

ROSS PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS POST REGULATION 14

This report notes the changes made to the Ross-on-Wye Neighbourhood Plan following from comments made at the Regulation 14 consultation stage. It focuses solely on substantive points; it does not cover points of clarification, typographical errors, pagination and reference issues, changes to dates and so forth.

In addition to changes made as a direct result of Regulation 14 comments, further changes were made as explained in Part 2. Part 3 addresses changes as a result of the proposed closure of the Chase hotel.

PART 1: DIRECT RESPONSES TO REGULATION 14 COMMENTS

Comments are noted in page order. Page references are to pages in the submission version plan.

Comment 95

p.18.

New 1.3 added:

1.3.2 The issues listed are not necessarily evidence-based (eg. unsafe junctions); they are based on the perceptions of local people at community involvement events.

Comment 154

p.18

Addition to end of 1.3.4:

* As assessed by Herefordshire Council, this is in terms of high shop vacancy rates, and in accommodation above shops and the poor condition of some buildings as well as the public realm.

Comment 48

p.28

New objective added:

1j: Ensure proper consideration of flood risk, groundwater management and waste treatment, using a sequential approach for all built development located within current flood zones.

Comment 176

p.33

Change to 4.2.1:

(Added after 'Broadmeadows/Tanyard') ... and all the land east of the A40.

Comment 176

p.33

Change to 4.2.4:

4.2.4 Additional development outside the boundary, and not addressed in this plan, would only be considered in exceptional circumstances, notably as 'exceptions sites' in line with national and Herefordshire Council policy.

Comment 176

p.34

Map changes:

Map amended to include sites in Rossleigh (143708 and 161659) and land off Fernbank Road (application number: 151189).

Comment 31

p.36/37

New 4.4.5 added and map amended:

Add a new 4.4.5 **and amend map:**

4.4.5 The area shown in on map ...is currently in the ownership, and under the control of, the Ministry of Defence, so the associated policy cannot apply to that land at present. At such time as the MoD release the land or their control over it, Policy EN7 will apply to that area of land.

Comment 37

p.42

Change to policy para.2:

(Any development support biodiversity) and meet the tests laid down in para. 97 of the NPPF 2018.

Comments 10 and 185

p.42

Change to policy, added para.:

(Any development proposals) both on the edge of the settlement or within the built part of the town, (that affect adjacent green infrastructure provision, will be required ...)

Comment 99

p.44

Addition to policy:

All proposals should meet Herefordshire Council design guidance.

Comment 73

p.45

New para. 4.9.3:

In the same way that introducing information and judgement on issues such as conservation and movement, when introduced early in the process (as other policies in this plan require), community involvement can change the form and nature of a development for the better – it affects land use. In just the same way that engaging early through formal pre-application discussions with planning officers can change a development for the better, community involvement undertaken early in the process can improve developments in all senses – it affects land use. (A similar policy passed examination for the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan.)

Comment 101

p.51

Additions to policy:

Para. 1 now ends: including car parking.

Para. 2 now ends: including arrangements for car parking.

Comment 75

p.52

Changed policy:

Where developments are of a scale that triggers a proportion of affordable housing, the Ross-on-Wye Community Land Trust should be offered the opportunity to deliver that housing.

Comment 102 and 227

p.53

Addition to policy:

Details of car parking arrangements, whether on-site or off-site must be provided.

Comment 102 and 227

p.53

Change to start of para. 4/16/3:

There may be scope

Comment

p.57

Changed policy E2:

Further edge-of-centre and out-of-centre retail development, especially large scale, will normally be resisted due to significant adverse effects on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. If applications are forthcoming, all schemes with a gross floorspace of 400 sq metres (or more) must be accompanied by a Retail Impact Assessment in addition to the normal sequential testing.

Comment 106

p.61

New para. 4.21.7:

Herefordshire Council's Highway design guide for new development should be used in designing any new developments. Depending on the scale and impact of the development, Transport Assessment or a Transport Statement will be required. Access Strategies and Active Travel Strategies should also be provided. Pre-application consultation with Herefordshire Council's Highways team should be entered into for larger developments or for developments which will result in significant impact on the highway network. Consultation with Highways England should be undertaken when dealing with the A40, A49 and A449.

Comment 40

p. 66

New para. 4.23.2

Developments currently underway and those allocated or proposed in this plan can also make a significant contribution to making walking and cycling an attractive travel preference for those who end up living or working there.

Comment 109

p.66

Additions to policy:

Add to first bullet:

(Improving existing footpaths) and cycle routes (into ...)

New third bullet:

Secure public cycling parking should be provided at key locations around the town and public amenities.

Comment 72

p.67

Remove policy, amend para. 4.23.2:

Much of this ambition cannot be addressed through Neighbourhood Plan policies but through action projects, see Section 6. However, developers are strongly encouraged to include within their proposals, signs that are fully in line (in location and design terms) with the integrated system to be developed through the Town Council.

Comment 83 and 112

p.68

Add amended text:

4.25.1 The town centre is served by several car parks managed by Herefordshire Council at which charges apply. These provide for short term access by residents and visitors as well as longer term provision for those working in the centre. There are also some private car parks, either linked to facilities such as supermarkets (e.g. Aldi) or strictly for those working in or visiting specific businesses.

4.25.2 Herefordshire Council data from 2011 and 2012 suggests that none of the car parks is ever full and some are poorly used; this is unlikely to be different in 2019. The limited usage may be a result of poor location, a lack of clear signage (something visitors have noted) and/or concern about charges.

4.25.3 While there is at present no reason to suggest that any of the car parks may no longer be necessary, and given other policies and projects to promote more use of the town centre, it may be the case over the plan period that one or more car park sites is no longer needed and can be put forward for development.

4.25.4 Much of this ambition cannot be addressed through Neighbourhood Plan policies but through action projects, see Section 6. However, one policy is appropriate, as opposite.

Comment 114

p.70

Addition to policy:

Care should be taken to avoid locations which would result in trailing cables of potential risk to any passers-by.

Comment 115 and 197

p.70

New para. 4.26.3

While the emphasis here has been on charging points for cars, consideration should also be given to what is anticipated to be an emerging need for charging points at non-domestic locations for e-bikes.

Comment 57

p.75

Completely new text has been added – see Part 2.

Comment 12

p.76

Amended policy:

Now reads: Existing allotments as shown on Figure 18 should be retained, unless equivalent or improved provision is delivered as near as possible to the site where allotments are lost.

Comment 12**p.76****New paras. added:**

4.31.1 Until recently there were a number of conventional allotments and sites for community food-growing in Ross-on-Wye. Those at Cawdor are now closed (because of a potential development), leaving only those at Tudorville. In relation to those being lost at Cawdor, section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 states that “adequate provision will be made for plot holders displaced by any such disposal, unless any such provision is not necessary or is not reasonably practicable”.

4.31.2 The Community Garden is not technically an allotment, but is also shown on Figure 18 opposite. The spaces at both the Community Garden and Tudorville are well-used. The larger, organic rotation growing plots at Model Farm have an uncertain future and suffer from wild animal predation. (See the Summary Evidence Report in Appendix 1 for further information. This report also covers Play as outlined below.)

4.31.3 There are issues of ownership of land, management and maintenance for the allotments, and most of the town now has no genuinely neighbourhood allotments. Although no formal requirements exist for how many allotments a town such as Ross should provide, the current provision is now severely lacking (particularly given the increased density of new housing and increased occupancy of town centre accommodation); an issue that needs to be addressed. There are also some relatively large, new housing developments planned and these should include allotments. Figure 18 on p.77 includes both allotments and play areas – the topic that follows).

Comments 117, 118, 119 and 120**p.84****New para. 5.2.4:**

5.2.4 All planning applications on any of the allocated sites that follow must be accompanied with a Transport Assessment that illustrates the impacts of increasing vehicles movements and shows how the proposals might be useful in providing active travel links for walkers and cyclists. Designs should be in accordance with Herefordshire Council design guidance.

Comment 11**p.88****Additions to policy:**

Changed 1st bullet: Access is only possible from Middleton Avenue (if Ashfield ...).
New bullet: Solutions should be included to manage local water-run-off problems.

Comment 2**p.90****Amendment to para. 5.3.16**

(Although the parking area on the land occupied by the adjacent Larruperz Centre is currently used by Children's Centre users, that is not formally for their use.) Vehicular access would be expected to be from Ryefield Road but consideration should be given to access to the southern part of the site from Grammar School Close. (Pedestrian access is possible from the Larruperz Centre direction.)

Comment 46
p.100
New bullet in para.5.4.34

New school playing fields will be provided to meet the needs of the school and to promote community use of the school's sports facilities.

Comment 1
p.101
Additions to para. 6.1

(The planning policies described in Section 4 will be supported by a range of practical projects.) These projects emerged from a very large number of suggestions made at all stages in the plan preparation (see the Consultation Statement). All suggestions were considered by the Steering Group, which resulted in the priority shortlist that follows.

Comment 1
p.101
New para. 6.2

6.2 There is also an intention within Ross to create a Development Trust to lead on the implementation of many of the projects. Developers would be expected to contribute to relevant projects listed below (via Herefordshire Council's Section 106 contribution agreements or CIL if that is implemented in the county).

Part 2: NEW SECTIONS AND POLICIES

New sections(without policies) have been added on Sports Facilities (see comment 57) and on Health Provision. These are on p. 75.

Changes were also suggested in the Regulation 14 comments about the section in the main plan about the Broadmeadows/Tanyard area (now starting p.93). These also affect the evidence report 'Broadmeadows/Tanyard in Detail', so what follows here is the comment references and either the comment text or a brief summary (in italics) of a comment. The final versions are in the final plan and evidence report.

Comment 4 – *deliverability. financial equalisation.*

Comment 21 - ensure access off main road at Morrisons is enhanced. Currently an eyesore and detrimental to the town as a whole

Comment 41 - The linear park through the potential Broadmeadow site would also be a potential corridor

Comment 50 – *flood risk.*

Comment 51 – *groundwater and waste.*

Comment 60 – Include sawmills and laundry site with Broadmeadows / Tanyard. Include a footpath from Tanyard Lane to the Ledbury Road. Reinstate the road entrance as originally planned on the outline planning phase 2.3 and 4 on the Tanyard Lane and Chase View Development.

Comment 62 – Tanyard Lane from Ledbury Road to the Chaseview Development site is an unadopted public roadway and due to the increased usage of pedestrians, children prams, the road needs radically improving and widening with a footpath clearly marked for pedestrians. HGV's and cars already using the lane for several businesses as they have done

so since the 19th century.

Comment 63 – Public footpaths Policy ,Walking and Cycling re Tanyard Lane, Ledbury Road to Chase View development site is an unadopted public road which needs urgently updating with development and footpath, Tanyard Lane - Overross through Meades Sawmills site and old Ross Laundry site as per condition of Chase View development site to access John Kyrle school and bus stops.

Comment 64 – Flooding of Broadmeadows is totally unaffected by the River Wye. In the severest of floods, back- up only reaches the northern side of the Greytree culvert at the Mill Pond.

Comment 88 - Provides good summary of constraints identified with this area but not clear regarding future proposals. Given the constraints and potential impacts upon potential viability it may be best to set some overall principles of development of this area but not include it as a specific proposal/allocation.

Comment 97 – mention previous interest in Tanyard site

Comment 113 - I can confirm the following with regard to potentially contaminative uses at Broadmeadow and Tanyard Lane (policy 5B.1) indicated in orange in 'Figure 20: Ross-on-Wye Neighbourhood Plan Development Strategy and Sites' Broadmeadow: Ordnance survey historical plans indicate a former coal yard, dismantled railway and garage was situated within the boundary of the allocated site. Tanyard Lane: Ordnance survey historical plans indicate a laundry and former sawmills to the west of the site. Following investigation and assessment, a remediation project was undertaken at Tanyard lane to address risks associated with the historical use of these sites. With the above in mind, we would recommend we be contacted at an early stage if this site is considered worthwhile to progress. Any future redevelopment of the site would be considered by the Planning Services Division of the Council however, if consulted it is likely this division would recommend any application that is submitted should include, as a minimum, a 'desk top study' considering risk from contamination in accordance with BS10175:2011 so that the proposal can be fully considered.

Comment 131 – Broadmeadow: Ordnance survey historical plans indicate a former coal yard, dismantled railway and garage was situated within the boundary of the allocated site. Tanyard Lane: Ordnance survey historical plans indicate a laundry and former sawmills to the west of the site. Following investigation and assessment, a remediation project was undertaken at Tanyard lane to address risks associated with the historical use of these sites. With the above in mind, we would recommend we be contacted at an early stage if this site is considered worthwhile to progress. Any future redevelopment of the site would be considered by the Planning Services Division of the Council however, if consulted it is likely this division would recommend any application that is submitted should include, as a minimum, a 'desk top study' considering risk from contamination in accordance with BS10175:2011 so that the proposal can be fully considered.

Comment 157 - the linear park through the potential Broadmeadow site would also be a potential (wildlife) corridor

Comment 162 - Include provision in this option 1 map for access to the town centre via the 'clear, direct, safe and lit footpaths and cycle paths' that are mentioned elsewhere in the plan. If they are not included at this stage in the process, they will very likely be missed off or ignored. With Map Option 2, presumably the Linear Park/Open Space would also provide the non-vehicular access to town (although this should perhaps be also explicitly shown).

Comment 172 - Section 5.2 Development Sites The criteria based approach for 'other sites' which are not allocated in the draft plan is sensible. There is an inconsistency in how the 'Broadmeadows/Tanyard' and 'Land East of A40' sites are presented in Figure 20 – and the

Steering Group may wish to consider the same 'question mark' treatment of both sites on this plan. The future of both sites is currently uncertain and therefore their status in the plan needs to be the same, and this needs to be consistent throughout the document.

Comment 177 - We are in general support of draft Policy E1. It is however of note that paragraph 4.16.2 which supports Policy E1 refers to Broadmeadows/Tanyard, yet it is not clear how Policy E1 is intended to relate to this site. Clarification is therefore required.

Comment 196 – We are in general support of draft Policy E1. It is however of note that paragraph 4.16.2 which supports Policy E1 refers to Broadmeadows/Tanyard, yet it is not clear how Policy E1 is intended to relate to this site. Clarification is therefore required.

Comment 200 - No policy has been formulated for this allocation at this stage, however whilst Yorkley Timber Company Ltd are supportive of the ambition to comprehensively redevelop the area, this is on the basis that the former Sawmills and Paragon Laundry site are included and an equalisation agreement between the various developers/landowners is signed up to. Only in this situation are the illustrative options proposed for my client's land interests, and in particular the use of the land as open space and attenuation area, accepted. In the absence of an equalisation agreement, my client would wish their land to be considered for a range of alternative uses that would be considered appropriate in this location, having regard to other development plan policies.

Comment 219 - Improve the facade at King's Acre Car Park by promoting quality building development hard against Millpond Street (with car parking to the rear) and improving pedestrian access at this very off-putting junction (BCP area). This will markedly improve the grim view of the supermarket car park at this point. Connect the two areas of Open Space at their closest point along the stream to ensure a high quality green link between the A40 and the town centre with footpath and cycle way.

Comment 231 - A suitable alternative site should be identified to ensure that there is still caravanning and camping provision in the area. Or, the housing proposal should be modified to ensure that all or part of the camping site remains.

NB. Since the Regulation 14 consultation, an additional part of the land within the overall Broadmeadows/Tanyard area has been purchased by another landowner.

PART 3: CHANGES RESULTING FROM THE CLOSURE OF THE CHASE HOTEL

All of the following is elaborated in full in the **Chase Report**.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan that was put out for the Regulation 14 consultation in autumn 2018 included an allocation of the site of the then current Chase hotel for two small housing developments. The text outlined some key criteria to be met to address specific details.

Later in the autumn, as the Regulation 14 consultation was finishing, the owner of the hotel notified the plan Steering Group that the hotel was no longer viable, that he had tried unsuccessfully to find buyers for it as an hotel and that he would therefore be closing the hotel and seeking permission to develop housing on part of the site.

In consultation with the chair of the Steering Group and the plan consultants, it was agreed that there should be a consultation about the new proposals and that, subject to the outcome of this consultation, changes would need to be made to the draft plan before its final submission. The section in the plan allocating development at the Chase site was then removed from the plan.

The owner set up a consultation about the emerging proposals for housing development. This consultation took the form of an open drop-in at the hotel over a day in January 2019. A full report of the event, including every comment made, was produced and sent to all who

signed. A short report was produced and placed on the plan website. A note was added informing people that they could, if wished, access the full report.

The proposal to close the hotel; and potentially develop housing on the site caused considerable concern locally. A petition was raised to keep the hotel open and the Town Council received a number of letters seeking to have the green space on the site protected/designated in the plan as a Local Green Space.

The plan consultants were asked for their opinion on the hotel retention and designation of green space options. Their judgement was that neither option was viable within planning principles. The consultants then suggested that the best way forward for the now almost finalised plan was to (a) add a new section to the plan about open and green space in general but also highlighting the value of the site, and (b) add a new section in the plan under 'Other Sites'.

A decision was then taken to undertake a structured survey to assess community views on these suggestions more formally than was possible via the petitions etc. The survey was undertaken in June 2019. Its results did not suggest strong views within the Ross community, other than from adjacent residents, about the importance of the current open and green qualities of the site. The results also showed good support for the two suggested additions to the plan.

With the agreement of the Steering Group, a section was added to the plan about Open and Green Spaces (p. 40) and also a section (pp. 91/92) supporting development on the site subject to a number of criteria (some emerging from the owner's January 2019 consultation). This also resulted in a minor addition to the section on Retaining Community Facilities (on p.73) – a new para. 4.17.4. Some maps also had to be amended.