

Ledbury Town Council

PROOF OF EVIDENCE - PLANNING

(Cllr E.P.J. Harvey)

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 APPEAL

By

Ledbury Town Council in support of the refusal by Herefordshire County Council of the Outline planning application for the erection of up to 625 new homes (including affordable housing), up to 2.9 hectares of B1 employment land, a canal corridor, public open space (including a linear park), access, drainage and ground modelling works and other associated works at Land North of the Viaduct, Ledbury, Herefordshire,

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/W1850/W/20/3244410

Local Planning Authority Reference: 171532

Date of Proof of Evidence: 5 June 2020

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Scope of Evidence
3. Development Plan
4. Ledbury - Local Planning Context
5. Housing Land Supply
6. Planning Process Issues
7. Planning Balance
8. Summary
9. Conclusion

1. Introduction

- 1.1. My name is Elizabeth Harvey. I have been a County and Town Councillor for Ledbury since 2011 and am the ward member for the development.
- 1.2. I am not a professional planner and have no planning qualifications.
- 1.3. I have been a County Councillor throughout the majority of the development phase of the Core Strategy. I have sat as a member on the Council's Planning Committee. I have responded to consultations relating to planning matters throughout the county. I have attended and given third party evidence at previous planning inquiries relating to Ledbury and other parts of the county. I have been involved in the development of the Ledbury Neighbourhood Plan and led the development of the Parish Plan.
- 1.4. I have a sound knowledge of the planning issues in the county. I am familiar with the application site and the immediate area, the planning issues arising and the local planning context.
- 1.5. I reserve the right to make alterations or to add to my evidence in the light of changing circumstances or in respect of fresh issues arising from evidence submitted to the Inquiry.

2. Scope of Evidence

2.1. The site

2.1.1. Outline planning permission, with all matters save for access reserved, is sought for a mixed use development including the erection of up to 625 new homes (including affordable housing), up to 2.9 hectares of B1 employment land, a canal corridor, public open space (including a linear park), access, drainage and ground modelling works and other associated works. All matters are reserved with the exception of access.

2.1.2. The site comprises 28.1 hectares of agricultural land comprising 3 fields which are located between the River Leadon to the west and existing industrial manufacturing, petrochemical, freight transport and engineering employment sites to the east. The site is bounded by open countryside to the north. To the south it is separated from the existing residential area of the town by the railway line, its embankment and the Grade 2 listed viaduct. Two short tunnels pass through the embankment, through which the original Hereford to Gloucester Canal and its towpath used to pass. The embankment structure itself affects drainage and water movement through and within the site.

2.1.3. The site is very close to the western boundary of the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“AONB”) within which there is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (The Ledbury Cutting) which is designated for its geological and ecological interest. To the south west of the site is situated on the hilltop is the Walls Hill Camp Scheduled Ancient Monument.

2.1.4. The site is accessed for farming and by Network Rail for maintenance from the south via a spur off Leadon Way (the Ledbury bypass) and from the north for cultivation through a field entrance which is set back slightly from the Bromyard Road.

2.1.5. Shops, schools, medical facilities and places of work, recreation and worship are all within walking distance of the site in a south westerly direction towards the Town

Centre. Almost all of these facilities are accessed via The Homend.

2.2. Policy Framework

2.2.1. The development site is identified in the **Herefordshire Core Strategy/Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted October 2015)** as one of the county's strategic housing sites. The planned requirement for this specific strategic site is given in policy LB2.

2.2.2. The policy states: Land north of the Viaduct: Development proposals north of the viaduct in Ledbury will be expected to bring forward the following to achieve a sustainable mixed use urban extension of the town:

1. mixed use development of around 625 new homes, at an average density of around 40 dwellings per hectare, comprising a mix of market and affordable house sizes and types that meet the requirements of Policy H3 and the needs identified in the latest version of the Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment;
2. around 3 hectares of employment land, restricted to Use Class B1;
3. a target of 40% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable housing;
4. land and contributions to facilitate a restored canal to be delivered in partnership with the Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Trust;
5. a new linear informal park to link to the existing town trail, riverside walk, recreational open space and existing allotments;
6. the provision of developer contributions towards any identified need for new/improved community facilities/infrastructure improvements. This shall include a new 210 place primary school within the development (or an expansion of the existing primary school) and new recreational open space, play, indoor and outdoor sport facilities;
7. provision of satisfactory vehicular access arrangements, the details of which will be determined at planning application stage;
8. appropriate mitigation to safeguard the amenity of future occupants from unacceptable levels of noise and to safeguard the continued operation of existing businesses adjoining the area;
9. development of bespoke, high quality and inclusive design, including accommodation that will meet the needs of older persons and that contributes to the distinctiveness of this part of Ledbury and respects the setting and significance of the listed viaduct and the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;

10. safeguards to ensure there is no adverse impact on water quality and quantity in the River Leaddon;
11. new walking, cycling and bus links from the urban extension directly to the town trail and riverside walk under the viaduct, the railway station and town centre to create linkages to nearby development and existing community facilities;
12. sustainable standards of design and construction; and
13. a comprehensive sustainable urban drainage system which includes measures such as rain gardens and swales to manage ground and surface water drainage and safeguard against any increased flood risk.

2.2.3. The evidence presented later in this document will cover the planning history of the site in detail, particularly as it pertains to the intended access to the site. Other witnesses address the detailed compliance with Policy LB2.

2.3. The Application

2.3.1. The planning application for the proposed development was received and validated by the Council on 28 April 2017 (application ref: P171532/O).

2.3.2. A range of consultations were received and are referenced in the officer reports for the November and December Planning Committee meetings and more than 400 letters of objection were also received through the Consultation process from members of the public. Ledbury town council objected to the proposal.

2.3.3. On 13 November 2019, the Council's Planning Committee considered the application for the second time and determined to defer it. The reasons given are set out in the minutes, dated 13 November 2019 as follows:

“Councillor Millmore proposed and Councillor Seldon seconded a motion that the application be deferred to give the applicant time to amend the application to include a second access point through the viaduct. The motion was carried unanimously with 15 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.”

2.3.4. On 11 December 2019 the Council's Planning Committee reconsidered the application

and determined to refuse it. The reasons given for refusal set out in the decision notice, dated 12 December 2019 and relate primarily to concerns regarding the proposed access and consequential issues relating to highways, landscape impact, and heritage.

2.3.5. The Appellant has appealed against the Council's decision to refuse the outline planning application. This proof sets out the position of the Town Council with regard to the appeal and explains why the Town Council considers the development, as currently proposed, to be unacceptable.

2.4. Purpose and structure of the evidence

2.4.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2.4.2. This proof of evidence set out the Town Council's position as identified within the Councils Statement of Case and explores the putative reasons for refusal in the context of:

- National Planning Policy: the relevant provisions of the NPPF and other national level documents
- Local Plan Policy: Referring here to the overall approach taken to the assessment of options for site access and their environmental impact and I also deal with the housing land supply position and its implications for decision-taking in this case
- Ledbury Town Context: The Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan, its preparation and housing delivery.
- The appeal proposals in the planning balance: an assessment of the proposals against the identified planning policies and other material considerations, weighing the benefits and impacts of the scheme in the planning balance in economic, social and environmental terms. This exercise draws on other evidence for the Town Council on landscape, heritage, highways, and

- On this basis I consider the planning balance in the context of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and NPPF paragraph 11

2.5. Scope of Proof

2.5.1. The reasons for refusal given by the LPA's Planning Committee state:

"... the proposed development is considered to be contrary to paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), policies SS1, SS4, LB2 (seventh bullet point) and MT1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 16 October 2015 and the provisions of Herefordshire Council's 'Highways Design Guide for New Developments' (July 2006).

"In forming this decision the Local Planning Authority have been fully conscious of the provisions of paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and indeed consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would have severe residual impacts on the local road network."

Also:

"... the proposed development is considered to be contrary to paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), policies SS6 and LD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 16 October 2015 and objective TRO1 together with policy TRP6 of the adopted Malvern Hills Management Plan 2019-2024."

And also:

"... contrary to the provisions of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) entitled 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' and policies SS6 and LD4 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 16 October 2015."

And therefore:

"As such, the proposal is not considered to represent sustainable development."

2.5.2. Herefordshire Core Strategy and the Ledbury Neighbourhood Plan sets out a planned sustainable strategy for housing delivery and growth of the town, utilising a strategic allocation to deliver around 625 dwellings, with the remainder delivered through appropriate windfall development and existing commitments.

- 2.5.3. The site's environmental sensitivities and dimensions are also further addressed by evidence for the Town Council on landscape.
- 2.5.4. The site's highways, transport and sustainability issues are also further addressed by evidence for the Town Council on highways.
- 2.5.5. The site's heritage sensitivities are further addressed by evidence for the Town Council on heritage.
- 2.5.6. It is considered all of the development plan policies are consistent with the NPPF, but because the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, the housing policies are deemed to be out of date by virtue of paragraph 11, footnote 7. However the housing supply shortfall stems from shortfalls outside of Ledbury and that Ledbury is delivering its housing requirement and as such this should increase the weight that is given to the breach of the relevant housing policies. The weight to be afforded to 'out of date' policies is for the decision maker as established in caselaw (CD.12). Neither paragraph 49 of the NPPF nor paragraph 14 prescribes the weight to be given to policies in a plan which are out of date. Neither of those paragraphs of the NPPF says that a development plan whose policies for the supply of housing are out of date should be given no weight, or minimal weight, or, indeed, any specific amount of weight. The weight to be given to such policies is not dictated by government policy in the NPPF. Nor is it, or could it be, fixed in the case law of the Planning Court. It will vary according to the circumstances, including, for example, the extent to which the policies actually fall short of providing for the required five-year supply, and the prospect of development soon coming forward to make up the shortfall.
- 2.5.7. [Edward Ware Homes v SSCLG \[2016\] EWHC 103 \(Admin\)](#) references the above From [Crane v SSCLG \[2015\] EWHC 425 \(Admin\)](#) and further states with regards to the

weight to apply to housing policies is an assessment to be made by and a matter of judgement for the decision maker taking into account such matters as the nature of the shortfall and the reasons for, or causes of, that shortfall and any evidence as to how it is likely to be overcome.

2.5.8. The decision-maker may consider such matters as whether a failure to provide a 5 year supply for the district is in fact attributable to problems with delivering sites in a discrete part of the district, whether reliance upon the development proposed to address the shortfall would breach the objectives of a distribution policy which continue to be soundly justified and whether the shortfall will be addressed within an appropriate timescale by other means which would not breach the distribution policy.

2.5.9. As set out above and with regards this appeal, it is noted that it is located in a Parish that is providing clarity on its growth through the Ledbury Neighbourhood Plan (NDP). The NDP was adopted in January 2019 and is currently in the process of being updated, as is the Herefordshire Core Strategy/Local Plan 2011-2031 (CS/LP). At the Parish level there is certainty on how the minimum growth would be met and far exceeded. The adopted NDP is in conformity with the CS/LP and the appeal site is included in the NDP as being a site which is suitable, in principle, to come forward to contribute to the delivery of the minimum of 800 new dwellings planned as the sustainable growth deliverable by the town during the current CS/LP period. The Ledbury NDP has been assessed by an independent Examiner ([Ref Examiner Report – Ledbury NDP](#)).

2.5.10. The growth evidenced within the Parish early in the CS/LP period demonstrates that it has already significantly boosted the supply of housing in this area.

2.5.11. In addition, the policies most relevant for this appeal are consistent with the NPPF. In particular, the requirement for the access to be satisfactory under Policy LB2. This

consistency with the NPPF further increases the weight that out to be attached to this policy, and its breach by this proposal

3. The Development Plan

This section confirms the composition of the “development plan” in Herefordshire; introduces the spatial strategy and its focus on sustainable development; sets out the current position with regard to housing land supply; and summarises the strategic policy provisions for rural housing delivery

3.1. Overview

3.1.1. The Core Strategy sets out a spatial strategy for Herefordshire for the period 2011-2031.

It is based on a comprehensive understanding of the County’s particular social, economic and environmental characteristics and key issues, detailed in Chapter 2 of the Strategy. A keen appreciation of the many components of environmental quality and their interaction includes recognition of the richness and diversity of the County’s natural environment.

3.1.2. Herefordshire’s high quality environment, including its landscapes, also has an economic dimension, as an attractive place to live, work, visit and invest; and a social and cultural dimension in supporting the health and wellbeing of its inhabitants (paragraphs 3.90 and 3.91).

3.1.3. **Three Themes:** The overall vision for the county starts to flesh out what this means for Herefordshire, explicitly recognising the interactions between the three themes of **social progress, economic prosperity and environmental quality:**

“Vision for the county: Herefordshire will be a place of distinctive environmental, historical and cultural assets and local communities, with sustainable development fostering a high quality of life for those who live, work and visit here. A sustainable future for the county will be based on the interdependence of the themes of social progress, economic prosperity and environmental quality with the aim of increasing the county’s self-reliance and resilience.” (paragraph 3.05)

3.1.4. **Twelve Objectives:** The three themes are further developed into 12 objectives,

including under environmental quality, the reinforcement of local distinctiveness:

To achieve sustainable communities and protect the environment by delivering well-designed places, spaces and buildings, which use land efficiently, reinforce local distinctiveness and are supported by the necessary infrastructure including green infrastructure (Figure 3.1, objective 10).

To address the causes and impacts of climate change by “To conserve, promote, utilise and enjoy our natural, built, heritage and cultural assets for the fullest benefits to the whole community by safeguarding the county’s current stock of valued heritage and significant environmental assets from loss and damage, reversing negative trends, ensuring best condition and encouraging expansion, as well as appropriately managing future assets” (Figure 3.1, objective 12).

3.1.5. The spatial strategy which has been developed to deliver the vision and objectives is then set out through a series of policies, arranged within the three themes of sustainable development. Paragraph 3.33 states that:

“the plan seeks to encourage new development which supports and enhance access to local services and tackle issues of rural housing affordability, giving consideration to neighbourhood planning. The location and level of development allocated o settlements will be determined though the preparation of a Rural Areas Site allocations development Plan Documents or Neighbourhood development Plans.”

The Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan was made on 11 January 2019 and is discussed in more detail later in this proof.

3.2. Spatial strategy:

3.2.1. The role of the strategy is to achieve an appropriate balance between improving quality of life (social progress) and economic prosperity for all and the protection of the county’s environmental assets, making sure that any necessary change and development is sustainable in the interests of future generations (para 3.17).

3.2.2. **Sustainable Development:** The aim of the spatial strategy is to provide for growth

whilst protecting and enhancing the attractive and distinctive character of the different areas of the County, so that sustainable development is achieved. Most development in the plan is focussed within and adjoining urban areas in the interests of sustainable development i.e. reducing the need to travel by private car where possible (para 3.19).

3.2.3. **Climate Change:** The spatial strategy aims to address the impacts of climate change by locating the majority of growth in places with good, sustainable transport links and jobs and services, thereby reducing the need to travel by private car (para 3.23).

3.2.4. **Movement and Transportation:** The spatial strategy itself aims to direct the location of significant new development proposed through the plan to the more accessible locations in the county to promote the use of existing nearby services and facilitate the use of active travel (walking and cycling) as well as public transport. This principle is stated as applying to all new significant development proposals that come forward through the plan period. The strategy also requires policies to minimise the impact of additional highway demand generated by new development on the transport network, so that journey times, journey time reliability, public realm and highway safety in the county do not deteriorate.

3.2.5. Importantly, the strategy identifies that transport and movement can play an important and positive role in contributing to sustainable development; delivering air quality improvements and removing vehicular movements from pedestrian and other areas to improve journey time and connectivity across the county.

3.2.6. **SS4 – Movement and Transportation:** This policy begins by stating:

“New developments should be designed and located to minimise the impacts on the transport network; ensuring that journey times and the efficient and safe operation of the network are not detrimentally impacted.”

It goes on to state:

“Herefordshire Council will work with the Highways Agency, Network Rail, bus and train operators, developers and local communities to bring forward improvements to the local and strategic transport network to reduce congestion, improve air quality and road safety ...”

And also:

“Development proposals incorporating commercial vehicular movements that could detrimentally impact on the environmental quality, amenity, safety and character of the surrounding locality will be expected to incorporate evidence demonstrating how the traffic impacts are to be mitigated.”

3.2.7. **Local Transport Strategy & Plan (LTP):** This plan sets out programmes of work for achieving the council’s objectives for transport, accessibility and pollution control which positively contribute to addressing climate change. The CS/LP requires developers to provide evidence showing how their proposed developments will deliver against those objectives.

3.2.8. For the market towns and for Ledbury in particular the LTP identifies one of the key challenges for the county council to be:

“Ensuring new development does not have negative impact on local transport networks and that we can help residents live healthier lives.”

The opportunities identified relevant to the appeal site are achieving:

“Balanced growth proposals will help sustain communities providing potential demand to help sustain core bus network, limited impact in terms of highway capacity.”

And also:

“Contributions from new development to help support local transport improvements and buses/community transport”

3.2.9. Key strategy elements identified in the LTP for the market towns include:

- *“Negotiation with private developers to ensure on and off-site measures to limit the traffic demands from new developments and encourage active modes, road*

safety and access for people without private car

- *Developing rail access improvements with station reviews (Leominster and Ledbury) to consider parking, integration with bus services, cycle access and disabled access.”*

Key improvements in the market towns that are identified in the LTP include:

- *“Working with local communities to design and deliver local improvements.*
- *Market towns transport and public realm improvements.”*

3.2.10. The CS/LP expands on Policy SS4 where it states:

“Herefordshire Council will work in partnership with the Highways Agency, Network Rail, bus and rail operators, developers and the community to achieve improvements to the public transport network. This may include improving both the quality and quantity of the service on offer. Land and routes will be safeguarded from inappropriate development and identified in site specific plans.”

3.2.11. **SS6 – Environmental quality and local distinctiveness:** This policy begins by stating:

“Development proposals should conserve and enhance those environmental assets that contribute towards the county’s distinctiveness, in particular its settlement pattern, landscape, biodiversity and heritage assets and especially those with specific environmental designations. In addition, proposals should maintain and improve the effectiveness of those ecosystems essential to the health and wellbeing of the county’s residents and its economy. Development proposals should be shaped through an integrated approach to planning the following environmental components from the outset, and based upon sufficient information to determine the effect upon each where they are relevant.”

Environmental components specifically mentioned include:

- *landscape, townscape and local distinctiveness, especially in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;*
- *historic environment and heritage assets, especially Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings;*
- *local amenity, including light pollution, air quality and tranquillity;*

Further, the policy states:

- *assessments of local features, areas and sites, defining local distinctiveness in other development plan documents, Neighbourhood Development Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents should inform decisions upon proposals.*”

3.2.12. **Sustainable Communities:** The CS/LP states:

“The strategic growth areas avoid locations at high risk of flooding wherever possible, to protect against loss of life and recurring damage to property.”

Further, the strategy states:

“Management Plans have been prepared for both the Wye Valley and Malvern Hills Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These documents will be relevant to the assessment of effects of development upon these important assets. The most rigorous approaches to assessing the effect of development should be taken for those areas with international and national designations, including proposals in areas outside but having an effect upon them, in accordance with the protection afforded to such areas in the National Planning Policy Framework. Sites and features of local importance should also receive an appropriate level of protection when determining the effects of proposals upon the environment and local distinctiveness.”

3.2.13. **Protecting the environment:** The CS/LP states:

“The location of new development proposed should deliver sites that, protect and/or enhance Herefordshire’s natural, built, heritage and cultural assets in the county’s cathedral city, historic market towns, smaller settlements and distinctive countryside.”

Further, the strategy states:

“The protection of residential and local amenity is essential to ensuring local communities are and remain sustainable. Amenity considerations include such issues as noise, air quality and lighting amongst others. Within the wider context, the issues of tranquillity and intrinsically dark landscapes may also be material considerations.

3.2.14. **Policy LD1 - Landscape and Townscape:** The policy includes the statement that:

“Development proposals should:

- *demonstrate that character of the landscape and townscape has positively influenced the design, scale, nature and site selection, protection and enhancement*

of the setting of settlements and designated areas;

- *conserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic beauty of important landscapes and features, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty [AONB], nationally and locally designated parks and gardens and conservation areas; through the protection of the area's character and by enabling appropriate uses, design and management;"*

3.2.15. **Malvern Hills AONB:** The Management Plan for the Malvern Hills AONB and its supporting guides are relevant to the interpretation of LD1 in the context of the appeal site.

3.2.16. **Policy MT1 – Traffic Management:** The strategy references the LTP in defining the hierarchy of the road network in the county, which is given as follows:

- *“the strategic highway network - comprising the M50, A49, A465, and A40. The strategic highway links Hereford with the market towns and provides the principal routes into and throughout the county;*
- *main distributor roads which comprise mainly A class routes that supplement the strategic network;*
- *secondary distributor roads which comprise mainly B and C class roads that link movements to and from the main distributor network; and*
- *local distributor roads that facilitate movement between rural settlements and parishes.*

3.2.17. The detail of the policy states that:

Development proposals should incorporate the following principle requirements covering movement and transportation:

1. *demonstrate that the strategic and local highway network can absorb the traffic impacts of the development without adversely affecting the safe and efficient flow of traffic on the network or that traffic impacts can be managed to acceptable levels to reduce and mitigate any adverse impacts from the development;*
2. *promote and, where possible, incorporate integrated transport connections and supporting infrastructure (depending on the nature and location of the site), including access to services by means other than private motorised transport;*

3. *encourage active travel behaviour to reduce numbers of short distance car journeys through the use of travel plans and other promotional and awareness raising activities;*
4. *ensure that developments are designed and laid out to achieve safe entrance and exit, have appropriate operational and manoeuvring space, accommodate provision for all modes of transport, the needs of people with disabilities and provide safe access for the emergency services;*
5. *protect existing local and long distance footways, cycleways and bridleways unless an alternative route of at least equal utility value can be used, and facilitate improvements to existing or provide new connections to these routes, especially where such schemes have been identified in the Local Transport Plan and/or Infrastructure Delivery Plan; and*
6. *have regard to with both the council's Highways Development Design Guide and cycle and vehicle parking standards as prescribed in the Local Transport Plan - having regard to the location of the site and need to promote sustainable travel choices.*

Where traffic management measures are introduced they should be designed in a way which respects the character of the surrounding area including its landscape character. Where appropriate, the principle of shared spaces will be encouraged.

3.2.18. Ledbury bypass provides the main route by which the A449 and A438 main distributor roads connect to Junction 2 of the M50 as the one of the key elements of the strategic highway network for the county. The bypass also provides the means by which people travelling along the local distributor networks access the strategic highway network. This plays a central part in making Ledbury a strong home location for people who commute to work elsewhere and plays a significant part in maintaining high house prices locally.

3.2.19. The bypass represents one of the key pieces of local transport infrastructure designed specifically both to protect the Conservation Area and heritage and listed buildings comprising the majority of The Homend/High Street/Southend/Worcester Road/New

Street main distributor network coming together in the town centre.

3.3. Place Shaping Policies

3.3.1. For each urban area place shaping policies and proposals are set out in the CS/LP, including a range of broad locations where larger scale or strategic development is proposed. For clarification and for the absolute avoidance of any doubt - the Core Strategy **does not identify specific development sites**. For the purpose of the Core Strategy, **a strategic location is generally defined** as around 500 or above homes for Hereford, around 100 or above homes within the market towns or around 5 hectares or above for employment land. For Ledbury there are two Place Shaping policies – LB1 and LB2.

3.3.2. **Place Shaping-Ledbury:** This section of the Core Strategy identifies that Ledbury will continue to be supported in its role as a thriving service centre to the surrounding rural area to the east of the County (para 4.5.1). The spatial strategy, which proposes sustainable development for the town, is balanced against Ledbury’s unique needs, opportunities and constraints.

3.3.3. According to 2011 Census data (2011 ledbury_2011_census_profile) Ledbury currently has a population of over 9,600 of which more than 25% are above retirement age (nearly 5% higher than the national average). Over 80% of households have one or more cars and 35% of households have two or more cars. 40% of local residents commute more than 10km to work with 70% of travelling by car/van, 1.5% using a bus and 1.8% travelling by train. Only 5% of residents work from home.

3.3.4. **Policy LB1 – Development in Ledbury:** sets out the spatial strategy for Ledbury. The policy states that:

“Ledbury will accommodate a minimum of 800 new homes balanced with a minimum of 15 hectares of new employment land during the plan period. The majority of new

housing development will be focussed to the north of the town as set out in Policy LB2 and the strategic location for new employment of around 12 hectares to the west of the town, south of Little Marcle Road. Further development will take place through the implementation of existing commitments, infill development, and sites allocated through a Neighbourhood Development Plan. A number of sites which have future potential for development have been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

3.3.5. In particular the policy states that:

“Within Ledbury, new development proposals will be encouraged where they:

- maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the existing town centre. Proposals for new retail, leisure or office development of over 400m² in gross floor space and located outside the town centre will need to be supported by an impact assessment to determine whether there could be any adverse impacts on the town centre;*
- protect and enhance its green infrastructure, including connections to the public right of way network and biodiversity, particularly the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the east and the Leadon Valley to the west;*
- protect and enhance the setting of the town from eastern and western viewpoints; and, where this is not possible, incorporate appropriate mitigation measures; and*
- have demonstrated engagement and consultation with the community including the town council.”*

3.3.6. **Policy LB2 – Land north of the Viaduct:** sets out the policy requirements for the appeal site. The policy states that the development shall deliver:

- 1. mixed use development of around 625 new homes, at an average density of around 40 dwellings per hectare, comprising a mix of market and affordable house sizes and types that meet the requirements of Policy H3 and the needs identified in the latest version of the Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment;*
- 2. around 3 hectares of employment land, restricted to Use Class B1;*

3. *a target of 40% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable housing;*
4. *land and contributions to facilitate a restored canal to be delivered in partnership with the Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Trust;*
5. *a new linear informal park to link to the existing town trail, riverside walk, recreational open space and existing allotments;*
6. *the provision of developer contributions towards any identified need for new/improved community facilities/infrastructure improvements. This shall include a new 210 place primary school within the development (or an expansion of the existing primary school) and new recreational open space, play, indoor and outdoor sport facilities;*
7. *provision of satisfactory vehicular access arrangements, the details of which will be determined at planning application stage;*
8. *appropriate mitigation to safeguard the amenity of future occupants from unacceptable levels of noise and to safeguard the continued operation of existing businesses adjoining the area;*
9. *development of bespoke, high quality and inclusive design, including accommodation that will meet the needs of older persons and that contributes to the distinctiveness of this part of Ledbury and respects the setting and significance of the listed viaduct and the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;*
10. *safeguards to ensure there is no adverse impact on water quality and quantity in the River Leadon;*
11. *new walking, cycling and bus links from the urban extension directly to the town trail and riverside walk under the viaduct, the railway station and town centre to create linkages to nearby development and existing community facilities;*
12. *sustainable standards of design and construction; and*
13. *a comprehensive sustainable urban drainage system which includes measures such as rain gardens and swales to manage ground and surface water drainage and safeguard against any increased flood risk.*

3.3.7. Para 4.5.3 expands on the spatial strategy for Ledbury stating that it:

“ ... focuses on delivering high quality, sustainably constructed new homes to meet

housing need and demand, especially for that of smaller open market housing and affordable housing, in this high house price area. It also aims to balance new development against the environmental constraints of this historic market town. The strategy to deliver new homes mainly in a single location is not only economically viable but also limits development mainly to land of medium-low landscape sensitivity and of lesser environmental merit, with regard to agricultural and biodiversity value. The listed viaduct adjoining the area also represents an opportunity to create a bespoke design solution and high quality townscape to meet the needs of all sections of the community including housing for older persons – a need highlighted in the study of the Housing and Support needs of Older People in Herefordshire 2012. Housing will be phased to tie in with the construction and provision of essential new community infrastructure in line with Policy SS3. The remaining housing requirement for Ledbury will be delivered through existing commitments, windfalls and the allocation of sites through a Neighbourhood Development Plan.”

3.3.8. Para 4.5.5 expands on the plans for additional employment land stating that:

“Land north of the viaduct will also include around 3 hectares of employment land (in addition to any existing commitments), which will be restricted to use class B1 (light industry, offices, research and development) in order to complement the larger employment area. Small-scale sites for employment use will also be identified through a Neighbourhood Development Plan.”

3.3.9. Paras 4.5.7-9 expand on the plans for movement stating that:

“The policy approach for movement in Ledbury is based on reducing the need to travel by private car. This will be achieved by locating new development within walking and cycling distance of existing and new facilities (including the railway station) and improving and extending sustainable transport routes. ...”

“Vehicular, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the housing site will need to be provided with additional sustainable transport links to the station. A reduction in the speed limit along the Bromyard Road and improvements to the Hereford Road/Bromyard Road junction are also likely to be required to improve the design, safety and efficiency of this road and junction. These, and any other highway improvements, will be informed by a traffic assessment, and will be considered as part of the Council’s determination of planning applications on the site.”

“The issue of car parking supply and demand at the railway station and in the town centre will be addressed through a Neighbourhood Development Plan. With regards parking to serve the railway station, the opportunity may exist for an underground overspill car park on land north of the railway line which could be funded through community infrastructure levy monies, subject to landowner agreement.”

- 3.3.10. Para 4.5.14 expands on the plans for respecting the heritage and archaeological value of the appeal site:

“A landmark feature of Ledbury is its railway viaduct which is Grade II listed. Any development of the viaduct site will need to respect the setting and significance of the viaduct, yet regard it as a positive feature to be integrated within, and inform the detailed master planning and design of, any scheme.”

- 3.3.11. Para 4.5.17 expands on the plans for surface water management and fluvial/pluvial flooding as a consequence of the development of the appeal site:

“The west of Ledbury is prone to flooding from the River Leadon. The physical development within the urban extension and employment area will need to demonstrate through a flood risk assessment that the housing, employment, play and sports facilities avoids the areas that are vulnerable to flooding and does not increase flood risk for any existing residents and businesses. Additionally, the urban extension and employment area should include a sustainable surface water drainage management system, incorporating features such as swales and ponds, sensitively integrated with the development, to achieve existing or better than existing greenfield runoff rates..”

4. Ledbury Local Planning Context

The Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan (Ref: Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan) was made on 11 January 2019. It now forms part of the Development Plan for Herefordshire. The Examiners Report is in (Ref Ledbury NDP Examiner Report)

4.1. Housing Delivery in Ledbury

4.1.1. The policy for Ledbury focuses on delivering high quality, sustainably constructed new homes to meet housing need and demand, especially for that of smaller open market housing and affordable housing, in this high house price area. It also aims to balance new development against the environmental constraints of this historic market town.

4.1.2. Herefordshire Core Strategy and the Ledbury Neighbourhood Plan sets out a planned sustainable strategy for housing delivery and growth of the town, utilising the strategic allocation of the appeal site to deliver around 625 dwellings with the remainder delivered through appropriate windfall development and existing commitments.

4.1.3. To be crystal clear on the matter: the Town Council supports the principle of this development and welcomes sustainably planned housing and employment which meets local needs, and which delivers this in the optimum manner.

4.2. Ledbury NDP

4.2.1. The Ledbury Neighbourhood Development Plan was made on 11 January 2019. It now forms part of the Development Plan for Herefordshire. The appeal site is referenced and acknowledged within the NDP, which states when combined with two other large-scale housing sites – *‘together amount to commitments of over 1,000 homes which the LNDP supports’*.

4.2.2. With regards to housing delivery the NDP states:

‘It is considered that these sites, in conjunction with the site allocated by the LNDP and windfall sites that will come forward ..., more than meet the needs of the town in

terms of housing provision over the plan period.

4.2.3. Whilst the NDP does not have site specific housing allocation or delivery policies, it is clear it can and will deliver in excess of the Core Strategy minimum requirement target of 800 dwellings.

4.2.4. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is designed to protect communities from becoming overdeveloped when they can evidence they are delivering development locally and are participating positively in the local planning process when their LPA isn't being as successful at doing likewise. It would be perverse to require any NDP to evidence the allocation of sites, just for the sake of it, if these aren't needed to meet the housing requirement.

4.2.5. Due to the timing of the publication of the NDP, it was examined under the provisions set out in para 214 of the NPPF. The NDP Examiners Report states:

“It is clear that Ledbury can deliver well in excess of the 800 dwelling minimum target, through the delivery of the strategic urban extension and planning permissions alone. This does not take into account the inclusion of other, smaller, housing developments that have already come forward during the plan period, or which may come forward as windfall developments in the future.

The Examiner then concluded:

“There is no requirement for neighbourhood plans to allocate land for development and in this case, it is evident that Ledbury is more than capable of meeting strategic policy requirements in respect of housing and housing land, without allocating any sites for residential development.”

4.2.6. Windfall sites accommodating four or less dwellings provide just under half of the total housing completions over the past ten years. The Council has stated in a recent appeal submission relating to Ledbury (APP/W1850/A/W/19/3225309) that it considers it realistic and reasonable to expect 100 windfall units will be delivered per year over the

next 5 years (in line with the windfall estimate set out in the Core Strategy).

4.2.7. Based on past trends and the number of windfall sites that are currently either undetermined applications or at an advanced stage of preparation, this is considered to be a conservative estimate of what is likely to be delivered. The Ledbury NDP supports windfall development within the town.

4.3. Wellington Heath NDP (Ref XXX)

4.3.1. This document, adopted 18 October 2018, identifies that a safe walking route between the village and Ledbury is required in Policy WH16. Currently there are significant numbers of pedestrians, particularly in the summer months, using both the Beggar's Ash and Burton's Lane routes to walk between Ledbury and the village. These pedestrians are mainly seasonal agricultural workers employed by the large intensive agriculture operations which are located in Wellington Heath and in the margins of the Ledbury parish adjacent to Wellington Heath.

4.3.2. Contrary to the statements in the Transport Assessment, Environmental Assessment and Residents Travel Plan made regarding pedestrians using the Bromyard Road and lanes into the AONB, There are significant numbers of pedestrians using these routes, particularly during the late spring, summer and early autumn seasons. Any increase in the traffic along the Bromyard Road will inevitably impact upon their safety, if safe off-road walking options are not available.

4.3.3.

4.3.4.

4.3.5.

5. Housing Land Supply

- 5.1.1. The Town Council accepts that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
- 5.1.2. The Council's latest published housing supply position is set out in the Annual Position Statement published in July 2019 which sets out the Council's five year land supply position as of 1st April 2019 for the 5 year period 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2024.
- 5.1.3. It is the Council's position that it can demonstrate a 4.05 year supply of deliverable sites.
- 5.1.4. Further, the permissions granted for new housing in the housing market area or 'Locality' surrounding Ledbury demonstrates that whilst there may be constraints presently on development in some parts of the county, in the Ledbury area housing is actually coming forward in advance of the planned delivery profile.
- 5.1.5. That said, since 2015 when the CS/LP was adopted for Herefordshire, Ledbury has faced a number of large-scale unplanned development applications located primarily to the south of the town. Two of these applications have received planning permission, one for 100 dwellings and one for up to 320 dwellings. Both of these commitments are recognised in the NDP.
- 5.1.6. In addition to these existing commitments, Bovis have submitted an application for 140 dwellings (Application Ref: P192482/O) which is also located to the south of the town. This development is recommended for approval by planning officers. It forms the first tranche of development on a large land option block held by Bovis which was brought to the attention of the Inspector at EIP of the draft Core Strategy back in February 2015 (Ref: 2015 CS EIP 326_Matter7_Ledbury_Bloor Homes with Appendix). Bovis proposed this as a more easily deliverable, sustainable and better located site for a

strategic development than the appeal site proposed for Ledbury in the Core Strategy. Bovis stated their land options were sufficient to deliver in excess of 625 dwellings over the plan period, and the site connects directly onto the town's bypass.

- 5.1.7. The argument that Ledbury has additional developable, deliverable and sustainable locations for housing, as alternative options to the appeal site, was most recently confirmed in October 2019 in the decision report of the Inspector hearing Appeal: APP/W1850/A/W/19/3225309 (Ref 2019 Oct Dymock Road Appeal Inspector Decision Report) which suggests that in excess of 900 dwellings can be delivered on additional alternative sites. At para 72 of her report, the Inspector states:

*“I accept that the Policies are out of date, and the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply which applies across the district as a whole. However, Policy LBI does not place a cap on development, its spatial distribution of housing across the settlement is in accordance with the Framework, and on the face of it, it appears capable of delivering in excess of the required minimum number of dwellings within the plan period taking account of social and environmental factors. While I accept that the Council is in the early stages of addressing its housing shortfall, it seems to me that the continued operation of Policy LBI would not restrict further development coming forward in an appropriate location. Indeed, it identifies that a number of sites which have future potential for development have been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Council referred me to seven sites to the west of Ledbury which it considers **have the capacity to deliver an extra 950 dwellings**. While the SHLAA is seven years old, I have seen nothing to suggest that the sites may not still be relevant. The Policy therefore still attracts considerable weight.”*

- 5.1.8. It is evident that since the adoption of the CS/LP in 2015 Ledbury has not developed in accordance with northerly direction of growth proposed in its Place Shaping policies. And that there is demonstrably available and deliverable sites other than the appeal site, which have already been assessed as such in the CS/LP SHLAA, that are capable of delivering in excess of the minimum housing growth target for the town over the plan

period. This fact should be borne in mind when considering whether, on balance, the appeal site proposals are acceptable and satisfactory.

5.1.9. On this basis, Core Strategy Policy SS1 echoes the test posed by NPPF paragraph 11: whether the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

6. Planning Process Issues

6.1. Screening and Scoping Requirement

6.1.1. In a report dated 17 May 2016 the case officer for the application issued an EIA Screening and Scoping Opinion Report & Decisions document to the appellant. This report specifically requested that

Transportation

A full assessment needs to be carried out as to alternative arrangements with respect vehicular means of access(es). The following alternatives must be assessed:-

- A through road linking the Hereford Road (A417 / A438) roundabout to the Bromyard Road (B4214);
- A single vehicular means of access from the Hereford Road (A417 / A438) roundabout;
- A single vehicular means of access off the Bromyard Road (B4214);
- Two individual (not linked) vehicular means of accesses – one from the Hereford Road (A417 / A438) roundabout and one from the Bromyard Road (B4214).

Such an assessment would need to be in depth. In terms of a vehicular means of access off the Hereford Road roundabout under the railway viaduct a detailed design analysis and drawings would be required to ascertain whether such a vehicular access is physically achievable.

Then with respect all four alternatives the full environmental impacts would need to be assessed including:-

6.1.2. The full requirement issued by the Case Officer can be found starting at **p17 in the June 2018 BWB Environmental Assessment Vol 3 Appendix 1.3 (RefXX)**.

6.2. Use of Environment Assessment Data

6.2.1. The appellant sought to discharge this responsibility through the mechanism of its Environmental Assessment carried out by BWB and submitted with its appendices to the LPA in June 2018. The EA suggested that the environmental impact of each of the access options was similar and argued that, as a consequence of that, only the appellant's preferred access option from solely the Bromyard Road need be considered in detail in their Transport Assessment.

6.2.2. The LPA provided a response to the appellant's Transport Assessment and linked EA

by its Highways experts. The response was dated 9 May 2017 and is provided at **Ref XXX HC Highways IntConsResp to July BWB TA-EA**. The consultee response highlights process errors in the way the matter of assessing access options was handled between TA and EA. The comments made were as follows:

“Paragraph 7.1.5 identifies that a range of access options are being considered and that the ES Chapter will ‘identify a preferred access design based on the assessment results. This is not the purpose of an ES. The preferred access option should be determined based on a number of factors, notably highway capacity and accessibility of the site. The ES should then consider the access strategy and whether this is acceptable in environmental terms, identifying any mitigation as appropriate. It would therefore appear that the chronology of preparation has been backward.”

Also:

“As a result of the ES chapter appearing to have been prepared prior to or in isolation of the TA, the ES has not assessed the mitigation proposed in the TA.”

Also:

“The main conclusion drawn is that any of the access options would be acceptable in ES terms. However this is not the purpose of an ES, and in any event the number of technical flaws in the methodology set out here means that the ES transport chapter cannot be reasonably relied upon.”

6.2.3. Specific to the matter of assessing access options the Highways response states:

*“**Viaduct access:** The submitted TA looks to review two access points to the site, firstly the Bromyard Road access and a provision for a vehicle access under the viaduct.*

The TA does not provide any details of any discussions undertaken with Network Rail in regards to using the access under the viaduct and very quickly dismisses using this access as any more than a footway/cycleway and canal route. There is no evidence provided that vehicular access under the viaduct to the Hereford Road/ Leadon Way Roundabout cannot be provided.

A footway / cycleway needs to be provided under the viaduct to the Hereford Road / Leadon Way Roundabout to provide a link to the existing Riverside Park on the western side of Leadon Way adjacent to the River Leadon. The application appears to show such a link provision in the form of a tow path within the canal corridor to be transferred to the Canal Trust. However, the application fails to provide a mechanism for the delivery of the canal and it is understood

that the provision of the tow path would be part of that same engineering operation. If the link were to be provided, the cycle / footway section must be provided prior to occupation.

The access via the viaduct would be advantageous to the highway network as it would significantly reduce the impact of the development onto the Bromyard Road junction and the wider network towards the Town Centre. The issues around Knapp Lane are exacerbated due to not accessing onto the by-pass as discussed further below.

A full and reasoned justification must be provided as to why the viaduct access cannot be provided.

6.3. Withdraw and Review

6.3.1. BWB recommended that a signalised junction would not work at the station junction if the sole access was to be from the Bromyard Road because the delays generated on the Bromyard Road would be unacceptable. BWB recommended a mini roundabout solution, which the Council, as Highway Authority objected to on a number of grounds which this report covers in some detail.

6.3.2. The Highways response to the BWB TA, recommended refusal of the application on the following grounds:

I suggest the following grounds of refusal.

- 1) The proposed development by virtue of the single access strategy does not facilitate a genuine choice of modes of travel including walking, cycling or public transport. The submission fails to demonstrate that the proposed development can be made sustainable through the provision of improved public transport, or walking and cycling infrastructure of a level commensurate with the level of development proposed. It therefore fails to satisfy Policy SS4 of the core strategy.
- 2) It has not been demonstrated that satisfactory vehicular access arrangements are to be provided. Neither are appropriate new walking, cycling and bus links from the proposed urban extension directly to the town trail and riverside walk under the viaduct, the railway station and town centre being proposed. As such the routes proposed will not encourage walking, cycling or the increase use of public transport. As such the residents / employees of the development will be over-reliant on the vehicle use, even when undertaking local journeys. The proposals do not therefore meet the objectives of Policy LB2 to a sufficient or appropriate level.
- 3) The application has failed to demonstrate that the local highway network can absorb the traffic impacts of the development without adversely affecting the safe and efficient flow of traffic on the network or that traffic impacts can be managed to acceptable levels to reduce and mitigate any adverse impact from the development. This is contrary to Policy MT1
- 4) The travel plans submitted in support of the application are not considered detailed enough to encourage travel by sustainable modes, and therefore fail to meet Policy MT1.

6.3.3. As a consequence of this, the Case Officer invited the appellant to withdraw their planning application and reconsider their access strategy. Bloor declined to do so and

chose to appoint a new traffic consultant instead.

6.4. Address Screening and Scoping Requirement

6.4.1. The appellant engaged PJA to be their new highway consultant in the autumn of 2018 and they reviewed the BWB TA and submitted a new one of their own in January 2019. This was accompanied by a revised Transport section to the original BWB EA.

6.4.2. The appellant did not address the requirement of the Case Officer's letter of 17 May 2016 as regards properly assessing their access strategy across the 4 options and a feasibility assessment of a road access under the viaduct, in the TA subsequently produced by PJA.

6.4.3. The appellant did not address the requirement of the Council's Highways Consultee, in his response dated 9 May 2017, that "a full and reasoned justification must be provided as to why the viaduct access cannot be provided", in the TA subsequently produced by PJA.

6.4.4. The appellant did not address the requirement of the Council's Highways Consultee, in his response dated 9 May 2017, that "a full and reasoned justification must be provided as to why the viaduct access cannot be provided", in the TA subsequently produced by PJA.

6.4.5. The vehicle access strategy (**section 4 of the Jan 2019 PJA TA**) only considers: Compliance with the Herefordshire Council 2006 Highways Design Guide, Emergency Access and – as they describe it – "The capacity of the local highway network based upon a single point of access." In the PJA access strategy.

6.4.6. The requirement to comply with the Design Guide is suggested by the appellant as dismissed with the following argument:

4.2.4 The Herefordshire Highway Design Guide for New Developments was published in 2006 and provides typical design criteria for new access roads. The design criteria states that a maximum of 200 dwellings can be served via a single access road with emergency access.

4.2.5 Manual for Streets was subsequently published in 2007 and supersedes the local guidance and this states:

"The length of cul-de-sacs or the number of dwellings have been used by local authorities as criteria for limiting the size of a development served by a single access route. Authorities have often argued that the larger the site, the more likely it is that a single access could be blocked for whatever reason. The fire services adopt a less numbers-driven approach and consider each application based on a risk assessment for the site, and response time requirements."

4.2.6 The emergency planning officer at HC has twice been consulted regarding this application and has not provided a response.

6.4.7. I have enquired as to why no comment on the proposed single site access has been provided by the Emergency Planning Officer at Herefordshire Council and the reply received is included at (Ref 2020 June Response from HC Emergency Planning).

6.4.8. The indicative layout for the site shown in document Ref: Indicative Site Layout. Justification for the sufficiency of the emergency access proposed is as follows:

Emergency Access

4.2.7 In considering the risks of an emergency vehicle being unable to access the site:

- In the event that the site access road becomes blocked, the proposed roundabout provides a second entrance to the development that could be used by all vehicles;
- In the event that the Bromyard Road roundabout becomes blocked, there would be an emergency access off Bromyard Road to the south of the roundabout;
- The development therefore offers two alternative to enable access to the development in the event of an emergency.

6.5. Highway Design Guide

6.5.1. The Core Strategy makes it clear ay para 5.1.55 that:

"development proposals should have regard to the council's LTP while promoting the principles set out in Herefordshire Council's Highway Development Design Guide for New Developments and the Department for Transport's Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 – Wider Application of the Principles (2010) or subsequent documentation.

Consideration will also be given to the Department of Transport Circular 02/2013 and Design Manual for roads and bridges or subsequent documentation.”

6.5.2. The Design Guide not only requires two accesses for any development of more than 300 dwellings but it also requires a distributor road design for such large scale developments. This is exactly the highway format for the New Mills development just the other side of the Hereford Road from the appeal site. It has traffic calming chicanes and speed bumps along its entire length to keep speeds low and services shared space style residential areas which are so safe to move about in that children can play safely in the street – just like they did 50 years ago before the car became king.

6.5.3. If street design has moved on and distributor roads aren't favoured any more, then presumably that can be dealt with in the detailed application. The issue of whether or not a double access is required for the development has not been properly addressed by the appellant. In their latest Transport Assessment the appellant states at para 4.2.6 that: *“The emergency planning officer at HC has twice been consulted regarding this application and has not provided a response.”*

6.5.4. This has been taken by the appellant to signify consent to their proposed single access. Whereas it states clearly in the section of the actual edition of the Manual for Streets quoted from in para 4.2.5 of the TA that it should be the local Fire and Rescue Service that is consulted on this matter and not the local authority's Emergency Planning Officer. Therefore it does not appear therefore that the safety of the proposed single access has been confirmed or approved by the relevant statutory consultee.

6.6. Construction Traffic Management Plan

6.6.1. The PJA Transport Assessment and BWB/PJA Environmental Assessment do not address the matter of the route by which construction traffic is to access the site during the (at least) 6+ year period of site build-out. The latest versions are silent upon the

matter save for proposing to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan at a later stage under reserved matters.

6.6.2. However, the July 2018 BWB TA states the developer may use the viaduct access route through the construction phase as a temporary access to avoid having HGVs make the turns both ways at the station junction and the double journey along the link between the Leadon Way roundabout on the Hereford Road. The January

6.6.3. Since this appeal is to determine all matters relating to access, it is important to be clear regarding the route by which construction vehicles will access the site since this will also impact on the route such vehicles will take on the local road network. Especially when vehicles coming from a Malvern/Worcester direction will travel up New Street to drive straight across the junction onto the A449.

6.6.4. If the Construction Access is to be off the Bromyard Road then the loading on the junctions and environmental impact of likely trips through the sensitive and most direct route along The Homend-High Street–Southend to the motorway needs to be considered. As does the loading on the station-bypass link section containing the pedestrian/cyclist crossings.

6.7. Environment Assessment of Transport Options

6.7.1. As previously the PJA TA relies on the EA assessments to justify the appellant's argument that the Bromyard Road access acceptable without the need to undertake the required review of all four options at the Transport Strategy stage.

6.7.2. Table 7.17 of the January 2019 PJA update to section 7 of the original BWB Environment Assessment (Ref) appears to show errors regarding the number of AADT allocated for the alternative site accesses, compared to the appellant's preferred option. This is particularly obvious for Option 2: Link 2, but is also the case for several of the

other Options and Links in the table – See flow maps at Appendix 1

6.7.3. The traffic flows have an important effect on the assessment of the other environmental impacts, particularly at key locations on the trip network. It is important that these flows are correctly assessed in order to consider the impact on driver and pedestrian/cyclist choice/behaviour – particularly as regards the routes taken for different destinations at key junction/route decision points. At the very least the Transport element of the assessment process does not appear to have been undertaken correctly and therefore this undermines the confidence that can be attributed to the EA overall.

6.7.4. This calls into question whether, without the full option assessment required in the original scoping and screening decision, it is possible to have confidence whether one or more of the access options would have a much better overall environmental assessment than the preferred option.

6.7.5. A loss of confidence in the robustness and accuracy of the EA may be considered to be an important matter, particularly if the Town Council's evidence is considered compelling as regards the robustness and accuracy of the proposed access solution itself.

6.8. Improved parking and access at Ledbury Station

6.8.1. The CS/LP and LTP identify the need for additional car parking and improved access to the eastbound platform of the station. In January 2017 stakeholders were all sent copies of the initial suggestions from the landowner of Old Kennells Farm, Mr Wilce, for how these requirements might be met ([Appendix 1a Ref: 2017 Jan Wilce - Ledbury Station East January 2017](#)). The list of stakeholders provided with draft parking and access proposals for Ledbury station is as follows:

“Herefordshire Council, Network Rail, First Great Western, Malvern Hills AONB, Gareth Davies (train users group), Marches LEP, The Wilce family, Ledbury Town

Council, John Goldrick (platform ticket franchisee), Ledbury Cycle Forum, H&W Chamber of Commerce, All Ledbury parish councillors (as of January 2017), The Ledbury neighbourhood planning committee, Herefordshire Council transport department, Hereford planning department, Hereford High Sheriff (Bill Jackson), Head of Herefordshire Council, Bill Wiggin (MP) who has contacted transport minister Chris Grayling”

6.8.2. As ward member, upon receipt of these proposals, I requested in writing that the Case Officer ensure that the existing access to the farm and the stated requirements of the Council’s adopted strategy and policy documents relating to transport infrastructure improvements at the station be taken into consideration and access routes protected when the options for the configuration of the station junction were considered by the LPA in its role as also the Highways Authority. Working with landowners and stakeholders, and to save routes for future infrastructure provision is stated in both the Council’s adopted CS/LP and LTP.

6.9. Engagement with Network Rail

6.9.1. Malvern Hills District Council undertook a feasibility study in 1997 to explore the deliverability of building a northern extension to the Ledbury bypass (Ref: Viaduct Site Feasibility Study). This proposed an access road to serve the appeal land-block (then allocated as employment land) from the spur provided for that purpose on the Hereford Road/Leadon Way roundabout through both parcels of land to emerge on the Bromyard Road. The reason and requirement for this is covered in more detail in Appendix 2 which documents the planning history of the site. It is reasonable to suppose that both the landowners and Network Rail and/or their predecessor organisation/s were involved and/or consulted for that study.

6.9.2. The study showed the road access was technically feasible and would address the problem that the station junction was, even at that time, operating above its design

capacity, by providing a safe and direct route for vehicles, particularly large or heavy vehicles, travelling to/from a northerly direction.

6.9.3. From 1997 onwards the requirement for a northern extension to the Ledbury bypass was built into Development Plans for MHDC and later for Herefordshire, and the route for the road was saved in policy.

6.9.4. When the CS/LP was being drafted in 2012 and the appeal site was proposed to be reallocated to become housing land, the requirement for the road as planned was built into the original wording of the access policy (LB2) for the site, which was:

“Primary vehicular access to the development will be from the Hereford Road under the viaduct with the option of a secondary access from the Bromyard Road to the north.”

6.9.5. This form of wording continued through several rounds of public consultation on the Core Strategy, and was the form in the adopted draft Core Strategy in 2013, right up until 17 February 2015: the day the Ledbury Place Shaping policies of the Core Strategy were being examined in public.

6.9.6. No objection was raised to the road by Network Rail at any time from 1997 to 2015.

6.9.7. However, the landowners objected. See [Appendix 2](#) for the detail and circumstances of this matter.

6.9.8. As a consequence of the one objection from the landowners’ Council officers proposed alternative wording to the access policy requirement for LB2 which removed the 30 year old requirement for a road connecting to the town’s bypass to be an access the site.

The revised policy wording then became:

“vehicular access to the development will be from either the Hereford Road under the viaduct or from the Bromyard Road to the north”

6.9.9. This wording was consulted upon by the Planning Inspector, along with the rest of the

examined Core Strategy. A significant level of objections were raised to this single policy wording change – around 75% of all the responses received on the entire Core Strategy were from Ledbury area residents about this particular change.

- 6.9.10. The consequence of this high level of public concern was that the Inspector suggested that all mention of an access route be removed from policy LB2, and that the detail of the access be determined at outline planning. She left it up to Council officers to decide for themselves upon the final wording for this aspect of the policy.
- 6.9.11. It is clear from the content of **Appendix 2** that the landowners did not want to have the viaduct access, and that this was for financial reasons. Documentation provided by the landowners in 2014 and dated back to 2011 makes it clear that they were working to secure an access from the Bromyard Road which did not involve paying network rail for permission to pass a road under their flying freehold on the viaduct.
- 6.9.12. It does not appear that the LPA has engaged with Network Rail during the consideration of this application, or prior to that as regards delivery of the long-planned access to the site under the viaduct. This is contrary to the intentions stated in the CS/LP and in the LTP as regards working with stakeholders and partners. The appellant has made a number of statements relating to their engagement with Network rail throughout the assessment period of this development application. However, these have contradicted correspondence from Network Rail made available to the Case Officer by local residents.
- 6.9.13. The BWB Residential Travel Plan February 2017 states at para 4.5-6 that an access under the viaduct, whilst feasible, is not acceptable to Network Rail:

- 4.5 A potential secondary vehicular access to the site via the existing 5 arm roundabout has been reviewed. The northern arm of the existing junction is currently constructed to the end of the splitter island and from here a track extends to the southern boundary of the propose development site. To provide access into the site the current track would be required to be upgraded to a formal access road from the existing arm into the site and would be required to route under the viaduct.
- 4.6 Topographical Survey data obtained confirmed that there is sufficient highway boundary width under the viaduct to construct a new adoptable access road into the development. However discussions have taken place with Network Rail who have land ownership of the existing rail line, who confirmed that they would not accept a carriageway built underneath the viaduct.
- 6.9.14. There was an email exchange between the Case Officer and Bloor in May 2017 regarding para 4.5 of the BWB May 2017 Residential Travel Plan. The series of 3 emails are included at (Appendix 3 Ref 2017 May Inconsistency in Travel Plan statement re Network Rail, plus letters plus Bloor reply) which shared correspondence from Network Rail which was provided to the Case Officer by a local resident.
- 6.9.15. BWB Residential Travel Plan May 2017 states at para 4.5-6:
- 4.5 A potential secondary vehicular access to the site via the existing 5 arm roundabout has been reviewed. The northern arm of the existing junction is currently constructed to the end of the splitter island and from here a track extends to the southern boundary of the propose development site. To provide access into the site the current track would be required to be upgraded to a formal access road from the existing arm into the site and would be required to route under the viaduct.
- 4.6 Topographical Survey data obtained confirmed that there is sufficient highway boundary width under the viaduct to construct a new adoptable access road into the development. This is discussed in further detail in the Transport Assessment.
- 6.9.16. The BWB TA which was contemporaneous with the Residential Travel Plan states that, as already confirmed in text in the CS/LP as regards necessary highway infrastructure improvements, the station junction for the Bromyard/Hereford Roads is already operating above capacity in 2016 and would need to be upgraded under any scenario in which the site was to be developed. See extract below.

Hereford Road/Bromyard Road Junction – Existing Layout

- 10.8 The Hereford Road/Bromyard Road Junction is located south-east of the site and is currently a priority controlled T-junction with a right-turning ghost island lane.
- 10.9 Capacity assessments for all scenarios based on the existing geometry of the junction have been undertaken and the results are summarised in **Table 15** below. The full Junctions 9.0 outputs are shown in **Appendix H**.

Table 15: Hereford Road/Bromyard Road Existing Junction Assessments

	Results			
	AM		PM	
	RFC	Network Residual Capacity	RFC	Network Residual Capacity
2016 'without development'	0.74	5%	0.86	-5%
2016 'with development'	1.51	-38%	1.77	-45%
2026 'without development'	0.85	-5%	0.99	-15%
2026 'with development'	1.67	-41%	1.96	-49%

- 10.10 As identified in **Table 15** above, the existing junction is forecast to operate over capacity in 2016 PM, 2026 AM and PM without development scenarios. The existing junction is also forecast to operate over capacity for all with development scenarios.
- 10.11 Based on the above results, improvement measures are required to mitigate the impact of the additional the development traffic.
- 6.9.17. It seems clear from reading the CS/LP that, as also confirmed in the objection made by Mr A Fussey (Ref: Mr A Fussey ReplsObj 385) , it was fully recognised by Malvern Hills and Herefordshire Councils that the station junction would need to be remodelled if the development site came forward, irrespective of the access.
- 6.9.18. No evidence was provided by the appellant with reference to Network Rail until an email was received 10 minutes before the second Planning Committee meeting in December 2019, which contained a letter from Network Rail which appeared to have been generated at the appellant's request. **Ref: 2019 6 Dec Network Rail letter to Bloor.**
- 6.9.19. No up-to-date feasibility study was undertaken into building a road under the viaduct at any time by the appellant, as was requested by the Case Officer back in 2016.

6.10. Community Engagement

- 6.10.1. The landowners of the appeal site have known for 30 years what is required to deliver a satisfactory access to their land. Historically, they have pleaded that the cost of delivering the required access made the development of the site for employment purposes unviable. During the time this land was allocated for employment land, the landowners have resisted approaches by existing businesses along the Bromyard Road to purchase land contiguous with their existing sites to enable on-site expansion and employment growth in the town.
- 6.10.2. When the development of the Core Strategy came along it was an easy case to make to planners to solve the housing growth ‘problem’ in Ledbury, to propose to flip the site from employment to housing and secure the hefty uplift in land value that the landowners had been holding out for since their last large pay-out when more of their land was developed for the New Mills estate.
- 6.10.3. Shifting the long-planned viaduct access to off the Bromyard Road brings an additional welcome windfall straight to the bottom line, since Network Rail won’t need to be paid their ransom for crossing the flying freehold they own along the route of the viaduct. All that needed to happen to achieve that extra bit of icing on the cake was for the landowners to hold out until the last minute and then, just before EIP, to object to the allocation of their own land for a strategic housing site (very embarrassing to lose one of these in front of the Inspector) on pain of a policy change to enable a perversely non-obvious access to be a policy compliant option.
- 6.10.4. The appellant has known from before the Core Strategy was adopted that the means by which the site was to be accessed would be a critical issue for the delivery of the site and for its acceptability to the community which must accommodate it.

- 6.10.5. All public consultations on the appeal site prior to examination had been clear that the site access would connect to Ledbury's bypass. There was a massive number of objections raised in response to the changes consented to by the Inspector at EIP.
- 6.10.6. It appears that the appellant has signed up to a land option with the owners which has contractually forbidden them from achieving an access under the viaduct to the existing bypass.
- 6.10.7. Despite the way in which the data is presented, it is clear from the developer's own Statement of Community Involvement (Ref 2017 Feb Bloor Stmt of Comm Involvement) at para 4.22 that almost 90% of those attending their pre-submission consultation event told the appellant that the access they proposed to the development was not satisfactory.
- 6.10.8. In the years that have passed since then the view of the community hasn't changed.
- 6.10.9. What also hasn't happened in that time, is that the developer hasn't made any attempt to engage with the community or with the Town Council in an effort to come to some other arrangement. Even though this is what they are required to do, according to the guidance for the Manual for Streets, and according to the requirements for public engagement in the NPPF. That said, there would have been little point in them doing so were their land option agreement to positively excluded such an access.
- 6.10.10. In 2019 when the PJA Transport Assessment had been provided and officer's were advising that the application would be coming to the committee shortly, there was a Parish Meeting at which 98% of those present voted to request that a Parish Poll be held on the question of whether the proposed access was considered 'satisfactory' as the policy requires. There is no qualification or explanation as to what is meant by 'satisfactory', so the community is reasonable to contend that 'satisfactory to the people

who are going to have to live with the development' is as valid a yardstick as any other. The Town Council supported the request of the Parish Meeting and a poll was conducted according to the statutory requirements on 15 August 2019.

6.10.11. The result of the poll was that 95% of those voting said 'No' to the question:

"Land North of the Viaduct' of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy 2011-2031 requires "provision of satisfactory vehicular access arrangements". This site is proposed to contain at least 625 dwellings and 3 hectares of employment land. The developer for this site proposes vehicle access arrangements solely via the Bromyard Road (in Planning Application: 171532),

Do you consider this provision to be 'SATISFACTORY'? Yes/No"

6.10.12. The community of Ledbury has been steadfast for more than 10 years in expressing its view that the longstanding plan for this site to be accessed primarily via our existing bypass is the only sensible, sound and satisfactory means by which this site can come forward for development of any sort.

7. Planning Balance

In accordance with s.38 (6) of the 2004 Act, the application must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Core Strategy constitutes a spatial strategy and policies designed to achieve sustainable development under the three objectives; social, economic and environmental which are also referenced in Para 8 of the NPPF.

7.1. NPPF

7.1.1. **Transport:** The shortcomings, errors and inaccuracies identified in the Town Council Proofs w.r.t. transport matters combine to evidence that the appellant is not able to demonstrate that they have met the requirement to ensure that “safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users”. Consequently, the development, as presently proposed, is **contrary to para 108(b)** of the NPPF.

7.1.2. Although some of the minor shortcomings of the proposed transport measures are capable of being mitigated with further measures, e.g. appropriate lighting, the cumulative residual effects of the development, as presently proposed, are judged to remain severe and the application is therefore also **contrary to para 109** of the NPPF.

7.1.3. **Landscape: Para. 172** requires that ‘*great weight*’ is given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in nationally valuable landscapes such as AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. NPP-Guidance with regard to developments in, and in the setting of, such protected spaces states:

“Land within the setting of these areas often makes an important contribution to maintaining their natural beauty, and where poorly located or designed development can do significant harm. This is especially the case where long views from or to the designated landscape are identified as important, or where the landscape character of land within and adjoining the designated area is complementary. Development within

the settings of these areas will therefore need sensitive handling that takes these potential impacts into account.”

7.1.4. Whilst it is correct to note that, given the contiguous nature of the boundary of the AONB w,r,t, the developed edge of Ledbury to the east, any development on the edge of the existing mass of the town’s built environment would inevitably be “in the setting” of the AONB. However, the issue for the appeal site is that it massively extends the reach of its effect deep into the AONB itself. This is a consequence of the modelled impact that traffic generated, both by the site and as a consequence of other residents acting to avoid the traffic generated by the site, have on the AONB’s lane systems.

7.1.5. Insufficient weight has been given and therefore effort expended by the appellant to avoid and prevent these damaging effects and the development, as presently proposed is therefore **contrary to Para 172**.

7.1.6. Consequently, the independently modelled effects of those vehicle movements also run **contrary to Para 170(a)** which has the objective of protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

7.1.7. **Heritage:** Finally, the heritage evidence demonstrates that the proposal causes less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. I consider the extent of public benefits below, but I do not consider that these outweigh the less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area which must be given considerable weight.

7.1.8. **Sustainable Development**

7.1.9. Notwithstanding the LPA’s lack of an up-to-date supply of housing land, as it relates to Ledbury, the Town Council contends that significant weight should continue to be given to Core Strategy policies in considering this appeal. Specifically, significant weight given to the **policies SS1, SS4 and SS6, MT1 and LD1**; and also afforded to

the specific Ledbury Place Shaping **policies LB1 and LB2**.

7.2. Development Plan

7.2.1. Notwithstanding the LPA's lack of an up-to-date supply of housing land, as it relates to Ledbury, the Town Council contends that significant weight should continue to be given to Core Strategy policies in considering this appeal. Specifically, significant weight given to the **policies SS1, SS4 and SS6, MT1 and LD1**; and also afforded to the specific Ledbury Place Shaping **policies LB1 and LB2**.

7.2.2. **Transport:** The errors, underestimations, and over-optimistic assumptions contained within the appellant's transport assessment and highlighted in the Town Council's Proof combine and compound to present an unrealistic picture of the operation of the appellant's proposed access solution and the traffic management and mitigation measures proposed.

7.2.3. The development is therefore **contrary to policy SS4** which is clear in its requirement that: *"New developments should be designed and located to minimise the impacts on the transport network; ensuring that journey times and the efficient and safe operation of the network are not detrimentally impacted."*

7.2.4. The development is also **contrary to policy MT1** which requires that developments *"Demonstrate that the strategic and local highway network can absorb the traffic impacts of the development without adversely affecting the safe and efficient flow of traffic on the network or that traffic impacts can be managed to acceptable levels to reduce and mitigate any adverse impacts from the development."*

7.2.5. **Landscape:** The policies in the CS/LP build positively upon those of the NPPF with Policy SS6 seeking to: *"conserve and enhance those environmental assets that contribute towards the county's distinctiveness"* especially the county's AONBs of

which the Malvern Hills is one. The policy highlights key environmental components to be considered carefully in the context of planning. These include “*landscape, townscape and local distinctiveness*” which then links on to the requirements of policy LD1.

7.2.6. Policy **LD1** requires that developments “conserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic beauty of important landscapes and features, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty” and that developments demonstrate “protection and enhancement of the setting of settlements and designated areas”.

7.2.7. Reference is also required to the AONB Management Plan and its guidance documents in considering the appropriateness of development. In the case of this appeal the objective **TRO1**: “*To reduce the impact of the motor vehicle whilst promoting a more sustainable approach to accessibility management.*”, and the policy **TRP6**: “*Ensure that new developments on the periphery of the AONB do not give rise to significant traffic increases and associated effects on tranquillity and enjoyment. Seek compensation for such effects where relevant.*” are particularly relevant.

7.2.8. Again, the evidence provided in the Highways Proofs demonstrate that the traffic impacts of the development upon the AONB will be significant in the context of the area’s existing traffic movements and that tranquility and, by association, public enjoyment of the area will be diminished and the environmental asset that is the AONB will be eroded and undermined. Consequently the development, as presently proposed, is **contrary to policies SS6 and LD1** of the CS/LP and also **contrary to TRO1 and TRP6** of the AONB Management Plan.

7.3. NDP

7.3.1. **Planning:** The Ledbury NDP (section 6) recognises and welcomes the opportunity

presented by the CS/LP identifying the general area to the north of the viaduct as having the potential to deliver a large-scale mixed development of housing and employment land for the town. Were landowners and developer willing for this site to be brought forward satisfactorily, the Town Council believes it has the capability to provide much needed affordable housing and employment, community facilities, amenity space and important transport infrastructure in a sustainable manner, as well as open market housing.

7.3.2. However, should the developer and landowner continue to resist providing the previously planned and obvious access connection to the town's existing high quality road network, it is fortunate that credible options for large scale housing growth are available at sustainable locations to the south of the town.

7.3.3. Since the adoption of the CS/LP in 2015, Ledbury has been developing rapidly in a southerly direction. There remains considerable scope for this direction of growth to continue on land blocks already identified as available and developable so it remains certain that Ledbury can deliver on its minimum growth target of 800 homes by 2031 if it proves impossible for this site to come forward in the plan period.

7.3.4. Current commitments will deliver up to 420 new homes with a further 140 likely to be approved within weeks and windfall in the plan period assessed by the LPA of at least 100 dwellings by 2031. This leaves only a further 140 to find to meet the town's required growth. A recent planning appeal decision report identified developable land sufficient to provide up to 950 dwellings.

7.3.5. The future growth and prosperity of Ledbury as a thriving market town in the 21st century is assured – we are the 'Jewel in Herefordshire's Crown' and a nationally renown destination for Independent Shops, Food and Drink, Walking and Cycling,

Heritage and Culture, Grow we shall and grow we must ... we welcome development and developers – but not at any price.

7.3.6. The big decision to be made is whether we continue to grow to the south, or whether we begin also to grow to the north. This appeal casts the die.

8. Summary

- 8.1.1. The Town Council accepts that the principle of the development of the appeal site. However, because the proposed access arrangements are not satisfactory, the development causes substantial harm to the local transport network and is contrary to the development plan taken as a whole. This matter should be given considerable weight in the planning balance.
- 8.1.2. The substantial harm to the local network caused by this development is compounded by the consequent substantial harm caused to the both AONB and to the Conservation Area, both of which should also be given considerable weight in the planning balance. The specific policy conflicts are identified above.
- 8.1.3. The Town Council also accepts that there are economic and housing benefits which would be delivered were this development to come forward. However, such benefits would be consequent upon any similar such development being approved. Further, such benefits would similarly be delivered were this development to come forward with two access points – and better, they would come forward with none of the harmful effects which are consequent upon the development as presently proposed. Therefore I would give such benefits no more than moderate weight in the planning balance.
- 8.1.4. As such, in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the presumption is that permission should be refused.
- 8.1.5. It is recognised that the Council does not have a five-year housing land supply, and as a result the most important policies for determining the application are deemed to be out of date (see footnote 7 of the NPPF). However, for the reasons set out above this does not mean that these policies ought to be given minimal weight. I still consider that these policies ought to be given significant weight in the overall planning balance.

8.1.6. Nor does the presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraph 11(d) apply as:

- i. paragraph 11(d)(i) of the NPPF is engaged as a consequence of the identified harm to the development would cause to the Malvern Hills AONB and to our Conservation Area (the latter of which is not outweighed by the benefits of the development) and
- ii. in any event, the adverse effects of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1.1. This Proof of Evidence is submitted by me, Cllr Harvey, I am not a planning professional or an expert in planning matters. I am an expert in understanding the needs of my community and, hopefully, an adequate advocate on behalf of the residents I represent.
- 9.1.2. This submission is made on behalf of the Town Council in support of the decision of the Planning Committee of the Council to refuse planning permission for an outline planning application for a mixed use development including the erection of up to 625 new homes (including affordable housing), up to 2.9 hectares of B1 employment land, a canal corridor, public open space (including a linear park), access, drainage and ground modelling works and other associated works. All matters are reserved with the exception of access.
- 9.1.3. It is the Town Council's position that the cumulative effects of the proposal's shortcomings and flaws mean that it is not consistent with the objectives of the NPPF the development plan and Ledbury's adopted Neighbourhood Plan when read together as a whole.
- 9.1.4. Overall the adverse effects of this development, as presently proposed, significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits. It is respectfully requested that the appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendix 1

Traffic Flow maps for PJA/BWB EIA Section 7 Table 7.17



Planning PoE -
Appendix 1 Traffic F

Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendix 1a

Plans for Parking and Access at Station – Wilce



2017 Jan Wilce -
Ledbury Station East

Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendix 2

Planning History of the Site



Microsoft Word 97
- 2003 Document

Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendix 3

Network Rail Correspondence



2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra




2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra





2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra


Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendix 4


Additional Files


- 
193 Blencowe
Ledbury Examinaton


- 
Mr A Fussey
RepsObj 385.pdf



manual for
streets.pdf



Indicative Site
Layout.pdf



HC UDP
ledbury_map.pdf



HC UDP
chapter_8_transport


- 
HC Highways
IntConsResp to July



2020 June
Response from HC E



2019 Oct Dymock
Road Appeal Inspec



2019
Malvern-Hills-AONB



2019 Jan Ledbury
NDP_october_2018.p


- 
2019 Declaration of
2019 6 Dec Network



2018 June BWB
Rail letter to Bloor.p



2018 June BWB
Residential Travel PI



2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra



2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra


- 
2017 May
Inconsistency in Tra



2017 May BWB
Residential Travel PI



2017 Jan Wilce -
Ledbury Station Eas



2017 Feb BWB
Residential Travel PI



2017 Feb Bloor Stmt
of Comm Involvement


- 
2016
local_transport_plar



2015 post EIP
main_modifications_



2015 CS EIP pre-EIP
letter_from_blencow



2015 CS EIP
matters_and_issues.



2015 CS EIP
local_plan_inspecto


- 
2015 CS EIP
local_plan_inspecto



2015 CS EIP
letter_from_blencow



2015 CS EIP
CG5_Blencowes.pdf



2015 CS EIP A10
Summary of Main Pc



2015 CS EIP
326_Matter7_Ledbur


- 
2015 CS Adopted
core_strategy_sectio



2014 CS PSP
Consultation Comm



2014 CS EIP
pre-submission_put



2013 July 19 FC
Adopted Draft CS


2013
sedraft_core_strategy_

- 
2011
ledbury_2011_censu


2010 Analysis
Schedules mt ra gp.


2008 Core Strategy
Developing Options


Ms J Burgess Reps
PINS.pdf