pdfs to see the detail and this note will help them to find the links	
<b>15</b>		LSC3	LSC3 description in the leaflet is confusing. What is the point at which it stops in Frith Wood – is it the parish boundary?.	Yes extend north if possible ask BB	DONE
<b>16</b>		LSC4	As I have said before, you are missing an LSC altogether on the map. It is the green corridor which goes from the Riverside Walk, up alongside Ledbury Welding and Aldi, past the Primary School and up to the Recreation Ground.	BB advises - LSC4 is an HC corridor not changed by LTC – any revisions can be suggested through the consultation. The corridors and enhancement zones are diagrammatic – the green spaces Cllr Harvey refers to are captured on Figure 8 Green and open spaces to be protected. If these are wrong please feed back through consultation. BUT Agree change description in line with Cllr Harvey's suggestion.	Description changed
<b>17</b>		LSC4	Incorrectly described in the leaflet and incorrectly positioned on the map. It connects from the Riverside Park through New Mills along Kempley Brook to Robinson's Meadow and Masefield's Meadow.	Change description – see comment on LSC4 above	DONE
<b>18</b>		LSC5	LCS5 is also incorrectly described in the leaflet or it is incorrectly drawn on the map. Upper Hall used to be the Grammar School – do you mean for LSC5 to cross the Worcester Road and connect with LSC3? Or to stop at the Walled garden and start of the Conigree to the south of the Worcester Road?	BB advice that the corridors are diagrammatic and Worcester Road seemed a natural edge to the corridor  Remove reference to Upper Hall it is wrong.	DONE
<b>19</b>		LEZ2	LEZ2 – what is the land that is identified as sensitive which you say is included in the zone? Identified by whom and sensitive as regards what?	Ask BB advice - Identified on HC's green infrastructure map – and also as stated by the planning	DESCRIPTION CHANGED SLIGHTLY

				inspector in landscape terms in relation to AONB.	
20		Q5b – Fig 8	Q5b – Fig8 Should you be proposing protection of the green space for the extended sports grounds? What about Masefield’s Meadow? Why exclude Ledbury Park? How are you handling the woodland areas that extend beyond those shown on the map? Why protect Frith Wood beyond the designated extension of LSC3? You are proposing to protect as green space the area of land on which the Nursing Home is being constructed. Is that correct?	On Masefield Meadow please feedback through consultation with reasons BB confirmed that although small, the footprint of the new nursing home is shown by the side of the bypass.	DONE Ledbury Park is included in LSC5. No change re nursing home footprint on Fig 8
21			No mention is made anywhere in the consultation to the hamlet of Parkway. Is this appropriate?	Pointed out this is not true because the brief refers to the whole parish and not just the town and that particular care has been taken to ensure when Royal Mail deliver the leaflet with questionnaire the post codes include all the parish including Parkway. Will bear in mind though when updating Topic guides to check on references to all parts of the parish are adequately reflected	Add reference to Parkway/ Ledbury green gap into leaflet LSC5 DONE
<b>Working Party members</b>					
22	Celia Kellet	Leaflet pg 1 para 1	to read ‘We would prefer you ...’	Agree these comments which simplify/clarify.	DONE
23		Page 1, para 3	A heading ‘for those who would like more detail, please see overleaf... It would be helpful if this whole para was all together overleaf, where there is plenty of space for it.	As above.	Wording changed so less confusing on landscape version of leaflet
24		Text through out	‘figure’ should have a capital ‘F - Figure’ as on pp.12-17amend on pp. 5,7,9 & 10.	As above.	DONE
25		Pgs 5, 7, 9	Please add the word ‘on’ between ‘Fig x’ and ‘page y’ on pages 5,7, & 10 to read	As above.	DONE
26		Pg 9	‘Figure x on page y’ and on page 9 to read ‘Figure 6 and 7 on pages 17 and 18’.	As above.	DONE
27		Q’naire Pg1. para 1 line 2	delete ‘and especially’ add ‘particularly’	As above.	DONE

28		Q1, line 1	amend to read ...you prefer, also are there...	As above.	DONE
29		Q2d	amend 12ha to read 12 hectares ( approx 30 acres) ...	As above.	DONE
30		Q2dii	Delete 'detriment' insert 'loss'	As above.	DONE
31		Q2diii	Delete 'periphery' insert 'edge'	As above	DONE
32		Qu 4, line 1	Delete 'as per' as unnecessary	As above	Yes change DONE
33	Paul Kinnaird	<b>Q'naire</b> Q1	Likely to lead to a less than positive result. For example, preference on Option 1 or 2 would be contrary to choosing 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in Q 2. As Option 3 is preferred by the LTC, it would be better to ask if the respondent agrees or not - similar to the results on all the following questions.	Valid point but respond to Paul - if people do want option 2 it will not preclude planning permission for employment and recreation land. Also add in new sentence stressing that C is the preferred option.	DONE
34		Q4	Too many options. I would prefer to see options for Red Zone (existing) or Red Zone + Extensions. The recent application on Lidl's behalf brought to light that trade to the Town Centre as currently defined would only effect One Stop and Spar whereas the effect on the 2 supermarkets Tesco & Coop was discounted because they were defined as Edge of Centre. HCC's Retail consultant happily showed the full effect of the Application to all the retail offerings in Ledbury. The Lawnside site is also important to recognise it as a site for future development.	Valid point but 4 options are being offered to give people an opportunity to consider what balance there should be between a tight town centre and an extended one which includes quite a lot of housing.	No Change
35		Q5	The definitions of a LEZ (Local Enhancement Zone) and LSC (Local Strategic Corridor )should be made available in the explanatory leaflet or links to website definitions.	Agree. Add definition of LSC and LEZ (AL/NF) to topic paper, issues and options paper and leaflet.	DONE
36		Leaflet Fig 7 page 18	Is there a specific reason for the New LEDLSC5 not to reach the proposed Settlement boundary to the south of the town? It seems to leave open a patch of ground which is currently in Gladman's eye for further development. Why not colour that patch green?	No. Zones and corridors indicate broad brush location of green infrastructure, not precisely defined areas. LSC5 could be broader here?	Ask BB to broaden LSC5 to meet bottom of LEZ2  DONE
37	Griff Holliday	Leaflet Maps	Maps are coming out too small in A5 format – is it worth putting up larger size maps on the LTC website which people can access in case of need. Alternatively/additionally some simple labelling of e.g. main thoroughfares would be helpful.	Yes label maps and direct people to website for larger maps	DONE

38		Q'naire Q1 and leaflet	<p>Appreciate this is difficult to put across! The problem is that the options are too long and do not match between the leaflet and the form– how about going for describing the options as follows in both the Leaflet and the Form and simplifying as below?</p> <p>1. Defining a Settlement Boundary (see accompanying leaflet pages 3 and 4) Question 1a: Which of the settlement boundary options do you prefer? (Please rank options in order of preference – 1 for most preferred to 3 least preferred) Option 1: No settlement boundary Option 2: Settlement boundary including existing and all currently approved permitted developments Option 3: As Option 2 plus Riverside Park and areas for recreation and employment South West of Little Marcle Road</p> <p>Question 1b: Do you have any suggestions on other areas to be added? Enter your suggestions here:</p>	Good suggestion	<p>Yes add in phrase 'LTC and HC and our professional consultants preferred option would be C'</p> <p>Yes to suggested wording and add to Option C 'protects' Riverside Park</p> <p>Yes new Q1b</p> <p>DONE</p>
39		Q'naire – other comments:	1. For clarity put instructions in bracketed italics e.g. (See figure 3)	OK	YES do this DONE
40		Q2d	<p>The instructions you give for the options are unclear - what does "advancing", "exploring" and "identifying" mean to me as a respondent? I genuinely can't answer these questions. The questions need to be simple</p> <p>– e.g. Should vacant land by the Full Pitcher roundabout be assigned for employment? – or changed to ask for suggestions where additional employment land might be found.</p>	OK	Yes change wording to make clearer – DONE
41		Q4a	Is a double question change to the way Question 1 is suggested above.		No change on taking advice of consultant MB
42		Q4b put in leaflet	Delete "Given the changes in retail type definitions" – it confuses the question – this should be in the leaflet if at all.		See response to Cllr Harvey above
43		Q4b	Is a double question. You need a separate question on the siting of hot food takeaways.		Change wording and remove' and that' 'which allows hot food takeaways'

					On double, MB advice is that this is not confusing. NO CHANGE
44		Q5b and 5c	Double questions – suggest change to way proposed for Question 1		No change on taking advice of consultant MB
45		Q5d	Shouldn't this be looking for additions to the footpath/cycle network rather than asking me if existing ways should be protected (the latter is surely a given? Do you want me to list all the ways I use?) – How about asking – “Can you suggest footpaths, cycleways or other connections that could be improved or created to benefit residents and access to green space and wildlife? (See also Town Plan E11)	Agree suggested change to drafting of this question.	Yes agree to new wording DONE
46		Q5c	Suggest change as for Question 1. Do you need to ask whether allotments and community gardens should be encouraged – this is in the Town Plan (E12 and E14)	Necessary change?	Leave as it is as will provide evidence if we are asking developers/ Herefordshire Council to support
47	Steve Glennie Smith	Q'naire Q3	Add comment box	OK	Add comment box to Q3b DONE
48		Settlement Boundary options	Not keen on extension to the west and Little Marcle Road as that is the only quiet road coming into Ledbury particularly after UBL we don't want lorries on it.	Access to new site would be between UBL and the town so wouldn't affect quiet part of road.	Ask commentator to make this point when submitting responses to consultation.
49		Settlement Boundary options	Why are UBL and Cheese factory sites identified on maps 2 and 3 and not the other existing employment sites?	Agree	Yes change maps DONE
50		Bridleways	There are only 3 bridleways in Ledbury shouldn't they be protected?		Ask for feedback through consultation
51	Tony Evans	Overall comment (all given verbally to the WP chair)	Very well presented, likes the format overall ok, but although he can see we are trying to present complex issues as best we can, he thinks some simplifications for better understanding can be made; his most important comments are: - reducing the wordage on the leaflet if possible would help - there are some questionnaire points he thinks could be simplified for better		Point noted we will have a read through to see if we can simplify language further. DONE

			understanding		
52		Q'naire	Third para line 2, 'draft' is confusing, suggests 'a new version of the plan'. In general thinks we should do word search on 'draft' and change the wording similarly		Yes DONE removed from questionnaire
53		Q1	Q1 – suggests we change Options to A, B & C so as not to confuse with ranking 1, 2 & 3		Agreed change DONE
54		Q2d	Q2d – these are complex and difficult issues to explain, thinks it would be better if we cut out 'descriptive' words, so 2d question instead of. 'would you agree' ask: 'what are your thoughts on;' and then 2di) could read: 'More than one site ..... and 2dii) is hard to understand, change to something like: ' Further employment land being on the Ross Road roundabout site next to the new housing development' and 2diii) Other smaller areas to accommodate new or expanding businesses in appropriate locations elsewhere on the periphery of the town'		Yes 2dii simplify question and add considering at beginning Full Pitcher instead of Ross Road to description 2diii yes agree new wording change periphery to edge and identifying at beginning DONE
55		Q5e	Thinks we should go through the rest of the quest in the same way to simplify the 'ease of reading' for those not familiar (the majority probably) with some of the terms, eg, Q5e) Do you think more or improved children's play areas are needed and if so, where?		Yes agree new wording to 5e DONE  Read through q'naire for simplification DONE
56		Leaflet	Take out the word 'draft' where possible as for the quest, he thinks it conveys too much of a feeling of lots of loose ends still and lots still to be considered which he thinks would generate the wrong impression even though we are asking for broad feelings		Yes change in first paras DONE
57			He wondered why traffic issues were not included in the list in page 2? Also wondered why we were asking a Q7 if this was a limited review, could be confusing?	This was explained as a non-NDP issue and is being considered by the Traffic Man'gment WP, and also this is a limited issues revision of the NDP anyway. Explained that point 7 in the leaflet was intended to explain why.	No Change
58			If we agree with changing Q1 options 1,2,3 to A, B, C, then the leaflet will be need to be amended as well on page 3		Yes change
59			Settlement boundary – did not understand	Explained reasons and	No Action



			why option 2 was being asked, could there not only be 2 options if option 3 was preferred?	this had been confirmed by Sam Banks as being an appropriate option; and that was accepted	
60			Maps – felt they were too small and not easy to see the detail	Explained logistics and cost issues and need for some compromise, and that the maps would be on the website as pdfs that could be accessed and zoomed for those interested, which was accepted.	Clearer direction that larger maps can be seen on the website. DONE
61			Figure 2 on page 13 – could not easily identify the green site differences or different areas	Explained the current coloured areas were going to be differentiated with clearer and different coloured dots or cross lines, which was accepted	YES change DONE
62	Cllr Helen l'Anson		There is no reference to facilities or provision for Youth	Explained this is outside the remit of this revision of the NDP	No action
63			The document is very wordy – could it be made simpler	Yes we will try to simplify the language	DONE
64	Steve Glennie-Smith by email		I remain very concerned about how far west of UBL proposed employment land might go. This is virgin countryside alongside Little Marcle Road. The land rises here, so any further development would be visually intrusive from further west. A ramification of this I didn't mention at the meeting is light pollution. That was very noticeable last August when I cycled out at midnight to try to see the Perseid meteors: I had to ride as far as the junction with Falcon Lane to get away from Haygrove/Redbank's lighting. At a very minimum, this must be the last area to be developed, and there must be no night working.	We could refer to Dark Skies in policies in the NDP (already being considered and worked upon by Cllr Bannister). These are useful comments but please feedback via the consultation.	Ask Steve to submit comment when he fills in the questionnaire
65			I am even more concerned about the triangle of land west of the area marked as 'new playing fields'. If this became industrial, it would seriously affect important footpath LR12 and bridleway LR8. The former leads from near where LMR crosses the Leadon to Rowlands Green: the latter leaves LMR a little further	Points noted and taken into account as far as possible, but we are obliged to find 12ha of employment land to the south of the Little Marcle Road by the core strategy	Also see above

			<p>west of LR12 and crosses LR12 near where it originally did - at grid ref 696371. It then continues to the Ross road. (The diversion was put in place when UBL expanded: previously it left LMR by UBL's entrance.) Ledbury only has 3 bridleways, which are the only public rights of way (PROWs) that may legally be used by cyclists. Both these PROWs must be protected. LR12 has already been diverted to the south of UBL's curtilage and would be a useful boundary between any new employment land and playing fields. This triangle would therefore be better designated as open space/playing fields.</p>	<p>and face rejection of the revised plan if not shown. Agreed it is a balance and we need to consider all these points very carefully when producing the first draft of the NDP document, and especially in ensuring PROWs are preserved and protected.</p>	
66			<p>Land between UBL and the bypass is effectively blighted: however it is prone to flooding. This could be overcome by raising it with aggregate, as was done on the site now occupied by the Childer Road estate. The eastern ends of LR12 and LR8 could be combined (as a bridleway) in a diversion following the west bank of the Leadon to avoid this land.</p>	<p>This detail could be fed into any development brought forward on the site and should be noted by LTC. Would be useful if this comment could be fed back via the consultation</p>	<p>Also see above</p>
67			<p>Little Marcle Road is the only quiet road leading west out of Ledbury: as such, it is very popular with cyclists and walkers. As a narrow road, its quietness must remain sacrosanct and heavy traffic minimised, if not prohibited (using weight limits) - certainly to the west of Redbank's entrance. Redbank does not generate a large number of vehicle movements: there must be no more as a result of any industrial development - so; LMR must not be the service road for any new development: new road(s) must fulfil that function, joining the wider section of LMR no further west than UBL's main entrance. The best place for the junction would be beside UBL's eastern curtilage: this would minimally affect LR8/12.</p>	<p>Yes agreed; it is proposed that the access to the proposed new football facilities and the new employment land will be from the already widened section of the LMR between the bypass and UBL's own access road. This includes from the suggested new employment land to the west of UBL which was turned down by planning before precisely because the access would have been onto the narrow part of LMR. The current suggestions for consultation would ensure this was not suggested or necessary now.</p>	<p>Also see above</p>
68			<p>Lower Road industrial estate and other areas that are existing employment land such as those adjoining Little Marcle Road</p>	<p>Agree label existing industrial/ employment sites and</p>	<p>DONE</p>

			and near the railway station are not shown as such on the plan (p14). We agreed there must be consistency - ie. they should be marked in the same way as UBL. We also discussed possible colours: I strongly suggest a lighter shade of violet for all (possibly cross-hatched), so the colour violet is associated with all employment land.	remove colours for existing employment land.	
69			Unused land to the north of the Childer Road estate between Amcor and the bypass is designated for industrial use but remains vacant - so must be included in 'new land'. It is crossed by two public footpaths (L1 and L2).	Unfortunately it is counted as existing employment land although currently undeveloped	No action other than to show as 'existing' on maps in agreed colour scheme
70			The map on p14 is not good enough quality. I realise it has to be reduced to fit A5 and I am pleased a better definition version will be available on the website. I do, however, suggest a note is printed on the paper version saying a better definition version is available and listing the link. Quality would be improved by cropping the image to the top, bottom and right to omit land outside the SB and enlarging accordingly. Another possibility (admittedly not ideal) would be to enlarge it to A4 across the centre double page (currently pp10 and 11), and move the text from current p10 forward by the required number of pages.	Agreed put note on leaflet suggesting people visit the website to see plans at a larger size.  Maps could be cropped a bit, but within the (very tight) budget we can't print the maps across A4.	Done
71			LSC1: The Town Trail (TT) has been badly neglected and surface erosion has been a continual problem ever since it was opened for use by cyclists and mobility scooters, as well as pedestrians, in 1998. The original width of 2m is seriously reduced by vegetation encroachment. It is now not fit for purpose. The bridge across Orchard Lane is only 850mm wide: this falls foul of the DDA. A bridge that was originally proposed to carry its northern end directly into the station yard was never built due to lack of funding.  The surface has worn down to its substrate, such that it is uncomfortable on a road bike. The situation is much worse for mobility scooters and pushchairs with their smaller wheels: I have not seen a mobility scooter on the TT for well over a year. Ledbury Area Cycle Forum (LACF) has advocated a tarmac surface for many years: this would cost more initially but	Agreed with these points, but apart from showing as footpaths and green infrastructure and improving access these are not really points for the NDP being not development issues as such.  However, the widening of the Orchard Lane bridge is an item to mention (already in the HC plans to widen as it happens and budget allocated as we understand it) as is developing and	See note about adding points to the actual consultation feedback when the survey becomes available.

			<p>would remove the need for continual patching up and removal of vegetation. The surface could be beige non-slip chippings: the canal towpaths in the Dudley area were resurfaced this way a few years ago and look attractive.</p> <p>The bridge over Orchard Lane must be replaced with one that is at least 1.2m wide. The existing bearers could accommodate this: a prefabricated replacement could be installed with minimal disruption to road traffic beneath. Put the station bridge on the 'wish list'. The existing Town trail exit will become a safety issue, now those who think they know better have forced a single access to viaduct estate via the Bromyard Road.</p>	<p>preserving footpaths, cycle and walkways. All items to review as being in the topic guides as being important and aspirations, reflected in policies as far as practical and possible when writing the NDP document.</p>	
72			<p>LSC2: Add cycleway - particularly where the extension goes under the viaduct. There was an old PRoW (LR15) under the viaduct, which was on the 1956 definitive map but was omitted from the 1968 map: thus it has been lost. It is worth noting that the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) has a provision that all missing links must be claimed before 1st January 2026 - this date falls within the timeframe of the NDP.</p>	<p>Again, very good points but this level of detail falls outside this particular set of consultation documents. It will be important though to review how these points can be covered in the supporting topic guides and in the draft policies document.</p>	<p>See again note about adding points to the actual consultation feedback when the survey becomes available.</p>
73			<p>LSC3: Change status of LR13 (from southern end of Green Lane by the stile where another footpath [LR33] joins - to Homend Crescent) and LR14 (Upperfields, running south to join LR13) from 'footpath' to 'bridleway'.</p> <p>Currently, the south end of Green Lane (a permissive route open to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders) is legally a dead end for cyclists and horse riders!</p>	<p>Similar comment as above.</p>	<p>Again could this be fed back through consultation Q5d</p>
74			<p>LSC4: No path within the New Mills estate, apart from the one that leads past the back of the primary school, can legally be used by cyclists. These are only 6' (imperial!) wide. Current guidance for shared use paths is 3m width, and certainly no less than 2m. Paths defined by LSC4 must be widened to 3m and open to cyclists.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>
75			<p>LSC5: Must include cycleways, primarily for use by residents of Hawk Rise as a partially traffic-free route to the town centre.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>
76			<p>Infrastructure: No mention of this. Of particular importance are the sewage and waste (tip) sites: neither is adequate for expansion of the town within the 2021-</p>	<p>Not within the remit of this NDP</p>	<p>Added to the NDP action list as recommended</p>

			2031 timeframe. Herefordshire Council recently gave itself planning permission to extend operating hours of the tip to a full day on Sundays - which took effect from 2nd May 2021, and to allow expansion of the site (without specifying where to). Three full days will not be sufficient within the NDP timeframe, especially if the inconvenient booking system remains. If the tip is extended northwards, it would be into woodland that is a valuable wildlife habitat - and it would affect the Town Trail. If southwards, that would be into the sewage site, which will definitely not be adequate as it stands by 2031. So we need to consider how the sewage site could expand, or a location for a second site - or relocation of the tip to make that land available for the sewage site.		to be considered by the next iteration of the NDP.
77			Add a comment box to Q3.	Agreed	DONE
78			The invitation to continue comments on a separate sheet is not easy to spot. I suggest it becomes a separate paragraph, immediately preceding Q1.	Put this in bold on the front page	DONE
79			Comment boxes in the online version must not be limited in size, and should allow HTML (eg. bullet points, bold and <i>italics</i> ).	Agreed this makes sense	Feedback to Maxine Bassett who is putting online questionnaire together