

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 1

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
	11/13/19		How do the house building requirement numbers for Walford Parish compare with the National average?	This is a bit of a difficult one to answer, without going through each of the individual council areas requirements. Addition to response: This paper provides an insight into the complexity of housing requirements nationally https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7671/CBP-7671.pdf	
	11/13/19		Is 14% requirement a national number?	The 14% figure that has been applied by Herefordshire Council across "rural areas" to meet its overall housing requirements. It is not a National requirement, other councils will have had their own targets set.	
	11/13/19		Does the number required of the plan refer to "physically built" or just "planning approved"?	Neither. As part of our plan we must demonstrate the potential to reach the numbers required. Whether developers wish to build or not is outside the control of the plan.	
	11/13/19		Will the National Framework and Core Strategy alter with changes in government and how does that affect our plan?	Quite likely, and of course there will be a knock-on effect into our plan that will require adjustment. We can, however, construct our plan in a manner that provides flexibility and avoids constraints, to minimise the impact of any imposed changes.	
	11/13/19		What is the role of consultants?	Their role is multi-purpose. First, they bring expertise in planning, data analysis and understanding the construction of NDPs having expertise in all these areas. They also provide a degree of independence.	
	11/13/19		Will Hereford Planning Authority refer to our plan at all before it is adopted? Is there a stage that it becomes more relevant to planning decisions?	The plan gains weight as it progresses. So, once we have a draft plan in place, Herefordshire Planning Authority will reference it to some extent during planning decision making. It will not become fully part of the process until it is adopted.	
	11/13/19		What has happened to all the work undertaken by previous steering groups?	All that has been achieved in the past is being taken forward by the new Steering Group. It will of course need to be understood and verified as still relevant, particularly as some of the information is quite old.	The steering group has commissioned a further site assessment to address new sites available now and a number of issues with the old report.
	11/13/19		Are the sites offered going to meet our required quota?	At this stage there appears to be enough sites that may be suitable to meet the number for the current plan's requirements. We need to bear in mind that this is a rolling process. The current plan extends to 2031, this will be followed by a subsequent plan, most likely with a different number of houses required.	
	11/13/19		I attended a very similar, and equally enthusiastic meeting in 2017. What is different now?	We have a new council and a new steering team and a renewed energy. We have also engaged consultants to help us with the progressing of the plan, something not done previously. Will that get us to the finish line? It's impossible to say!	
	11/13/19		Where are our settlement boundaries and what is the impact of drawing them?	Our settlement boundaries are a bit of an unknown, we may set them as part of our plan. However, there are implications arising from setting a boundary. Firstly where are Walford (Coughton), Bishopwood and Howie Hill, our local understanding needs to be defined. Secondly where might it be best to draw a boundary where development might be more favourable inside than outside; whose land is inside and whose is outside. We have to do this in a consultative way to make sure it will stand up to scrutiny.	
	11/13/19		Can Herefordshire override the Parish Plan?	Herefordshire planners must take our plan into account when making decisions. However, as with most documents they are open to interpretation. Some things that we may have defined in one way may be taken to be something else by others. Skilful development of our plan will help negate this.	
	11/13/19		Drainage in many areas is becoming a greater problem as water table levels increase. Will new development be required to have mains drainage systems?	Infrastructure is outside the direct remit of the plan, as it is not a planning issue. We have the opportunity of adding our concerns as a note within the plan, but it will have no direct planning decision influence.	
	11/13/19		Are we expecting a flurry of planning applications just before the planned adoption of the plan, to try and get around it's constraints?	Not particularly, the planning process will remain the same and once we have submitted a draft plan it will have some influence on decisions.	
	11/13/19		Will residents still be able to input to individual planning applications as they do now?	Yes, we are not altering any planning processes, merely adding a level of detail to the decision making. Parishioners will continue to be able to comment and lodge objections to planning applications as now.	
	11/13/19		If a site is deemed unsuitable at this stage is that the end of it?	Not necessarily, we are about to re-evaluate the current site assessment using new criteria set by parishioners. It is possible that part of a current site may be deemed suitable, where the whole site is not considered so.	
	11/13/19		Electricity in Walford keeps going off. Will this get worse with more development?	This is much the same as the drainage issues raised in an earlier question. There is not a direct planning requirement for stability of electrical supply. However, we can note our concerns as an appendix to the plan.	
	11/13/19		Two individuals have asked to submit sites for development, is this possible?	As the call for sites exercise was undertaken some time ago, we will be accepting additional sites and reviewing them alongside the existing 16 that have been put forward. Site submission forms will be added to the parish website soon.	The call for sites was extended until end March 2020 and a total of 30 sites is now offered. Site assessments will commence in April.
	3/17/20		How has this target of 91 new dwellings been calculated and given to Walford to fulfil? Further, what types and locations of properties are included in the 30 nr dwellings already committed to? How does this allocation fit with the extensive residential development that is currently taking place within Ross and around the A40?	<u>The target comes from the Herefordshire Core Strategy which in turn is derived from national housing targets allocated to county councils. Basically 91 is 14% of the housing in the parish as at 2011. You can find a map of the 34 houses which are either built or approved on the website (https://walford-ndp.co.uk/the-plan/?eeSFLF_ListFolder=The-Plan/Evidence-Base/Maps). The number of houses required for Walford parish are separate from any adjoining parishes. They have their own targets, which are also 14%. Ross, as one of the market towns, has a slightly higher target to meet. The Core Strategy set all of these targets and how Herefordshire, as a whole, will meet those figures.</u>	
	3/17/20		Walford Parish needs to ask local government which groups of people need housing, what their needs are and then identify appropriate locations for development. As opposed to the other way around. Is this target just a "box ticking exercise"?	The process is one where local government needs to find good solutions to the housing shortage. It is a process of planning and at the end of the day if there is no demand then builders are not going to build. Herefordshire Council has a housing land supply target which is to have identified a minimum of 5 years land supply so the NDP process is geared to support this, but at the end of the day market forces and real needs will be in the lead as far as they are currently.	
	3/17/20		Who are these additional dwellings aimed at, i.e. locals, incomers etc?	The Core Strategy allocates housing numbers by Parish. Studies conducted by Herefordshire Council have indicated that the internal demand for housing is well below the nationally applied target figures. However the targets for Herefordshire as a whole were based on extrapolation of the actual increase in population over the period 1991 to 2011. It is therefore highly likely that many of the new dwellings will be for those moving into the County from outside. We are permitted to take a view on what we anticipate may be the best fit for our Parish and including any affordable housing we feel is locally needed but the market will ultimately determine what is needed.	
	3/17/20		What are the needs that are driving this target?	Basically the needs come from national targets for housing growth and are cascaded down through layers of government.	
	3/17/20		As a general principle sites should be selected on the basis of needs and not just because they are currently unused/underutilised green fields. The previously commissioned Aecom report refers to the Parish Council undertaking a "call for sites" to landowners and developers rather than a needs-based assessment.	The parish council could have chosen not to call for sites in 2017 and the result would have been that HC would choose them for us. The parish council decided that it would be better to have parish control over our land development, which is why it was originally decided to make a NDP in the first place. Better that we, as a parish, shape our land use and development than people who are not here and do not know the local character and features to be used and preserved.	
	3/17/20		The Aecom report was based on 16 sites that were offered for development in 2017. The recent public consultation drop-in sessions include 23 potential sites.	We have extended the call for sites because of a sufficiently large time lag between the first one and our current efforts to draft an NDP document.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 2

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
	3/17/20		The pro-forma criteria that was used by Aecom in evaluating the original 16 sites is purely subjective and there is no weighting of criteria or use of a scoring matrix. All 16 sites in the report were visited in one day in November 2017 which does not allow anywhere near enough time to properly assess both sites and the environs in which they are located.	Fully agree. This is why it was decided to do the whole exercise again and to do to clear up a number of anomalies. We have consulted the parishioners in February as to what criteria are important to them and the sites will be subject to two stage assessment. We are developing stage one "knock out" criteria which are things like does it conform to the core strategy (things like is it in or adjacent to a named settlement), or is it within an unacceptable flood risk zone. If it passes that test it will be assessed on criteria which are more qualitative like the ones which the parishioners have advised us they are happy with. The process is likely to take more than one day and will involve desk assessment as well as physical assessment.	
	3/17/20		Apart from flood risk the criteria by which a site has been determined to be classed as "no development, "potential development" or "yes (to development) appear to be mixed. For example, several sites are remote from public transport and amenities, or affect wildlife or views over the AONB but these are not mentioned in the entries in the Executive Summary.	We intend to use the criteria the parishioners are happy with which include these aspects you mention. To date we have not had any suggestion of a view which should be preserved.	
	3/17/20		The density of proposed development in the Aecom report that forms the basis of the potential development of each site is based on 30 dwellings per hectare. Where has this been taken from? Is this an urban 'yardstick'?	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the highest level of the planning hierarchy, defines a figure of 30 dwellings per hectare as the lowest density that should be used to make best use of available land. Within cities the target figure can be as high as 4,800 per hectare. The Core Strategy has to align with the NPPF, as does our NDP. In their assessment Aecom chose the lowest figure. However there are exceptions to this density target and one of these is development within AONBs, where visual and habitat impact is given a high priority. We intend to include this as a consideration in the site assessment but I cannot give you any specific figures at this stage.	
	3/17/20		All the existing sites will require a change in planning use from agricultural to residential use.	True.	
	3/17/20		Generally, there appears to be a move to take away the "green belt" between Walford/Coughton and Ross-on-Wye.	The event on 22nd February gave the opposite view; that the gap should be preserved.	
	3/17/20		What proportion of social/affordable housing is required as part of the total Social/affordable house owners would generally prefer proximity to Ross-on-Wye with good public transport and good access to shops, schools, doctor's surgeries, amenities etc. This would be true for both a younger and older demographic.	We have yet to discuss the point about affordable housing although the last housing assessment undertaken by Herefordshire Council only identified one family looking for affordable housing within Walford Parish.	
	3/17/20		How does this proposed development plan on greenfield sites sit with the government's green agenda and general focus on brownfield development?	There is a preference to use brownfield sites but it is marginal. Whilst we might prefer brownfield sites we need to have them offered and/or planned to count towards the target of 91. Having said many of the houses built or approved are on brownfield sites.	
	3/17/20		Public transport is generally poor in the parish once you stray from the main B4234	It's basically non-existent away from the B4234.	
	3/17/20		What effect will increased numbers of dwellings and associated traffic have on the attractiveness of the AONB for tourism?	Visual and habitat impact are already key planning elements when considering any development within an AONB. The NDP gives us an additional opportunity to have our say on where we want houses and the character of the houses to be built. Unfortunately traffic density is not normally a key planning issue and in rural areas traffic levels are usually considered to be low by modern, urban standards.	
	3/17/20		Once off the B4234 roads are generally small which should be borne in mind when greater traffic movements are generated, especially in inclement winter weather.	This will be taken into account.	
	4/17/20		Generally we were very impressed by the thoroughness of the meeting... however the technology or the means of communication was poor. I urge you to invest in zoom us so members of the public can see the graphs etc. and each other. I suggest that this social distancing will extend into the autumn and the committee should do whatever they can to encourage public participation.		In future the steering group meetings will be open to video attendance for residents using WebEx.
	4/17/20		Coronavirus. There was scant regard paid to this in relation to development. This national emergency is not going away any time soon and must be factored into any plan.	We have to work within the current planning system and that doesn't currently include making provision for pandemics.	
	4/17/20		Flood zone. Even considering just for one moment building onto the floodplain is totally irresponsible and should be avoided at all costs.	Our approach aligns directly with current Government directives on the use of areas liable to flooding and we are preferring sites which are in flood zone 1.	
	4/17/20		Hereford have approached their plan rather ingeniously by scattering new builds across the country... unlike Cheshire who have attached high density developments to existing conurbations. I think this is a fundamental consideration for you all at the outset: scatter or focus? What impact do you want these 91 houses to have on our community?	We are required to focus developments in or around the named settlements. Outside of these settlements we will expect to have some RA3 open countryside development in line with core strategy rules, these would by nature be scattered around the parish.	
	4/17/20		Are you interested in people from outside the community buying homes in the Parish? If you are... what provision are you making for them? There seemed to be a resistance within the steering committee to even considering looking beyond the immediate parish to expand the community. Frankly, identifying local 'need' is missing the point and not what is required of you. 91 new families must be attracted into Walford. It is up to the council to make them feel welcome. There is a national housing shortage, each region has been assigned a certain number of homes to be built and Walford must build 91 houses.	The purpose of the NDP is to plan for a minimum of 91 new houses and also to shape development in the parish according to what existing residents need/want. I agree that if 91 new houses are to be built that there will be a lot of incoming residents, however this demand will be made through market forces which we cannot control. Attracting residents is not in the remit of any NDP, however we are striving for a parish which would be worthy, and welcoming, for incoming as well as existing residents.	
	4/17/20		Walford no longer has a pub or a local shop from what I saw last month. Any development should have a caveat for all developers given planning permission should provide say 10% of build costs to provide community amenities so the 91 new families who move into your parish have amenities like a village shop or pub. What kind of new business are you looking to attract into the village?	This is a good point and where we can we will encourage amenities. Herefordshire Council is working towards introducing a community infrastructure levy which would provide funds for amenities in the parish. Also feedback from our consultations demonstrated a desire for a village core(s) and we will be taking this into account when developing policies. This may also bring a greater support for any business providing amenities like a shop or pub.	
	4/17/20		In my opinion if you scatter new builds across the parish rather than concentrate them say along the Walford Road a more audacious approach would be to consider any plot from Coughton Corner to Kerne Bridge to Howle Hill for appropriate development creating a development zone unconnected to the flimsy and arbitrary settlement boundaries and force all areas take one or two houses. This gives the opportunity for multiple landowners to cash in on the building bonanza rather than just a couple of lucky locals. This also might encourage the council to think about upgrading foot paths or Welsh Water to invest in sewerage.	We are only permitted to allocate potential development sites to the named settlements, we cannot include any sites outside of these. This does not stop all development in open countryside provided these are approved by Herefordshire Council Planning and for this they must meet the tests of Core Strategy Policy RA3.	
	4/17/20		Attitude toward change. This is perhaps the most difficult for all of you. Change is hard but inevitable. I sensed from a couple of you that you wished these 91 houses would just go away. Talk of the SSI and OINB are all well and good but should not be weaponised against the project at hand. As for 'local Nature reserves' etc. you know as well as I do this is nonsense. Walford during the 18th C with its many lime kilns and quarries was arguably place and has only recently become a green enclave. And only just 'green'. The timber yard is not only a ghastly visual scar on the landscape but responsible for terrible noise pollution. Poly tunnels interrupt the view for miles and the higher you climb Bulls Hill the worse the noise from the motorways in the Wye Valley. The committee must abandon this bucolic fantasy of Walford and address the immediate housing demands of the nation. Pragmatism not nostalgia must guide you all.	75% of the Parish lies within the Wye Valley AONB and that the AONB designation was granted in 1971 based on the landscape qualities of the Wye Valley at that time, not what it may have looked like in the 18th Century. Both Herefordshire Council and Walford Parish Council have a statutory duty, under the CROW act of 2000, to maintain and enhance that landscape. The precise wording from www.gov.uk - Under the CROW Act, you, the relevant local authority, must make sure that all decisions have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Your decisions and activities must consider the potential effect it will have within the AONB and land outside its boundary.	
	4/17/20		There was mention of 'good design' this always perplexes me. Do you mean architecturally significant and assessed as such? Or do you mean local mish mash pastiche? Great design will always attract people with means. Again, I'm asking you what kind of people do you want in your community? 91 homes is a lot of people. Over what time scale do you want this influx. Again... what provision are you making for an influx of say 300 more people in your parish? Are you prepared for more people?	The NDP is the parish's approach to preparing for additional 91 houses in the parish, which with local occupancy rates would lead to around 200 more people. The timescale for the increase is 2031. We are still discussing what types of housing might be important and still working towards what if any design aspects we might want to include in the NDP.	
	4/17/20		As we start to consider what this Covid19 means to us as a nation we must also consider how it might impact us locally. Will it mean that people continue working from home? Fragile people will have to stay at home for long periods? The effects of long term social distancing. What kind of broadband capability does the area have during this time of increased use? Would an urgent care facility be appropriate? A local shop or baker attracted into the village to create a community hub? Will restaurants and bars only open after we have a vaccine?	Covid 19 is outside the scope and timescale of this project.	
1	24/04/20	email	I act for the landowners (name redacted) who you will be aware own some of the land to the west of the Walford Road. I am aware that the NDP Steering Group have been through an initial site sifting process, in order to assess the various opportunities presented around the village for housing development. What I wanted to do initially, was make contact with you to put forward a more 'coherent' approach, bringing in more than one landowner and looking at delivering far more benefits to the village as a result. This would involve integrating sites with the ref WAL 01, 02 and 07. In that event, we would want to include a new public park, walks, community orchard, informal spaces for play, allotment gardens and so on, with a particular focus on keeping the more open uses within the area marked out as having higher landscape and visual impact sensitivities. If you would be amenable, we are considering undertaking some evidence gathering (to include in the first instance ecology, landscape and visual impact, heritage, drainage and transport) to look at what other mitigation might be required, and we would be happy to share this with the NDP team. If you could let me know if you are open to receiving this further information, I would be obliged.	Thanks for your email. We are not conducting consultations with land owners or agents at this stage. We await the site assessments before deciding if consultations are required. If at a later stage we find it necessary to do so we will do so for all viable sites at the same time. We have made two calls for sites now and the sites you mention are inconsistent with the land offered in the call for sites. WAL 002 is not offered. WAL 001 is larger than the site offered. WAL 007 is smaller than the site offered. We will assume that the details in the sites as offered are correct unless otherwise advised.	
2	27/05/20	email	The minutes of the last NDP meeting commented that there was landfill on Howle Hill. This is not the case.	Thank you for your input the contents of which are noted.	
3	28/05/20	email	If the Government follows through in the commitment to throw £250M at cycling and walking infrastructure, what mileage would there be in a sustans type route following the old railway line initially from tudorville to kerne bridge, and speculatively, onwards to Chepstow?	Thank you for your input the contents of which are noted. The NDP does not deal directly with such projects but we will pass on your suggestion to the parish council.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 3

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
4	01/06/20	email	Querying if all 8 sites submitted are included in site assessment and dates for the assessments	Confirmed all 8 sites but no date given	
5	03/06/20	email	Land off Walford Road, south of Cedar Grove Landscape Visual Appraisal and Land Promotion Report	Receipt acknowledgement.	
6	14/06/20	email	Has the council viewed the sites recently (attached to the brook Bulls Hill Rd)? By making these sites potential housing land, it has had the unfortunate affect of the owner completely vandalising them. Trees have been ripped out, wild flowers scraped away and general severe environmental damage done no doubt to make them look more "attractive" for building. I'm sure this was not your intention but would ask you to strike off these sites as potential housing to discourage such dreadful behaviour in future. Thank you.	Thank you for your input the contents of which are noted.	
7	14/06/20	email	Can you view online a map of potential house building sites?	Thank you. We will be uploading a map shortly.	
8	06/07/20	email	Hi, we at Stondon Parish are in the process of writing the NP, great site very detailed, do you have assistance from a consultant?	Yes. We found it very helpful.	
9	06/07/20	email	I was looking though the draft NPD plan proposals on the website and wondered if it might be worth thinking about some sort of chicane or 'village gateway' arrangements to the road to slow traffic down around Kerne Bridge and particularly the entrance to the canoe launch site.	Thank you for email. The Parish Council is already looking into this matter and I will pass on your comments to them. It may be feasible to use S106 money to fund such initiatives and this would be between the parish council and the Highways Department to organise. Unfortunately we cannot include any aspect of highways in the NDP.	Idea passed on to Parish Council
10	07/07/20	email	We have decided to withdraw one of our submissions of land availability for the NDP process. The submission is labelled WNDPIT 37348.85	Thank you for your email. I note your wish to withdraw site WNDP17 from the site assessment process and I have done this for you.	Site withdrawn from site assessment process.
11	07/07/20	email	We feel that small housing development sizes would be more in keeping with our village community. We would therefore suggest that 1-5, 6-10 & 11-20 would be the maximum that should be built. Any homes built should also be kept in character with the village.	Thank you for your suggestion about appropriate development sizes for our NDP. We will take your ideas into account.	Include in evidence to WPC.
12	09/07/20	email	Please could you correct the site boundaries for the proposed site at Warryfield cottages – it includes my house and garden, Upper Warryfield, and that is obviously not a site that has been offered.	We have prepared a new version of the map with the corrected site boundary and will post this on the website in the next few days.	Site boundary amended.
13	14/07/20	email	Are you still open to additional submissions?	Yes if the landowner wishes to submit a form and map by 22nd July we will add to the ongoing assessment.	
14	16/07/20	email	I consider that any development not on the main B4243 should be limited to 1-5 houses. It is not only the number of houses that has a visual impact, but the accompanying light pollution, traffic and noise has to be taken into account, and in very low density areas, even 1-5 houses could have a very considerable impact.	Thank you for your suggestion about appropriate development sizes for our NDP. We will take your ideas into account.	Include in evidence to WPC.
15	17/07/20	email	I see that the map on the website is still the version with Upper Warryfield included, and am slightly perturbed that in your minutes from the meeting of July 15th, site 5, which is the number given to the Warryfield site on the map, is not one which is said to require clarification with the Landowner. Can I assume that the exact boundaries of the site have been clarified, including the yet to be registered piece of land I purchased earlier this year. (My solicitors inform me that there is a very long backlog at the Land registry – it was purchased in February, and is still pending).	Apologies for the map on the website. I am assured that it will be updated this weekend. We have only removed the original Upper Warryfield land and I would be grateful if you could let me know the details of the land which is to be registered with Land Registry which also needs to be removed so that we correct it further. Once this is done we will assess whether we need to clarify anything with the site owner.	Site boundary amended.
16	23/07/20	email	Site 31 lies directly opposite our home, Peace Haven (HR9 5RF). Now aged 65 and 60 respectively, my husband and I moved to our forever home in May 2015, after more than a year of searching for a location which would meet our wellbeing needs now, and into the future (in fact we plan to stay here for the rest of our lives!). At Peace Haven we have the tranquility and green outlook we craved for so long. Having just spent a significant lump of our hard-earned money adding a first floor with balcony, to derive maximum benefit from the beautiful views, you can imagine how upset we are at the prospect of looking straight into and onto any houses built on the field! Given the narrow nature of the lane, the field is in very close proximity to our property. I attach, for info, some photos of the view from our balcony, which includes the proposed site. This is a view we very much wish to preserve! Apologies for the lack of a grid reference, but we don't have a smartphone. Especially disappointing is the fact that, not so long ago, the new owners reassured neighbours the field would remain a paddock. It's interesting that they have very recently removed their horses from the field, presumably in readiness for a site inspection. Quite apart from the devastating personal impact on our lives any such development would have, the site is quite unsuitable for the following reasons: - Forest Green is a hamlet within the AONB, where houses are mostly spaced quite a distance apart, therefore hardly providing the established built environment which seems to be an essential criteria. Allowing additional building to take place would not protect the rural character of the local area - The lane is very narrow and not appropriate for any increase in traffic, however minimal - Our night skies (and my sleep!) would suffer hugely from the increased light pollution	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
17	23/07/20	email	We live at Forest Green and were very disappointed to discover last week that the field adjacent to our property, has been put forward as a potential development site - WNDP31. This was not shown on the site map when we attended the public consultations in February. AMENITY In response to your request for parish views, features and amenities, we wish to highlight an amenity particular to our neighbourhood and others like it, which we would want to see protected against development. Namely, the dark night sky. Areas of sparse population, like Forest Green, benefit from low levels of light pollution. When development is allowed, artificial light levels inevitably increase and the ability to see and appreciate the stars decreases. Therefore even small developments should not go ahead in Forest Green and other areas of sparse population to maintain this much-valued amenity for residents and visitors. To quote from current Government Guidance on Light Pollution: "Will a new development, or a proposed change to an existing site, be likely to materially alter light levels in the environment around the site and/or have the potential to adversely affect the use or enjoyment of nearby buildings or open spaces?" The answer is "yes" to all the questions posed in the quote above, were development of any size permitted on site WNDP31. We attach a photo as requested, taken from our garden. Unfortunately, at this time of year, close to midsummer, and without the benefit of a high quality camera, it is almost impossible to capture what the eye can see at night. But we trust the point is made. PREFERENCES In terms of appropriate size of housing development across the parish, our preference would be to see the required houses being split into three developments each of say 21-30 on the three largest site areas. Two along the B4234 within or adjacent to the already built-up areas of Walford and Coughton, and the third to the west of Tudorville. Concentrating the majority of housing, and therefore additional residents, close to Walford village would encourage and support village facilities and businesses such as a shop/farm shop/pub. It would put family housing close to Walford Primary School allowing walking to school rather than travel by car. It would maximise the opportunity for the additional residents to make better use of any public transport along the B4234 into Ross. In turn, this could see a smaller increase than otherwise in the number of cars driving into Ross with the associated knock-on effect on town parking facilities. All development sites, for whatever number of houses, should be adjacent to an existing area of significant population, where the overall character of the area is already a 'built environment'. We feel strongly that even small (1-5) developments are not appropriate in areas which are currently sparsely populated as new development cannot help but fundamentally change the character of the countryside.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
18	24/07/20	email	There is a site located on the land next to & behind the Mill Race (apologies I cannot read the reference on the map.) This land already has permission under planning reference: S111970/F "Proposed extension to existing pub with 10 bed accommodation and 2 staff dwellings." The new accommodation to be built is tied to the staff and guests of the Mill Race. The question is, would this potentially be included in the NDP as per the current permissions under S111970/F or an alternative development subject to revised planning permission?	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. The NDP only assesses sites and does not deal with specific planning applications so we cannot comment on this. The specific site you refer to is included in the results of the site assessments which are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
19	25/07/20	email	The max housing depends on it's location. If it is near a small settlement, 1-5 houses should be max. If it is in an extension to an existing village 6-20 houses are acceptable as long as there is good road access. Enclosed are 2 pictures of views to be preserved from Hom Green.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments and views which are noted.	Include views in data base

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 4

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
20	25/07/20	email	<p>One of the most famous and iconic views of part of the parish which I think should not be changed would be the view from the entrance to the Coppitt Hill Nature Reserve looking North East down over Kerne Bridge with Goodrich Castle on the left and Leys Hill and Bishopswood to the Right, in the foreground with Walford and Ross in the middle distance. This view is from outside the parish but looks well into the parish.</p> <p>OS outdoor leisure14, so189576</p> <p>No new housing development should be allowed to interfere with Public Rights of Way. No new Housing development should in any way interfere with Nature Reserves or Ancient Woodland or species rich ancient pasture.</p> <p>All veteran trees, and ancient trees should be protected from housing development with Tree Preservation Orders</p> <p>All new housing development should be in the category of 'affordable' to reflect the dire need for low cost housing for low income families and low income retirees from the parish.</p> <p>Proposed dwelling numbers should be low and spread throughout the parish but concentrated in the villages, so in my opinion as numbers should be as follows, as an example.</p> <p>Walford 11 to 20 Coughton 6 to 10 Bulls Hill 1 to 5 Howle Hill 1 to 5 Bishopswood 1 to 5</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and views which are noted.</p>	Include views in data base
21	26/07/20	email	<p>Further to the document I submitted in February, and with regards to the request for images of scenic views that as residents we would like preserved, please see attached and to follow images of three of the sites that have been submitted for development which sit directly in front of us and behind us in Hom Green (we live at 7 The Cottages, Hom Green, HR9 7TG and we own 'The Old Hall Holiday Cottage' next door). I can't seem to get accurate GPS co ordinates on google maps, but they are referred to in the attached document as plots 10, X & Y. I notice on the map on your website they have now been named, but unfortunately as the resolution is too low to be able to read, I'm afraid I'm unable to reference them correctly. As a small hamlet that has already been identified by Herefordshire planning department on numerous occasions as 'unsustainable', I feel strongly that all of these views should be preserved and none of these plots should be developed for reasons outlined in the attached document. With regards to what size of housing development would be suitable in Walford parish and where, with the exception of Hom Green where we live, I don't feel qualified to specify any particular area that I would feel more suitable as I haven't looked in depth as to the impact it would have on them specifically. My general feeling however is that as a small parish, and with 900 houses already planned for nearby Ross on Wye and all the additional developments in the surrounding hamlets and villages, my preference is for the least number of new dwellings possible. Despite this large number of houses recently built, currently in progress and planned for Ross and its surrounds, there still appears to be absolutely no additional provision for the enormous influx of people who will further burden the minimal resources in the town, and the impact on our doctor's surgeries, schools, supermarkets, roads, sewerage and drainage etc. will be significant and potentially devastating. Already, the huge increase in traffic is noticeable making it progressively more difficult to park and shop in the area, and with the completion of the planned developments, aside from the aforementioned practical considerations, I fear that the unique character and beauty of this historic market town and picturesque landscape of its surrounding rural areas such as Walford will sadly be lost forever.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and views which are noted.</p>	Include views in data base
22	27/07/20	email	<p>Taken from footpath on Leys Hill facing SSE</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your view</p>	Include views in data base
23	29/07/20	email	<p>Re. the above, I am sending a photo of my beloved view of the two oaks visible from my home and photographed throughout the Seasons. Alder Close is opposite Walford school and my view is from no 3 looking towards (name redacted) farm. My cottage was sent to the Woodland trust who welcomed it as a visual record of Nature's calendar and asked me to send it to their media team.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your views</p>	Include views in data base
24	29/07/20	email	<p>I would like to register the following as Scenic Views/Protected Amenities for Walford Parish as per your recent call.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your views</p>	Include views in data base
25	29/07/20	email	<p>In response to your request for opinion to contribute to the Walford NDP, I have included two photographs that show a view across the top of Bull's Hill towards Ruadsden. Whilst this may not be considered an iconic view, it is a specific view that we frequently admire. I have submitted these photos as this particular viewpoint would be directly impacted by the proposed development site at that location.</p> <p>In response to your third question regarding what I would consider an appropriate size of housing development, I feel this varies considerably across the range of proposed sites. For example, for the larger proposed sites alongside the B4234, a number of 31-40 would seem reasonable, whereas with some of the smaller, more rural sites, I would consider 1-5 only to be reasonable. That said, with such a small number of houses being proposed for some of the more rural sites, I would question whether the comparatively small contribution these sites would make to the target of 91 houses for the parish, versus the potential environmental and residential impact, would make the proposal worthwhile.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and views which are noted.</p>	Include views in data base
26	31/07/20	email	<p>Please find attached two photographs taken from my property, front and back views.</p> <p>From my perspective, having lived at Stoggle thorn for over 30years therefore witnessing many changes that if any further building was to take place in either field it would not only directly and adversely affect everyone living in Hom Green but add to the already busy and dangerous road that runs from Rehu to Archenfield .</p> <p>I appreciate new building needs to take place but genuinely feel this would not be a sensible or safe development area. I would also like to flag up our very high water table and flooding that takes place during the winter months.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your views and comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/.</p> <p>There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.</p>	
27	03/08/20	email	<p>Please see views I would like to be preserved. They are taken from the Wye Valley Walk (WVW) Bulls Hills walking towards Leys Hill. Even though I am . . . I am sending these views as a local resident. The Chair of the NDP came on the walk with me and has the co-ordinates because these are taken with an old fashioned camera.420 - 421 = view from WVW looking towards Ross on Wye (see the spire of the church)425 = view towards Hom Green427 - 430 = dappled shade of the WVW431 - 433 = view towards Goodrich from Bus Stop on B4234434 = View from the stile on bridleway towards Welsh Mountains (bridleway from Windsong towards lane that goes down towards Leys Hill)</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your views.</p>	Include views in data base
28	03/08/20	email	<p>Would it be possible to have sight of Section 2 of the Walford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan before the next Walford Parish Council meeting on 19th August? I understand Section 2 includes a detailed description of all the settlements in the Parish? I have been told that information contained in Section 2 would be most helpful to me as I am currently gathering intelligence on settlements before submitting a motion to a Full Council meeting at Herefordshire Council.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/.</p> <p>There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.</p>	
29	04/08/20	email	<p>I apologise for a belated response to the request in the latest village Newsletter.</p> <p>In respect of a parish view On Leys Hill I believe the views south in the direction of Welsh Bicknor and beyond <u>all along the lane/track running west from the Queech</u> (Grid Ref 594193) to Warren Farm, and a little beyond, are impressive and worth noting. I see no threat to them providing that the hedges of the fields on the south side continue to be trimmed, as they are regularly. The lane is bounded on the north side by the southern boundary of Ted's Wood.</p> <p>In respect of a features to be noted/preserved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Just inside the boundary of the Queech, opposite the eastern end of the above lane, and reaching well over the public road, is the most impressive and huge oak tree – quite a magnificent specimen. It looks to be in good condition but to me feels so spectacular a tree that it is worth specifically noting as it would be a huge loss if anything happened to it. I will follow this email with a phone picture of it, though I am unsure whether I had location set on my phone. o Ted's Wood is of course a huge and valued amenity, as well as of growing wildlife value, with scarce shrubs (a native Hellebore eg) and at least 4 species of orchid present. There may be an issue about how it will be best managed [I write in ignorance of what the arrangement for this may be] but I personally would be happy to help in any programme to support its continued maintenance. It certainly will be damaging if there is not a proper management plan in place and acted upon for this woodland, and I'd suggest that is a priority to ensure. 	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and views which are noted.</p>	Include views in data base
30	06/08/20	email	<p>...My query is what actually is it that you're looking for that goes beyond this?As someone who's produced a history of the parish and collected many photos over my 22 years of living overlooking the Coughton valley from Howle Hill, I'm confused as to what scenic views I may contribute to assist the NDP project.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your question. We are looking for views, verges and local heritage assets that may be worth preserving via the NDP policies.</p>	
31	11/08/20	email	<p>Could you confirm if the site assessments and full approved site list will be published at the parish council meeting on 19 August? If so, how do we participate in that meeting virtually?</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay.</p> <p>Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/.</p> <p>There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.</p> <p>The NDP is being progressed via a committee which is meeting regularly to discuss matters. You can find information on access to, and dates of, meetings on the parish council website.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 5

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
32	15/08/20	email	Plot WNDP1 14042.14 Deep Dean : During heavy rain this can create deep running water. We are concerned that if the plot above is developed the land belonging to Riseford would act as a soak away to the new houses. This would increase the flow through the land. Our second concern is the access. The Deep Dean road is single track and incredibly steep. It would be dangerous to increase the flow of traffic, and thus the risk of meeting on coming vehicles. This is especially true in winter, when these roads are icy (due to the flow of water) further increasing the risk to drivers safety. We would appreciate an update on the development plan for this plot and your comments to alleviate our concerns raised above.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
33	18/08/20	email	Could you advise when we expect to see the report on all of the individual sites and whether they are considered suitable or not?	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
34	19/08/20	email	I understand you the NDP Steering Group will be concluding their assessment of the sites put forward today. I would be grateful if you can confirm when feedback will be provided to landowners for further consultation.	We have had unforeseen delays and will provide feedback asap.	
35	19/08/20	email	Thank you for your update. if you would like any further detail on the sites we have put forward please do not hesitate to ask. We had provided (name redacted) with a fair amount of detail for Watling Street but if you require any more detail on this please let me know.	No reply.	
36	01/09/20	email	On behalf of our client, we are currently preparing a submission to the Herefordshire Council Call for Sites which closes on 14 September. It would be very helpful to this process to have sight of the NDP's Site Assessment Report. Please can you advise whether the report will be made publically available ahead of the 14 September.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
37	03/09/20	email	Hope things are progressing with the Neighbourhood Plan. I was wondering when you might be in position to provide feedback to Landowners for further consultation.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish. Landowners have been informed that the report is published and invited to respond.	
38	04/09/20	email	I have been speaking to a colleague of mine surrounding our submission for Watling Street. I would be grateful if you could confirm if a C2 use would count towards your housing target, I imagine it does not, therefore would the NDP be open to residential use too, if that is the case we could look into a C3, straight residential, use for our Watling Street site. Perhaps we could discuss this, and if so would you need any further detail, i.e. a modified form sent in or if this email will suffice.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. We can confirm that C2 would not contribute to the housing target and are treating your site at Watling Street as a residential site for the purposes of the Site Assessment Report addendum at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
39	14/09/20	email	Please see the attached late submission for consideration by the Walford NDP. I apologise that it is after the timeframe you were accepting submissions. However because of the unforeseen delays with progress of the NDP I would like to think this site can be considered. ... Whilst writing I would be grateful if you can confirm when feedback will be provided to landowners for further consultation.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your site submission. We have made an assessment of the site near Bishopwood House. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ in the addendum. There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
40	16/09/20	email	Hello - just checking that the email underneath was received?	Already covered under Mill Race question.	
41	17/09/20	email	I note that the deadline to submit images was extended, please find attached images of views of the unspoilt open countryside we are so fortunate to enjoy. They are taken from the public footpaths that run across the fields from 1. Upper Wythall looking west towards Penraig. 2. Lower Wythall viewed from the B4234 3. Looking towards Coughton Marsh from the B4234	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your views which are noted. GPS coordinates would be very helpful, thanks.	
42	18/09/20	email	Further to my email below, are you able to advise of any updates on the progress of the NDP? It seems strange that no meetings are appearing in the calendar on the NDP website when these have been held very frequently through the summer.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. The NDP is being progressed via a committee which is meeting regularly to discuss matters. You can find information on access to, and dates of, meetings on the NDP and/or parish council website.	
43	18/09/20	email	I was unable to connect to the last scheduled meeting and there appears to be no future events or meetings scheduled. Please could you confirm if the neighbourhood plan has been finalised? If there are any further public meetings I would be keen to participate. If there is now a plan published, please could you advise on how I can obtain a copy?	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. The NDP is being progressed via a committee which is meeting regularly to discuss matters. You can find information on access to, and dates of, meetings on the NDP and/or parish council website. The plan is not yet finalised but the results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
44	23/09/20	email	We would like to know when the assessment of proposed sites regarding the Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan will be completed and available to view online.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
45	29/09/20	email	There has been no update on the website for over a month, with no minutes of the meeting of 26th August yet published. When can the public expect to know which sites have been selected? Thank you	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
46	12/10/20	email	We are writing to update you on the progress for the site we submitted for the Neighbourhood Plan. Site 21 (WNDP21). The comments made in the Assessment Report August 2020, suggested that we don't have adequate access onto the proposed development site. We have now agreed with our neighbour to bring in a wider access partly across their land and on our own.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your update regarding site 21. We have updated the results of the site assessments which are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ in the addendum. There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
47	14/10/20	email	I am trying to find the original 2017 draft site assessment report on your website, but when I click on the link I get to listed buildings in Walford. Please could you make this document available to me. Thanking you in advance	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. The 2017 site assessment report can be found at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/evidence-base/	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 6

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
48	28/10/20	email	My Client (name redacted) has requested I contact you with regard to your site assessment document which has recently been placed on the website. In the first instance he advises that he received no notification regarding the call for sites and as such had no opportunity to put forward his site forward as part of the process. He would therefore be grateful if you could confirm how and when the Call for Sites Assessment was carried out. I note from the document that the initial call for sites was in 2017, with a second in January to March 2020. My client was unaware of either of these processes and wonders what the criteria was for sending out such letters. He were they sent only to residential and not business addresses. Secondly my client would like to point out that in assessing the potential for development in Howle Hill the Parish Council make reference to various planning applications but no acknowledgement is made of the current application for residential development at (name redacted) which is supported by Planning Officers and is now on the Committee with a recommendation to approve. (this application has been on going for many many months and was therefore clearly in the public forum) My client argues that as a key brownfield site in the village, this should have been considered in drawing up the development boundary and the junction of Crossways and Sharmans Pitch is more representative of a settlement, when taking into account the recent approval for 4 dwellings at Crossways which includes 2 affordable units, adjacent to Howle Hill Nursery. Furthermore no mention is made of the fact that the school bus for both junior and high schools has a pick up point directly outside (name redacted) at the junction with Sharmans Pitch and Crossways thereby adding to the weight that this can be considered a central settlement point. Finally my client questions the weighting given to Brownfield sites by the Parish Council, the report writer himself recognising that development on brownfield sites is inherent in national planning policy and is clearly reflected in the Core Strategy. Thus giving brownfield sites a weighting of only one appears to place the Site Appraisal in direct conflict with the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy. My client would request on the basis of the above that his site is considered more appropriate than many of the greenfield sites put forward in Bishopswood	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. We have made an assessment of the Waters Edge site. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ in the addendum. There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
49	04/11/20	email	I have now read report and wanted to say a huge thank to everyone as it must have entailed an enormous amount of work! was most impressed with all the detail and delighted that arturus Dingle has potential to be a positive. I liked your suggestions of a gatehouse and individual sensitively designed buildings. PIs could you tell me the procedure from now. I do have a landscape report and am engaging a planning consultant as there is some issue over the current access from haslehurst drive	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments and question. The site assessment report is only one step in the process and does not confer approval of any site. You are free at any stage to present a planning application to Herefordshire Council Planning Department. The parish council will now discuss and decide on the best housing option in the next few weeks and this will go into the draft NDP. When the draft NDP is submitted to Herefordshire Council there will begin a year long procedure of quality checking before the NDP is formally adopted.	
50	05/11/20	email	I hope things are progressing with the Walford NDP. I would be grateful if an indication of timeframe can be provided for when we can expect feedback on the proposals submitted.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your question. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ . There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
51	14/11/20	email	I found Wednesday's NDP meeting quite informative and the team have done a good job on the analysis so far. Obviously the strategy is the most important part and still remains to be written! As mentioned in the meeting I noticed an omission of a granted planning for 2 dwellings on Howle Hill. Having re-read the draft document today I also have a concern that the original "vision" that was agreed has not been fully integrated. Please see the attached document. If you have any questions please call or email me.	Apologies for the delay in response to your communication, the NDP process has undergone some disruption and re-organisation which resulted in the delay. Thank you for your comments which are noted. The housing figures are provided by Herefordshire Council Planning Department and include all applications that they count as dwellings. Regarding the vision, the process allows for any site to be offered, and through the site assessment process and consideration of the housing options, the council will decide on the most appropriate sites to meet the objective and vision.	
52	17/11/20	email	As you are aware, (name redacted) submitted a number of sites to be considered in the Walford Neighbourhood Plan consultation process. Having read your latest document 'Meeting Housing Need an Site Assessment Report' we have a few points and questions to raise in relation to the sites we submitted. Site 24 Land at Watling Street – We are aware that Walford Parish view is that any development at this site will contribute to the housing numbers of Ross Town, and not Walford Parish. We do not agree with this approach and have requested a second opinion from Herefordshire Council. We have commissioned a landscape appraisal of the site. With regard to the access, previous emails with (name redacted) have explained our position on this (please see attached email), we will control enough land at the access point to create a suitable access for any development at this site, as confirmed by Cotswold Transport Planning in the attached email, please can you confirm that you accept this? Site 14 Land at Rock Hill Farm, Lincoln Hill Road – I understand you have taken the Landowners 2017 submission for this site, however as we have explained we are working with him on this site. However, our same points as for Site 24 are valid for this site too. Site 26 Land on north side of Leys Hill Bishopswood – for clarification, we are looking for approximately 3 dwellings at this site, by no means a 'substantial cluster'. Site 25 Land at Howle Hill Crossroads and Site 29 Land at The Mill Race – there is no mention in your assessments that both of these sites have extant planning permissions which will hold some weight when it comes to future development. The site at Howle Hill has permission for 4 dwellings (P172215/O), elsewhere you have drawn settlement boundaries to include commitments, so why not at this site? At The Mill Race there is extant permission for hotel style accommodation and a staff dwelling (S111970/F), this should be considered when assessing the site which is within the settlement boundary for Walford. I would appreciate if you could consider the above points in relation to the sites submitted and come back to us with any further queries or comments on these. (name redacted) want to work with you in order to help deliver some housing development at these sites. Additionally, my colleague (name redacted) submitted an additional site which was Land at Bishopswood House. I am aware this was a late submission however please may you confirm if this site will be assessed at part of this process or not?	Regarding the housing allocation of viable sites adjacent to Ross on Wye We agree that any viable site adjacent to Ross on Wye would indeed count towards Walford Parish housing allocation as they sit inside Walford Parish. I cannot find reference anywhere in the report to suggest that Walford Parish Council consider these sites to be within Ross Town Council settlement. Ross Town Council in response to our request for feedback suggested that any viable sites would have to count towards their allocation but this is not the view of Walford Parish Council NDP project. The report states in its update "In response it was advised that as part of agreeing the purchase contract for the land from the vendor the two wedged shaped areas referred to (i.e. areas extending to the edge of the farm gateway) have been registered with freehold title absolute... This advice has been noted and accepted for the purposes of this assessment". Subject to confirmation of the site being offered for housing we have included it in the list of viable sites. Regarding site 14 There is a suggestion that (name redacted) is working with the landowner on this submission. Perhaps the landowner might clarify the relationship between landowner and (name redacted)? Also I am wondering whether they are working on the size of the land offered with an intention to change the submission to make it more viable? The site assessment looked at the possibility of a reduced site which is set out in the report. Regarding site 26 I note that (name redacted) are looking at 3 houses as suitable for this site and that the report is also suggesting 3 houses are suitable. No issue here. Regarding site 25 The report appendix 10 shows the site as having extant planning permission but that it is outside the settlement. Therefore the site has not been considered in stage 2. Regarding site 29 The report states "Normally small sites capable of accommodating one or two dwellings and comprising infill within settlement boundaries would not form housing allocations but be considered against a range of design and other detailed criteria. There are potential constraints upon the development of both these parcels, including flood risk, that would need to be addressed through the development management process because they already fall within the built-up area defined for Walford and Coughton. There is no need for these two parcels to proceed through to the Stage 2 assessment because they would not normally be included as allocations within an NDP but be accounted for through an assessment of a windfall allowance for development within settlement boundaries." So they are inside the settlement and therefore planning permission can be applied for via the planning department of HC. As such this site is not included in the report. Regarding site offered at Bishopswood House The NDP project has indeed considered this site in line with the assessment process used for the other sites. An addendum to the report provides the results.	
53	18/11/20	email	Following on from my email yesterday, 17th November 2020, I am now emailing to clarify a point I made in my previous email. Having spoken with Herefordshire Councils Neighbourhood Planning team, they have confirmed that any housing allocations or development at Sites 24 Land at Watling Street and Site 14 Land at Rock Hill Farm, Lincoln Hill Road, will count solely towards the housing numbers for Walford Parish and not towards that of Ross Town. I know this was disputed in your recently published document, however please see the attached email for confirmation on this point.	As per 17/11/20	
54	25/11/20	email	Have you had a chance yet to assess the email below in relation to the sites (name redacted) have submitted to the Walford Neighbourhood plan? (name redacted) would really like to work with you to deliver some of these small development sites in Walford Parish.	As per 17/11/20	
55	26/11/20	email	I (name redacted), believe that I can offer the Parish Council a prime piece of development land c. 1 acre in size and with access already in place to the main road between Kiln Green and Howle Hill. The plot would be ideal for either two or three detached dwellings or perhaps a few semi detached cottages in keeping with the area. The land has adjacent mains water supply, Openreach communication poles for both telephone and broadband and nearby overhead electrical power supply. Drainage would be in the form of septic treatment tanks as elsewhere in the area. I would like to register my interest in helping the Parish Council to achieve a Walford ndp in achieving it's development plans.	Thank you for your site submission. We have made an assessment of the site at Quabbs Farm. Results of the site assessments are available at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/the-neighbourhood-plan/ in the addendum. There will be a public consultation to present the results of this report soon, details of which will be published on the NDP website as soon as possible and circulated throughout the parish.	
56	06/12/20	email	At the initial public consultation, we were asked to identify the desired maximum size of any development - what was the majority view from the two public meetings held. 2. Infrastructure, sewerage. A response to a previous question asked in November 19, infrastructure is outside the remit of the NDP, yet the proposal of a 40% increase in dwellings adjacent to Coughton, (site 11R), will have considerable impact on the drainage infrastructure, surely this has to be a consideration of any plans submitted as part of our NDP 3. The revised proposal for 11R indicates the number of houses to be proposed as 40, which is a development 21% larger than the adjacent Priory Lea and 29% larger than Coughton Place, why is such a larger development being proposed than the current residential areas. One of the main objectives was to prevent Coughton / Walford becoming a development corridor, a development of this size will have significant impact on the green spaces, light and noise pollution levels, significantly reducing the enjoyment of the current open countryside for all who live and enjoy the open spaces of Coughton and Walford.	Thank you for your comments and questions. Your point 1, is answered by the evidence documents at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/evidence-base/ . Thanks again for your points 2 and 3 which are going to be dealt with at a later stage of the process.	
57	10/12/20	Clerk?	Would you kindly ask the Chair of the NDP Committee if it is possible to release the Addendum to the Meeting Housing Needs document, that was discussed yesterday, onto the NDP website? This will ensure the Meeting Housing Needs document, released onto the NDP website under FOIA, remains relevant. Also, is it possible for you to release the link to the recording of last night's NDP Committee meeting to me?	Thank you for your questions regarding the NDP. The addendum 1 is now on the website. Addendum 2 will be reviewed for approval at the NDP committee meeting on 13th January 2021.	
58	17/12/20		My agent has asked me to contact you with regards to the status of our NDP. He has reviewed the Hereford Council website and obtained the following information: Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Neighbourhood Development Plan is at the drafting stage. Neighbourhood area application date: 12 September 2012. Designation date: 14 November 2012. Regulation 14 draft plan submitted: N/A. Regulation 16 plan submitted: N/A. Plan sent for examination: N/A. Date of referendum: N/A. Can you please confirm that the above information is correct up to date and in alignment with your records. In addition, can you please provide a latest project status update as to when you expect to submit the next stage of submitting the draft Regulation 14. Finally, can you please confirm if the updated project plans are regularly posted this site. If not, can you please do so.	Thank you for your questions regarding the NDP plans. We can confirm the first two dates you have asked about. The NDP committee is still working towards Reg 14 submission and will be updating the project plan accordingly, but without a quorum in council a solution is still being sought. An updated plan will be placed on the website once this is resolved.	
59	23/12/20		Many thanks (name redacted) for taking the trouble to respond. Yes, I understood there had been a hiccup in the process so quite understand the delay.	No reply required	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 7

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
60	03/01/21		I would like to know why my submission was ignored by the parish council? Do I have to take legal action?	Thank you for your site submission. Due to the government lockdown restrictions, all site submissions received in 2021 will be evaluated once these restrictions have been lifted. These will be included in an addendum to the Meeting Housing Needs Site Assessment Report prior to submission of the NDP documents to Herefordshire Council for Reg 14.	
61	10/01/21		Could we please have paper copies of all minutes etc. My husband doesn't do the internet !!	I shall let you have copies.	
62	10/01/21	Web?	Is there not a 'cut-off' date for submissions? And if so, why is this being considered?	We are obliged to consider any site submission up to the formal submission of the NDP to Herefordshire Council. We will however be setting a deadline prior to this, in order to allow us to finalise the document.	
63	11/01/21		Please could you let us know when the presentations will be made. (name redacted) and I would like to participate.	Thank you, we are currently working on organising the presentations and are pleased that you would like to attend. It is important that we get as much feedback as possible from parishioners, developers and businesses. Details of the presentation sessions will be published in advance on the websites and Facebook pages plus the printed newsletter. The best way to keep up to date is to subscribe to the weekly email newsletter on the Walford NDP website. It is published to subscribers automatically when new information has been added to the NDP website.	
64	11/01/21	Letter	New site offered, delivered by hand.	Thank you for your site submission. Due to the government lockdown restrictions, all site submissions received in 2021 will be evaluated once these restrictions have been lifted. These will be included in an addendum to the Meeting Housing Needs Site Assessment Report prior to submission of the NDP documents to Herefordshire Council for Reg 14.	
65	13/01/21	Web?	I would like to participate in these meetings and also be included in any notes/ conclusions. We live in Priory Lea and have concerns with regards to the development that is proposed. I am also concerned that I have only recently found out about this development, which begs the question as to whether there has been sufficient public views taken into consideration. Thank you for your assistance I look forward to hearing from you.	Thank you for your comments. You are welcome to attend the NDP meetings and these are notified on the NDP website www.ndp-walford.co.uk where you can also find the minutes and notes from the various meetings.	
66	14/01/21	Web?	Can you explain to me why the hundreds of caravans that are in the parish are not counted as development towards the N.D.P. They are accommodation and in some cases are occupied year round.	Thank you for your question. Herefordshire Council has told us that "...caravans/mobile homes were not included within the 648 figures as they were considered temporary dwellings and not permanent homes. Seasonal agricultural workers accommodation are not included within the housing figures as the accommodation is seasonal and not occupied permanently, as they used for seasonal work. "	
67			Good morning , is there any reason why we don't have enough councillor's ? is there opportunity therefore to join the council ? A potential new councillor?	WPC currently has seven councillors with three that have a pecuniary interest in the NDP so they would be unable to take part in NDP discussions or voting. In order to conduct business we require a minimum of five councillors to be quorate. The process requires an election to replace the resigned councillors and due to Covid-19 restrictions that cannot take place any earlier than May 2021. We would welcome the opportunity for you to stand for election in due course.	
68	19/01/21	email	I have been trying to rebuild a small cottage at the back of my house for over 19 years and despite being given consent by a planner. The planning office lost the photographs of the original cottage and then denied its existence. The planner refused but suggested another site in open countryside that was rejected at appeal but I was then given consent to build a very large house subject to removing a perfectly good 4 foot thick stone wall and replacing it in the same location with a reinforced concrete wall. The cost was around £140000 but it was condemned leaving me with my workshop and outbuildings covered in a concrete roof where it remains today. I wanted to sell the site but of course that was refused by the planners I am now 76 years old living on my own in unsuitable accommodation. The site is of very little value and something of an eyesore.	Thank you for your comments which are duly noted.	
71	25/01/21	email	Thank you for your email of 18 January inviting (name redacted), as Landowner and Agent, to provide some feedback on your Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report. (name redacted) have already sent some feedback in relation to a number of sites we submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan (attached), and I hope that these further comments to be taken in conjunction with those made previously. Site 24 Watling Street – the report refers to C2, even though most of the assessment is predicated on a C3 development use. Paragraph 3.7 of the report states that the site has not been included in the assessment of housing allocations on the basis it is for C2 use. However, we would like for the site to be considered in this report as a C3 use as this option of residential development has not been ruled out for this site. Site 26 Lays Hill – we are pleased that you agree and consider 3 houses suitable for this site, would it be possible to extend the settlement boundary in recognition of this agreement? Site 25 Howle Hill Crossroads – this site has extant planning permission for 4 dwellings (P172215/O) and is located within a substantial cluster of properties at Howle Hill. We therefore feel it would be appropriate to extend the settlement boundary to include this site as it is already committed to provide housing numbers to the Parish. Just to note that page 135 Appendix 9 wrongly refers to site 21 which it should in fact be site 24 (Watling Street).	Thank you for reply. Regarding site 24 this has been dealt with in the addendum 1. The site is included in the housing options ranking table in this addendum. There are no settlement boundaries at this point and we will be considering these as we follow the process of developing the draft NDP. Regarding site 25 the report clearly identifies the current settlement and the site with extant planning permission (P172215/O) is outside of the settlement. Please refer to Appendix 10, page 138. Thank you for identifying the error in Appendix 9. We will address this in the next addendum.	Amend Appendix 9
72	30/01/21	Web?	Good afternoon, There is considerable concern among the residents in Coughton with regards to the large housing development under consideration in the NDP. This is now growing in momentum and the general consensus of opinion is that we currently have no platform upon which to make any views heard and have our questions answered other than this medium. Which we feel does not allow the councillors to adequately judge the level of concern, and strong opposition to any plan. How do we, under the constraints of COVID 19, get to address the council when they are holding a meeting? Can we select a representative to speak on our behalf on the live screening, or can we have the facility to type questions in to the live session and receive answers.	Thank you for question. Firstly all queries via email, web or letter are placed in front of the NDP committee. For addressing the parish council it is possible for any parishioner to address the council for up to 3 minutes at any of the parish council meetings. They want to have an open approach to gathering the views and concerns of the parish so they will be holding public presentations in February and March 2021 at which parishioners can make their points for the parish council to consider. They will be asking for parishioners to voice their opinions via a questionnaire after the March presentation. Lastly you can come along to the NDP committee meetings, all of which are held in public.	
73	30/01/21	Web	Dear (name redacted) have used your alternative means of contacting clerk but to no avail. As my query was a bit confrontational it would appear the clerk has censored my query. Linked to 65.	Apologies for not replying to your query. The capacity of the team is unable to keep up with the volume of correspondence and we will be addressing this to the NDP committee on 10th Feb and hope to reply soon after that. The answer to your previous question has been sent.	
74	02/02/21	Web	I am not good with technology and am not happy to join an on-line debate. However I have read the plan and would like to say that I am horrified at the amount of housing that has been proposed for the parish, especially Coughton where I now live. What is the definition of a "built-up area" as per the Government? Surely this means an area with many houses, estates, shops, facilities, etc etc and not an area with no amenities apart from a primary school? In the parish as a whole I don't know of any shops, chemists, doctors surgeries, restaurants. There is the school, a timber yard and a gastro-pub which isn't a village pub at all. I know of no other amenities or employment opportunities. How can it be reasonable to rip-up farmland to build houses on or very close to flood plains for people who don't exist in the parish? What developer would want to build such houses, and what people would want to live in them, especially as insurers won't insure houses for flooding that have been built after a certain date (in the past)? The only beneficiaries to these schemes are the farmers who want to sell the land and I am sure they don't live themselves close to the proposed sites. I blame the government for interfering in the lives of communities they don't know anything about and the greedy people who try to benefit from these policies.	Apologies for not replying to your query. The capacity of the team is unable to keep up with the volume of correspondence and we will be addressing this to the NDP committee on 10th Feb and hope to reply soon after that. There is no specific definition of what a 'built-up area' might be. The NDP seeks to define these for the settlements of Walford and Coughton, Bishopswood and Howle Hill. How this has been done is set out in Appendix 3 to the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report. Evidence from a number of sources was used. Areas falling within any flood risk zone have been excluded from consideration. Agricultural land value was one of a number of considerations used to judge between sites but Government policy does not rule a site out completely on this criterion. Herefordshire Council Core Strategy defines rural settlements where development might be located. It has determined that there are three settlements in Walford Parish. The Core Strategy also sets the minimum level of housing growth that each parish should accommodate. The approach was examined at a Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. The Parish Council can propose a Neighbourhood Development Plan indicating how the required housing might be accommodated, which must at least provide for the minimum. Should it not wish to do this then decisions are left to Herefordshire Council will determine planning applications for new housing within or adjacent to our settlements and this is unlikely to include consideration of any limit in numbers.	
75	02/02/21	Web	when are the live online seminars going to take place	Apologies for not replying to your query. The capacity of the team is unable to keep up with the volume of correspondence and we will be addressing this to the NDP committee on 10th Feb and hope to reply soon after that. The online presentations will be taking place on 22nd February 2021 and 15th March 2021. Details of these will be in the parish newsletter.	
76	02/02/21	Web	why would they not be safe places to vote ?	Apologies for not replying to your query. The capacity of the team is unable to keep up with the volume of correspondence and we will be addressing this to the NDP committee on 10th Feb and hope to reply soon after that. It's probable that some people may fear going to vote because of contracting covid-19. This is an Electoral Commission poster not a parish poster.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 8

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
77	02/02/21	Web	Thank you for a copy of the notes. Can you select some more sights for the posters, the three you mentioned are not covering a wide enough area. I live in Coughton and would not visit any of these suggested sites. People who are shielding or disabled as also very unlikely to visit these sites. I would suggest that you also make them waterproof and attach them to lamp post as per planning permissions.	Apologies for not replying to your query. The capacity of the team is unable to keep up with the volume of correspondence and we will be addressing this to the NDP committee on 10th Feb and hope to reply soon after that. Thank you for your comment. We will posting on all parish noticeboards but we cannot post to lampposts because it is classed as fly posting and unlawful. The Parish Newsletter has been delivered to all households and includes an article on the NDP presentations and more.	
78	10/02/21	Web	"With regard to the WNDP I would like to ask the following questions :- 1) Why are the mobile homes sited on Coleraine Farm and Old Hill Farm not included in figures? 2) WNDP 11 - is this not unsuitable due to the proximity of the overhead mains power-line, The Draper Study found that 600m was the minimum distance a Corridor around Power Lines should be considered due to the increased Child Leukaemia rates. Also, being an ANOB, these power cables are due to be re-sited underground in the not to distant future! 3) WNDP 11 - Why are out of date maps being used? DWG No. TCPA21/359 DOES NOT show Alder Close or any of the associated properties, so how can anyone make a judgement on this development? 4) Why do new site developments keep being added if the Consultant has inspected the applications? Is this incurring extra cost to the Ratepayer?? If so can we have details of these costs???"	Thank you for questions. 1) Herefordshire Council has classified them as temporary accommodation for seasonal workers and as such do not qualify as dwellings. 2) There needs to be a corridor around this power line and this is taken into account in the site assessment. We are unaware of any plan to take this cable underground. 3) I believe you quote the map sent by the owner with the site offering. Up to date Ordnance Survey maps from 2020 are being used by the consultant for assessment. The consultant also visited the location to see for himself. 4) The council is obliged to consider additional sites offered up to the point that the first formal consultation has been completed. This is after the final draft NDP is submitted to Herefordshire Council later this year. There is no additional cost to the ratepayer.	
79	11/02/21	email	We have recently moved to Walford and were made aware of the NDP plan. We attended the meeting yesterday which we thought was run very well. It came across that you were very understanding of peoples views and concerns and willing to take things on board. We certainly don't have the perception that there is any inbuilt bias in the committee and in fact the opposite. So please pass these comments and our thanks and appreciation to the committee for their hard work. Of course we share some of the concerns being raised and that is why we attended yesterday and intend to full participate in the process. Finally, we know you sent out details to everyone in the parish which you referred to in the meeting yesterday, including some inserts. I suspect that may have gone to the previous owners or at least we did not receive anything. Can we get a copy of anything not available on the website?	Thank you for your comments. We will share these with the committee members. Everything we sent out with the parish newsletter is also available on the website. We used the newsletter to inform those not on the internet and to make sure we contacted every household in the parish. We hope you have received your copy of the newsletter.	Shared with NDP Committee members
80	11/02/21	email	Herefordshire council are wrong about seasonal workers as some of the caravans at (name redacted) and the other at (name redacted) are occupied year-round and anybody who occupies a dwelling year-round is not temporary. While I have your attention can you tell me how much council tax these seasonal workers pay as they are allowed to use all the facilities, we do but don't pay a penny for the upkeep.	Thank you for your question. Regarding the question of counting caravans as housing Herefordshire Council has been very clear that they are not included in the parish's housing stock. The matter of council tax is not within our remit on the NDP project. Perhaps Herefordshire Council could help you with that question.	
81	12/02/21	email	Please look at this planning application (P132286/U) concerning (name redacted). The wording of this is key as it allows year round occupation of caravans and not temporary/Lawful certificate for existing use of the site for the siting and year-round occupation of 43 caravans (by agricultural workers) and 8 portacabins and associated works comprising the laying of the hardstanding, site access and bunding. Also as these are occupied all year round how much council tax do these so called temporary workers pay.	Thank you for your question. Regarding the question of counting caravans as housing Herefordshire Council has been very clear that they are not included in the parish's housing stock. The matter of council tax is not within our remit on the NDP project. Perhaps Herefordshire Council could help you with that question.	
82	12/02/21	Web	Having only just read the report dated August 2020, I am puzzled with the assertion in 3.12 on Page 15 that there are "7 medium sized housing estates in Walford and Coughton." Where are these? As far as I am aware, there are perhaps that number of cul-de-sacs leading off the B4234. These do not constitute "estates". The largest of these, Coughton Place, could at a stretch be called a "small estate" as it has 41 houses. The others range from seven houses (Alder Close), nine in both Cedar Grove and Willow Close and approximately 21 in Priory Lee. In Walford, Green Colley Grove has approximately 16 houses. By no stretch of the imagination can these cul-de-sacs be described as "medium sized estates" as many houses dotted along the B4234, the corner of the road to Bulls Hill and from Coughton Corner along the road to Pomshill as far as the turn-off to Howle Hill. The designation of "estates" seems to have been used to justify building even more houses in the area. The present population of the parish has to rely on Ross-on-Wye for amenities, as will any residents of new developments. The proposed sites in this part of the parish would absolutely swamp what is already here.	Thank you for your question. The Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report states the size of sites constituting medium size in section 4.2. Large sites, providing over 20 dwellings. Medium sized sites providing between 6 and 19 dwellings. Small sites providing up to 5 dwellings. Thank you for your other comments which are noted.	
83	13/02/21	Web	Has the council looked at the issue of food security in this plan. High grade agricultural land should not be used for housing development. A lesson learned from the recent pandemic is that we need to improve our food security. I would support building on brown field sites as these often have existing water/power/drainage etc and are frequently eyesores that do nothing to advance the rural beauty of our landscapes. Rich farmers should not be profiting from out NDP. Also you have said yourselves there is no support for large developments I would suggest you move away from those and revises other site options. We you may get more support.	Thank you for your questions. The site assessments included consideration of criteria on the use of agricultural land as well as green/brown field sites. We have to convince Herefordshire Council and an independent examiner that we have properly considered a variety of housing options and have chosen one for the NDP. To do this we have to have a full range of options and give arguments for why we chose the one we did and why we rejected the others. This is why we have 5 defined reasonable alternative options, and why we want to consult the parish before choosing one.	
84	13/02/21	Web	Why are you looking at sites 11R plus 21 to build the required 51 properties? Could you not use 11R and other smaller sites to make up the required number of properties, leaving site 21 unused, thus not creating a huge block of unsightly properties in an ANOB?	Thank you for question and your comments which are noted. We have to convince the examiner that we have considered all reasonable alternative options so we have included an option that includes both large sites. We do have an option that you have suggested and this will be part of the questionnaire so that parishioners can express their views for that or any of the others as they wish.	
85	14/02/21	Web	I strongly feel that any new housing development should aim at the development of a village nucleus. Walford is a linear village, along the line of springs issuing at the foot of the Forest of Dean escarpment. Houses are scattered and flourishing village life is so difficult to arrange, the village hall is underused. Likewise the pub. If a nucleus of houses could be created I think we would be thanked by generations to come. Think positive. Think ahead.	Thank you for your comments which are duly noted.	
86	2/15/21	email	Thank you for response a response I totally disagree with. I have read your response from Herefordshire council and I disagree with several points. Herefordshire Council has told us that "...The 173 caravans/mobile homes were not included within the 648 figures as they were considered temporary dwellings and not permanent homes. Seasonal agricultural workers accommodation are not included within the housing figures as the accommodation is seasonal and not occupied permanently, as they are used for seasonal work." The 648 figure referred to is the number of houses in Walford Parish as of 2011 and is used to determine the housing target of minimum 91 houses between 2011 and 2031 (91 = 14% more). This planning permission was granted for 43 caravans to be occupied year round and makes no mention of seasonal work. I suggest you go back to Herefordshire planning and get them to check facts.	Thank you for comment. We have contacted Herefordshire Council and here is their reply. "Thanks for your email, I have checked with my colleagues in Strategic Planning regarding this case. A seasonal workers facility such as this would not seem to fall within the housing supply even if they have year round residency. This is especially the case as the workers are housed in caravans and are using communal facilities such as shower and toilet blocks as shown in the drawings. As it is specific to seasonal workers, the site would not therefore be open to the wider housing market as the location and purpose means they are there to serve the farm's fruit picking business. The caravans are temporary structures and they can easily be removed when no longer required, which the planning statement states. My colleague has checked with in licensing and seasonal worker caravans are exempt from requiring a residential license (although these are all year round) so that wasn't a steer either way. We have also checked with the Strategic Planning Manager and he states that as the CLEUD was permitted in 2013 and the supporting info (which we accepted in granting the CLEUD) indicates the caravans were occupied from 2000 which was prior to the Core Strategy plan period so I think it would be difficult to indicate that they were meeting the housing needs for the current CS plan period 2011-31. On that basis these are not included in the housing figures." Your question is a good one and we hope this answers it now fully.	Emailled HC to seek clarification.
87	2/18/21	email	We note that (name redacted), of (name redacted) has put land forward to be considered for housing under the Walford Development Plan. The application document itself it is incorrect. The applicant has wrongly incorporated his neighbour's land. We understand that (name redacted) has written to you concerning the acreage. HM Land Registry Number HE62545 shows the exact area and location of the wood in question. The adjacent ruined barn being under separate title. It is to be noted that neither plot includes the adjacent drover's footpath. The applicant's statement that there are no trees or hedgerows is incorrect. On the plan submitted there are hundreds of trees. Many have been felled in very old woodland on this elevated site in the Wye Valley ANOB. Development would necessitate the felling of even more trees and denude the site even further. We have several objections and note them simply as follows:- We feel that any idea of more properties being built on Cherry Tree Lane should be rejected immediately as such a proposal would be detrimental to the conservation of the landscape value of this area of ancient semi-natural woodland, and would constitute a form of sporadic development which would be detrimental to this part of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is an isolated site in an Area of Outstanding National Beauty on the top of Bull's Hill and is far from the local amenities in Walford. It is chiefly made up of an expanse of woodland which makes a significant contribution to the landscape as well as being of interest as a woodland providing sanctuary for wildlife. The site in question is on a very steep slope, the gradient being approx. 1 in 3. (Not evidenced on the submitted plan) Development would necessitate the removal of yet more trees (the applicant has already had several trees cut down and left them to rot). This would significantly change the appearance of the site and may well create issues with the land and in particular drainage and stability. The site is subject to torrential run-off from fields above, the topography funnelling the water. The surface of a new track constructed by agents acting for the applicant in January 2021 was substantially washed away within days onto the council maintained highway and water washed into land in the property below. Two access tracks have been created by the applicant since 2016 and approved under permitted development by Herefordshire County Council on the basis that the land is being used as an agro-forestry business. This is not the case. Not business whatsoever is being carried out on the site which can clearly be evidenced by a site visit. It is to be noted now that the applicant is putting forward the land for residential development. Most importantly, planning permission was sought to develop the ruined barn (see area red on plan submitted to Walford Development Plan) in 2000 and this was categorically refused by Herefordshire Council under Reference SE2000/2838/F. Planning permission was also sought to build a single storey dwelling house in the adjacent woodland to Number 38 in 1991 and was also categorically refused. It would be a time wasting and costly exercise in times of great adversity as a result of the COVID epidemic if Herefordshire Council had to expend more time on repeat applications when it could direct funds to more pressing projects. The access road, Cherry Tree Lane is very narrow being only 2.5 metres wide, has only very few passing/turning places and often is used as a footpath by local residents as there is no pavement. It serves some 10 houses at present and we feel that this has now reached the limit of recommended use. Further development would leave the road inadequate to meet desired standards of accessibility particularly for emergency vehicles. We strongly believe that if this site is considered seriously as a site for building houses then it will encourage others to follow suit and the end result would be devastating for our country's heritage	Thank you for your comments. We have passed these on to the consultant who is going to do the assessment when covid restrictions allow. The results of the assessment will be added to an addendum of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report.	Comments passed to consultant for site assessment.
88	2/22/21	Youtube	The government has stated that they wish to get this through quickly due to the climate change programme	Thank you for your comment which has been noted.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 9

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
89	2/22/21	email	Following your meeting streamed on youtube 22/02/2021, I would like to understand the reasons for overlooking the findings of the attached report. The report was compiled by a very experienced environmental assessment specialist on behalf of AECOM, as such would have been compiled to professional standards and without bias. The report found site 11 unsuitable due to a range of constraints, particularly environment and biodiversity constraints. Do you have any evidence the findings of this report have been properly considered by an appropriately qualified team / individual? Is there any report which supersedes the findings of this report?	The Aecom report was carefully studied and was found to be inconsistent with some key points of Core Strategy policy. Mostly this has to do with definitions of whether sites are in or adjacent to built up settlements in Walford. This was also noted in an email from Herefordshire Council who were asked to review the report in 2017. As a result Place Studios, who helped Ross on Wye complete their NDP, was asked to help resolve the issues. Their conclusion was "that those given a green light by Aecom (very surprisingly) would constitute development in the open countryside and some of those given an amber light would result in coalescence of some of the settlements. Add in other factors such as the stream and overhead power lines and the current position is therefore that there are no suitable sites." We will be publishing these two additional documents on the website. Also since their work there have been more site submissions which have had to be assessed as well. It was decided to use an independent consultant to take account of the Aecom report, the feedback from Herefordshire Council and the Place Studios report and also to conduct a full review of all sites offered in 2017 as well as 2020/2021. New flood risk maps were published by the Environment Agency to take account of the increased flood risk posed by climate change.	
90	2/21/21	email	Size of Development On Prime Agricultural Land Sites 11R and 21 are being proposed for houses in excess of the preferred size of development as outlined in the NDP objectives, both are high grade agricultural land. Government guidance states it should only be used for development in extreme circumstances? How can you demonstrate that the size of developments proposed is for the benefit of the parish rather than just the financial benefit to the landowners, one of whom is a Parish councillor?	The effective and efficient use of land was one of the assessment criteria used by the consultant when considering each of proposed development sites. In the case of Site 11 most of the site was judged to be Grade 2 with a small amount of Grade 1 at the Western end. The impact assessment awarded to that aspect of the evaluation was adverse and that formed part of the final score for the site. Most of Site 21 was judged to be Grade 1 and that attracted a rating of major adverse for that element of the evaluation. Each site has been assessed for the potential maximum number of dwellings that could be accommodated, based on the site area and a similar dwelling density to that which currently exists in the surrounding area. Ultimately the NDP has to demonstrate to Herefordshire Council that Walford Parish can deliver at least the additional 91 dwellings required by the Core Strategy. This is a key factor that will need to inform the decision on which sites to select for inclusion in the draft NDP.	
91	2/21/21	email	Why are you not using brownfield sites What consideration has been given to using Brownfield sites? RA 02 states that, Locations make best and full use of suitable brownfield sites wherever possible.	Thank you for your question. The NDP project can only consider sites that have been submitted by landowners as potentially available for development. The parish has very few brownfield sites, a term normally applied to urban areas with prior industrial development and some degree of pollution residue. Of the submitted sites that we might locally refer to as "brownfield" none passed the stage 1 examination and would therefore not be acceptable under Herefordshire Council Core Strategy.	
92	2/22/21	Youtube	you have had brownfield sites offered but they have been rejected	The parish has very few brownfield sites, a term normally applied to urban areas with prior industrial development and some degree of pollution residue. Of the submitted sites that we might locally refer to as "brownfield" none passed the stage 1 examination and would therefore not be acceptable under Herefordshire Council Core Strategy.	
93	2/20/21	email	Why do Herefordshire council keep referring to seasonal workers on this site. They are not seasonal as they are here all year round. As for their temporary nature where does it give a removal date on the application. There is no such date and just because they are caravans they are permanent. This is another example of Herefordshire planning department giving way to farmers so they can have cheap labour all year round. One more question about the amount of sites that have been put forward for development. Who is going to stop these landowners not applying for planning permission now and not waiting for the result of the N.D.P. process.	Herefordshire Council have provided a recent response in respect of seasonal worker accommodation within the Parish and the impact on our NDP. This makes it clear that the accommodation is considered, in planning terms, to be temporary, regardless of whether the units are present, or occupied, on a year round basis. Therefore these units do not contribute to either the total number of permanent dwellings in the Parish or the 14% proportional increase that is mandated by the Core Strategy. Developing and adopting an NDP has no direct impact on the ability of any landowner to apply for planning permission to develop a site. An NDP can only affect the decision making process within Herefordshire Council once a planning application has been made. Just because a site is identified, within an NDP, as being considered suitable for development does not confer any rights to actually develop the site. A planning application is still required and it would still be assessed against the criteria set out in the NPPF and the Core Strategy. However, with an adopted NDP, Herefordshire Council also have to consider whether any application complies with the policies set out in that NDP. It is for this reason that an NDP cannot propose any policies that conflict with those contained in the NPPF and the Local Plan (Core Strategy).	
94	2/21/21	email	Impartiality Irrespective of any statement of pecuniary interest, should serving Parish Councillors be allowed to propose sites for development within any development plan they are directly responsible for and involved in and are set to gain financially	The Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. Any councillor with a pecuniary interest will have to declare an interest when the draft NDP comes before the Parish Council for debate and they will not be allowed to be present, express any view or vote on the outcome.	
95	2/21/21	email	Imbalanced Weighting Criteria Why have you decided in your weighting scales that the following should be given a low weighting in terms of adverse impact? • High Grade Arable land • Pollution • Brownfield sites	Sites progressing to the second stage were assessed against criteria determined from public input from the 2020 consultation events. The importance weighting of the criteria was agreed by the Steering group based on the strength of feedback received from those public consultations. The scales have been used to provide some broad sense of ranking of the suitability of the sites. Guidance for arable land is to use the lowest grade possible to meet the need. As there is little pollution or useable brownfield sites within the parish these criteria did not differentiate sites.	
96	2/22/21	email	Question set C - Employment What evidence has been considered regarding where the potential residents will work and the carbon contribution of commuting journeys? Is there an unfulfilled demand for permanent employees in the parish?	Section 8 of the draft NDP considers employment and business opportunities within the Parish. It specifically identifies Working From Home, Live/Work units and Re-use of Rural Buildings, together with Tourism, as those considered most relevant within the Parish and which reflect the largest current employment. It should also be noted that there is declared need for some 1,000 seasonal agricultural workers within the Parish. Policies WALF23 & 24 seek to support these employment opportunities within the planning system.	
97	2/21/21	email	Environmental Impact What consideration has been given to protecting the delicate eco systems that exist in Coughton/Walford? There are Kingfishers, Herons, Little Egrets, Barn Owls and Polecats as well as Bats in the immediate vicinity. Developments of the proposed size will have considerable environmental impact, including noise, light pollution.	Information about important habitats and protected species was obtained and used when assessing all sites. The approach taken to the assessment of effects on biodiversity is set out at paragraph A6.4.1 of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment report August 2020. Coughton Wood and Marsh is an SSSI and Natural England's information on impact zones influenced the approach taken in relation to site 11 and thereby the combined sites 11(R) and 21. (see pages 76 and 76 of the August 2020 report). In relation to species the sites at Walford and Coughton are generally arable land and as such unlikely to be optimal habitat for protected species as well as those other species referred to. They are in a location where ecological surveys would normally be able to identify acceptable mitigatory measures should any important species be present. In this regard NDP policies are likely to be suggested that would require appropriate mitigation and compensatory measures. Furthermore, measures may also be sought in association with development that would benefit biodiversity. Sites in Coughton may enable benefits to Coughton Marsh SSSI where the wet woodland is understood to be in unfavourable condition.	
98	2/22/21	email	Question set A - Carbon Reduction Targets How will additional housing in this parish help to meet the governments carbon reduction targets?	Thank you for your question. Negative impact on carbon reduction targets is an unfortunate byproduct of population growth. The proposed NDP policies (particularly WALF9) incorporate housing design criteria that will minimise and in some cases mitigate environmental impact both in new housing and alterations to existing housing.	
99	2/22/21	email	Question set B - Low Carbon Housing How will the design of the houses achieve a low carbon contribution? How will the carbon used in the building materials, their transport to site and the travel journeys of tradespeople be off-set?	The proposed NDP policy WALF9 outlines an integrated approach to low impact housing design. Development proposals including extensions and alterations should contain a co-ordinated package of design measures such as: Positioning and orientation for maximum solar gain. Avoiding the loss of woodland. Tree planting. Enhanced pedestrian and cycle accessibility, to highlight a few.	
100	2/22/21	email	Question set G - Environment The parish is already experiencing issues with flooding, affecting properties, roads and agricultural crops. Have investigations been carried out to assess the impact of the proposed schemes on flooding and groundwater levels? What is the position of Herefordshire Wildlife Trust regarding the potential impact on Coughton Marsh?	All of the submitted sites have gone through a two stage flood risk assessment against the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Maps and Surface Water Flood Maps. Where part of a submitted site within a flood zone and is not, consideration has been given to whether those parts outside might provide reasonable sites in terms of deliverability. Site 11 which borders Coughton Marsh has been substantially reduced in area to minimise both visual impact and any adverse effect on the SSSI. Herefordshire Council will subject the draft plan to a Strategic Environmental Assessment before it can proceed further.	
101	2/22/21	email	Hi we are extremely concerned with site 7 as we live directly at the foot of this and we are constantly under the threat of more flooding in our houses. We have many septic tank issues why is this still being a considered site as there has been lots of local issues and concerns now and over the last 20 or so years .	The proximity of the site to Castle Brook has been recognised in the site assessment and areas falling within flood risk zones 2 and 3 excluded from consideration as land for development. The potential for development on the remaining land to increase flooding elsewhere is also acknowledged and the planning concept statement for the site indicates that measures will be required to provide a sustainable drainage scheme that will accommodate peak greenfield flows so that the risk of flooding properties down stream is not increased. The site is crossed by a sewer to which it would be expected that development will connect.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 10

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
102	2/22/21	email	Question set H – Food Supply Chain Two of the proposed sites are productive agricultural land used for food production. Once this land is lost it cannot be replaced. The land is also located under 2 miles away from two large farming operations who grow crops for the food supply chain. If these sites were lost those farming operations would need to seek land further away or lose the ability to produce food. If land was available further away, what would be the carbon contribution of transporting crops and the materials required to grow the crops? If land was not available, this food may have to be imported, again increasing carbon footprint and the cost of food. Should we, as a parish, not be supporting sustainable and low carbon food production?	Without knowledge of where local farmers send their produce to be processed, where that produce then ends up in our shops or abroad, and where any alternative supplies may come from and through what route, it is not possible to pass comment on any possible effects on the carbon footprint.	
103	2/22/21	Youtube	(name redacted) you are talking about 91 houses but 11R and 21 allow for considerably more houses than this	They do indeed and we are sure that the parishioners will take full account of this fact. The required increase in dwelling numbers, between 2011 and 2031, has been set by Herefordshire Council through the Core Strategy. This is a minimum target and Parish Councils are encouraged to plan positively for growth. Herefordshire Council are monitored on both Planning Applications that are granted but also on new dwellings that are delivered against the 20 year total. If the delivery rate falls below that predicted by the Council then Central Government will apply corrective measures which can result in the target for permitted developments actually being increased.	
104	2/22/21	Youtube	Herefordshire Council and Ross are in excess of their target could we not ask for this to be taken into consideration	Herefordshire Council has not met its housing target for the County and in fact the opposite is the case. It is true that Ross Town Council's NDP shows that it is likely to exceed its housing growth requirement and has a Memorandum of Understanding with Bridstow Parish Council that the latter can use some of its excess. However, that is on the basis that Bridstow Parish Council uses its best efforts to meet its required minimum level of housing growth. It would be expected that a similar requirement would be made if Ross Town Council were to offer a similar arrangement. It is not yet possible to show that Walford Parish cannot meet its housing requirement.	
105	2/22/21	email	Question set F - Infrastructure The Covid pandemic has accelerated the trend towards home working. School children and Students are expected to carry out homework and study at home. This relies on reliable, high speed broadband. What additional fibre broadband capacity is available for the parish?	The Fastershire project has taken high speed broadband coverage in Herefordshire from 0.6% of households in 2012 to 94% in 2021. The remaining hardship to reach properties are not part of any planned rollout, Stage 5 of Fastershire's strategy supports communities through grant funding to contract directly with broadband providers i.e. any further development into hard to reach areas will have to be driven by local authorities or action groups. The Fastershire Strategy is due to be reviewed in 2022. The proposed NDP policies incorporate the inclusion of integrated broadband and mobile reception facilities for any new developments.	
106	2/22/21	Youtube	Also can you please advise us clearly where specifically the sites are i.e those you consider have potential. We cannot tell from your maps.	The detailed map of all submitted sites is available on the NDP website here: https://walford-ndp.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Walford-Parish-All-Development-Sites-Jan-2021-002-scaled.jpg The site submission forms, each of which contains an individual site plan are available here: https://walford-ndp.co.uk/potential-housing-development-sites/	
107	2/21/21	email	Not in my back yard Of the sites offered for the NDP how many were in areas where members of the NDP committee reside? Were any of these deemed unsuitable and why?	Members of the NDP committee and former steering group have no influence on the sites submitted nor the site evaluations, which were carried out by an independent planning consultant.	
108	2/23/21	email	I'm writing to congratulate the NDP team for their YouTube presentation last evening and to which I noticed around 80 people tuned in. Preparing an NDP is a very lengthy, time consuming process undertaken by volunteers from the community and which must follow a rigidly defined process laid down in law through The Localities Act 2011. The process is administered and scrutinised by the local authority ie Herefordshire Council and the NDP can't contain any policies that might conflict with the the NPPF or the Core Strategy. Whilst the detailed framework is being established and public consultation is undertaken there's always going to be controversy within communities as it'll be impossible to please even some of the people some of the time! During this process I'm aware land owners were invited to submit sites for consideration and all these sites have been independently assessed so accusations of bias aren't therefore helpful and only serve to undermine the process – and ultimately will, I feel, divide communities. Many of the sites that have been developed in the parish over the last 30 years were formerly green fields – and so the process continues! Parishioners need to perhaps be mindful that there's no legal requirement for a parish to prepare an NDP and local landowners can apply for planning permission, on any site and at any time, in the 'normal' way.	Thank you for your email, it's nice in a situation like this that our efforts are being appreciated. Thank you very much for your comments.	
109	2/21/21	email	Council Transparency Why did 6 Parish Councillors resign? It is reported that some resigned over the lack of transparency and debate about the NDP?	It is not the place of the NDP committee to pass comment on why any ex parish councillors decided to resign. This public consultation will be the 3rd that the steering group / committee have undertaken, and is a voluntary consultation to seek the views of the parish before putting our residents views before full council for debate. All information is available to view on the NDP website and is updated on a regular basis.	
110	2/22/21	email	Question set D - Schools What will be the impact of additional children in the parish? Does Walford school have the capacity to take more children without impacting the quality of education provided? What transport arrangements are anticipated for High School students and what carbon contribution will this make?	Herefordshire council core strategy included amenity location and capacity data when setting the housing requirement numbers. Walford School is currently under capacity. Demographics indicate that meeting Walford Parish's full housing requirement will add around 5-9 school aged children to the local population. The mix of housing development could alter the current demographic, for example the inclusion of more social housing may help younger people remain within the parish thus increasing this number. However, as more than 80% of Walford school attendees are from outside the parish a far greater impact is likely from developments in the surrounding areas, something we have no control over. The proposed NDP policies promote the inclusion of pedestrian and cycle access to amenities reducing the carbon impact particularly along and around the B4234. Additional High School transport arrangements have not been considered within the NDP.	
111	2/22/21	email	Question set E – Access to facilities Public bus services are very limited. How will residents access facilities such as shops, health care, and leisure? What carbon contribution will these additional journeys make and how will this be off-set?	It is acknowledged that access to public facilities, within many of the rural communities in Herefordshire is limited. In the case of Walford there is only one public bus route and that is along the B2434. Therefore to minimise the need for all new residents to own and travel by private vehicle it would be beneficial to concentrate the majority of new housing within easy walking distance of the B4234 and local bus stops. Additionally to avoid the potential pollution issues that can be caused by private four wheel disposal systems it would also be advantageous, from an environmental view, to site the majority of new housing within reach of the existing Welsh Water main sewer system.	
112	2/21/21	email	Why do the proposals contradict the 2020 NDP published objectives At the public presentations in Feb 2020 information presented to Parishioners under Housing Objectives stated that: 1) demand for local need affordable housing is less than anticipated. 2) Restrict future individual development size to less than 20 houses 3) The Residents survey stated a preference for small scale developments of mixed house sizes and styles although should match on traditional forms. Why do a number of the proposed developments go against the published parish plan of Feb 2020? Furthermore the benefit from such developments will not be to the Parishioners but would unduly benefit the landowners, 3 of whom are Parish Councillors? Please explain the rationale.	There are no proposals only options. The parish residents did indeed indicate a preference for small and medium sized sites in February 2020. If this is still the case then this should show again in the questionnaire. To pass the regulatory examinations we do need to consider a range of options and without larger sites we cannot do this. The Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report makes no specific proposals on which sites should be developed or the size of any affordable housing provision that should be included in the NDP. It assesses all the offered sites against clearly stated criteria and presents the results of those assessments. Herefordshire Council provide guidance within a Supplementary Planning Document on how affordable housing targets will be met. NDPs can offer additional guidance and this is contained in paragraph 3.11 of the draft NDP which confirms no recorded need for significant affordable housing. If Herefordshire council implement a policy that requires a percentage of all new developments to include some affordable housing then that will take precedent over local views.	
113	2/21/21	email	Why are your proposals are at odds with residents surveys Why do a number of your housing options go against the views of the public consultations held previously? The largest response of 140 people said- No to all on the same Site The largest response of 237 people said- developments should be divided between several sites as their preferred option Also, any development in Coughton had the least number of votes at 41 for preferred additional housing, in comparison to the most popular Arbour Hill 114	There are no proposals only options. The parish residents did indeed indicate a preference for spread out sites in the questionnaire and the consultation in February 2020. If this is still the case then this should show again in the questionnaire. The site location figures seem to relate to the Parish Survey & Questionnaire conducted in 2014. Unfortunately when the Core Strategy was adopted in 2015 many of the sites mentioned in that questionnaire were no longer compliant with Policy RA2. They are therefore no longer considered as viable development locations by Herefordshire Council. No decisions have been made about which of the viable sites should be put forward in the draft NDP and the current consultation exercise is seeking input from the Parish on all the viable sites and potential options. It will be for the Parish Council to decide which sites to include and for Herefordshire Council to decide if those sites meet the necessary criteria for the plan to proceed to formal consultation and referendum.	
114	2/21/21	email	Housing Need – What is the evidence of demand for the scale proposed A number of the proposals detail building significantly more than the 54 houses now required under the NDP. Where is the evidence for the demand for larger scale developments and the number of houses proposed under Sites 11R and Site 21? How does the proposal meet with RA02 which states that Housing proposals will be permitted where the following criteria are met: • They result in the development of high quality, sustainable schemes which are appropriate to their context and make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting; and • They result in the delivery of schemes that generate the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular settlements, reflecting local demand. • Specific proposals for the delivery of local need housing will be particularly supported where they meet an identified need, and their long-term retention as local needs housing is secured as such.	The growth target for rural parishes in the Ross HMA is set at 14% of the number of dwellings in 2011. This is where the figure of 91, for Walford Parish, comes from. It is not related to any identified local demand but is a result of specific Core Strategy policies to meet the overall housing targets for Herefordshire. It is true that using all of the viable sites would deliver many more new dwellings than 91 but the Parish Council is required to consider all possible development options before proposing a preferred one in the NDP. Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy states The minimum growth target in each rural Housing Market Area will be used to inform the level of housing development to be delivered in the various settlements set out in Figures 4.14 and 4.15. In the case of Walford Parish this is the 91 dwellings.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 11

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
115	2/22/21	email	Site 11R has a large opportunity however I think it's important to understand why 40+ houses would be required within a short timescale. What is the timescale expected for this number/opportunity as it would appear unrealistic to hold a site for a length of time pending local need/requirement. Additionally a developer would, I suspect, require build in as little time as possible? Could you please clarify the requirement over time for 40+ houses and whether therefor this has been part of the criteria, as this is excessive and it is not clear the time length and comparison to requirement and why this is preferred over smaller sites which would be more beneficial to developing in line with the expected requirement.	The NDP does not consider delivery timescales beyond the 2031 target of providing for 91 more dwellings than in 2011. NDPs are part of the Planning Process and thus they contribute to decision making for planning applications but not for execution of those plans, that is a matter for commercial house builders. Therefore the rate at which new houses are constructed will probably be dictated more by market forces. It is not something that the Parish Council can control.	
116	2/22/21	Youtube	I cannot understand how the WNDP committee can reach the conclusion that this development plan is "unbiased and independent". I refer to - UNMITIGATED BIAS towards sites 11R and 21	The Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. Members of the NDP committee and former steering group have no influence on the sites submitted nor the site evaluations which were carried out by an independent planning consultant.	
117	2/22/21	Youtube	Herefordshire planners does not support large developments on the Southwest side of Ross due to the restrictions on the B4234 so this would probably be rejected	Herefordshire Council, which is both local planning authority and the highway authority, has determined the level of housing growth that the parish must seek to achieve. Its advice in relation to the capacity of the B4234 at Ross is unlikely to influence the choice of development options to any significant degree. That Council will be consulted formally upon the draft plan when it has been prepared and should it have any concerns about the ability to accommodate the chosen level of development and set a finite figure in terms of traffic generation that can be accommodated, then this will be used to revise the plan accordingly.	
118	2/21/21	email	Comment s on Site Number 38 (small barn ruin & woodland) for Walford Development Plan We wish to object to the consideration of Site No 38 being suitable for housing development and will list the reasons below. However, to start with we would like it noted that there are inaccuracies in the statement put forward to be considered for housing under the Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is stated that the plot is clear of trees and hedgerows. It is not. On the plot are dozens of trees although some of them over the past 2 years have been felled (redacted). The boundaries are not correct (redacted). The gradient of the land is not illustrated. The plot is on a steep slope than is not indicated on the plan. The WND Steering Group should be invited to a site visit as this is evident on inspection. There is no mains water (or drainage) already on the land. The objections: Environmental. Development would necessitate the felling of more trees and will strip this elevated and environmentally sensitive site of woodland in the Wye Valley, AONB. It is critical that in the face of catastrophic climate change we protect the natural countryside and woodland as if were the emergency it is. Following recent works to clear the vegetation and trees around the ruined old barn and lay down a gravel track, Cherry Tree Lane was flooded. The gravel track was washed away almost entirely by storm water from the higher ground. The forceful stream of water ran onto (redacted) properties bringing with it significant amounts of gravel which blocked the drainage in the houses and also a recently installed drain at the end of Cherry Tree Lane (the gravel from the track had to be hand dug out of the drain after this episode). The run off has also caused disturbance to the road surface and the bank upon which the road sits. Removal of plants and trees will only cause further surface water to run from the higher ground down to the properties below in Walford. Accessibility. There are no amenities in Walford - no convenience store, post office, doctors, dentists, petrol station, farm shop or the like and indeed none in the settlements above the village. Therefore every house and resident is forced to use their car to shop in Ross for even the smallest of purchases. There is no public transport or community bus that ventures up Bulls Hill so how can that road carry more traffic? Placing housing in the remoter areas of the parish forces greater use of fossil fuelled vehicles. It will be many years before cleaner electric cars become affordable and the norm (this comment is relevant to all proposed housing developments in the Parish. From Walford there is one single bottle necked road (B4234) into the town of Ross where the food and convenience stores are. How is that congestion going to be addressed? Road Safety - Cherry Tree Lane is a single track cul-de-sac of approximately 2.5 mtrs width with insufficient passing places for the current residents traffic. Many ramblers and dog walkers (tourists and locals) use the lane for recreational walking as they loop the Wye Valley walk. To push more cars on the road and indeed large vehicles involved in the construction of housing will not just impact the peaceful and remote character of the area but more importantly cause further road safety hazards. This is also true of Bulls Hill which too has no pavements and limited passing places - Previous precedents. Planning permission was previously sought for the old barn ruin in 2000 and this was categorically refused by Herefordshire Council under Reference SE2000/2838F. Previously planning permission was also sought to build a single storey dwelling house in the adjacent woodland (Site Number 38 in 1991) and was also categorically refused. Any proposal to build either on the plot of the ruined barn or in the woodland would be to the detriment of the privacy and quiet enjoyment of the residents of the houses directly below (redacted). Surely Herefordshire Council shouldn't be wasting scarce resources in revisiting decisions they have made previously when there are more effective and pertinent development opportunities to address the housing needs in and around Ross On Wye.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultant in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	
119	2/21/21	email	Events of the last 12 months have brought the future rushing towards us and on the narrow lanes of Bulls Hill and Howle Hill this future takes the form of delivery vans. In considering the suitability of sites for new development, the Plan must prioritise the safety of pedestrians. We walk the lanes every day and live in fear of being flattened by a parcel van. More houses will generate more traffic on roads that were never designed to carry the volume or the dimensions of modern vehicles. Both Bulls Hill and Sharnham Pitch have blind corners and Cherry Tree Lane was never built for such traffic. Large vehicles, including food delivery vans, quite frequently have to reverse the entire length of the lane and out onto a dangerous corner on Bulls Hill. In doing so they damage the hedges, erode the banks and break down the edges of the carriageway surface, to say nothing of the danger to other road users. The remoteness of Site 38 from existing settlements and services and the fact Cherry Tree Lane does not comply with Herefordshire Council's Highway Design Guidance or is capable of meeting acceptable design standards for new development should lead to the exclusion of this site from consideration. SITE 38 SHOULD BE EXCLUDED BECAUSE THE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PLOT RENDER DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT CAUSING UNDUPLICATE DISRUPTION AND NUISANCE. ANY BUILT SCHEME WILL HAVE A PERMANENT ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE 'QUIET ENJOYMENT' OF ADJOINING RESIDENTS. Inordinately intrusive civil engineering works would be required to construct a satisfactory vehicular access up into the site and prepare the ground for building works. Recent works to form a new access track, with crushed stone sub-base material, have shown very clearly what could be expected. It was necessary for vehicles delivering aggregate and construction plant to back along the entire length of Cherry Tree Lane to exit the site. This included towed trailers, which caused damage to banks and hedges, necessitated by the absence of adequate turning space as highlighted above. Works on a larger scale must accordingly be regarded as unacceptable at this location. The recent limited site stripping and tree felling that has been undertaken has exacerbated storm water discharge from the site, washing earth and aggregate down onto Cherry Tree Lane and on down into the curtilage of dwellings on the lower side of the lane. This has caused considerable anxiety and nuisance to residents and genuine danger to road users. If development takes place, it is difficult to see how storm water drainage can be contained within the site. There are no storm water drains in Cherry Tree Lane. Waste water drainage will be similarly problematic. Given that the site rises steeply above the lane, it is hard to see how water outflow from septic tanks can be adequately dealt with. There is the risk of polluting effluvia running down into the curtilage of dwellings on the facing side of the lane. There are sites elsewhere on Bulls Hill and Howle Hill where constant nuisance arises from exactly this problem. New development should not be permitted where such a risk can be clearly foreseen. Any development on the footprint of the old stone barn site will severely compromise the privacy of the immediately facing dwelling which is built very close to the road. Because of the topography, the main bedroom windows of (redacted) are only a little above the level of the highway. Any new development will overlook (redacted) directly and down into the bedrooms. This would be a totally intolerable intrusion into the privacy of the residents. Given that access to development on the barn site can only be gained from one point, headlights of vehicles exiting the site would shine directly into the bedrooms of (redacted). The same level of intrusion and loss of privacy would affect the residents of the adjoining (redacted) if any development is permitted on the woodland part of the site. A further aspect that is weighed in the site sieving criteria is that of the potential for solar gain in any new development. Given the location of this site on a steep, east facing hillside, overshadowed by mature woodland, (not forming part of the development site), the opportunities for solar gain are extremely limited. Indeed the sun scarcely rises on the site in the depths of winter. Adverse physical characteristics of the site, which cannot be overcome, and the harmful impact that any development would have on the residents of nearby dwellings should cause Site 38 to be excluded from further consideration. SITE 38 SHOULD BE EXCLUDED ON THE GROUNDS OF DOUBTFUL DELIVERABILITY WITHIN THE PLAN PERIOD. Note to the Site Assessors - (redacted). The boundary of the Site 38, as submitted, is incorrectly identified on the accompanying plan. (redacted)	Thanks you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultant in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	
120	2/21/21	email	Objections to Site No 38 Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan We note that (name redacted), has requested this land be considered for housing under the Walford Development Plan. We have several objections to this proposal and list them as follows:- The site is located in an isolated position with the open countryside in the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in an Area of Great Landscape Value. Walford Parish Council and Herefordshire Planning Department refused a planning application in 2001 (Ref: SE2000/2838F) on the grounds "The introduction of a residential use and the associated works, including the removal of trees, provision of access and creation of a residential curtilage would have a harmful impact on the landscape character of the area. The introduction of a residential use in this location would be likely to have a harmful impact on the residential amenity of the dwelling adjoining to the north." In addition planning permission has been sought and refused in 1991 for a single-storey dwelling in the adjacent woodland. Any development of this site would severely impact and dominate the privacy of (redacted) (redacted) brutally effect their privacy too. Any further felling would additionally change the appearance of the site, which has been already partially stripped, the felled logs being left on the ground to decay. Further tree removal may well weaken this area of woodland, causing a danger of subsidence in the area. The access slope created last year without planning consent to the ruined barn has already had severe impact on the properties below and on the lane. Within a week of the access being created nearly all the 'hardstanding' stone was swept onto the road. (redacted) We are advised that the 'Neighbourhood Planning' provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community's needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area." In view of the above perhaps we could respectfully suggest that other sites be considered for inclusion and not this one, where affordable housing for local young people, securing First Homes, sold at a discount to market price for first time buyers, including key workers, through developers contributions; support SME builders as the economy recovers from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultant in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 12

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
121	2/22/21	email	We note that (name redacted), has requested that land be considered for housing under the Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan. We object to the inclusion of this site (No 38) for the following reasons: - The area: Cherry Tree Lane, Bulls Hill, is in an area of outstanding natural beauty. The lane winds its way down a very narrow council adopted road through farmland and woodland on either side. This tranquil area is greatly enjoyed by dog walkers and other pedestrians who observe the flora and fauna that occupy this particularly beautiful area of Herefordshire. The lane is sited above the Wye Valley Walk and thus walkers take advantage of the many footpaths that traverse the area up to and beyond the lane itself. Proposed site and lack of privacy: The site in question is located on the last straight leg of the lane and is positioned on a very steep slope elevated well above the lane's road surface, the gradient being 1 in 3 and the width of the lane being 2.4 metres at this point. The dwelling below the ruined barn is known as (redacted). A new development of this small and dilapidated ruin, given its proximity and elevated position, would severely impact on the privacy on the dwelling below. The exceedingly high bank walls are clearly visible from the windows of (redacted) and as such will affect the privacy currently enjoyed by this property. In addition, the small enclosed private courtyard garden positioned below the level of the lane will be rendered virtually unusable given the very narrow lane and the access track opposite intruding on this property's privacy and enjoyment. Flood Risk The access slope to the ruined barn created last year has already had severe impact on the property lies below and on the lane. There is no flood and/or drainage provision either to the barn site or the adjacent woodland. The lane was observed as actively being used as a 'soak away' from the torrential rain run-off from the fields above washing down the newly created slope as heavy rain was experienced. This created a waterway running beyond (redacted) to the turning circle below. A torrent of water entered the gate way by (redacted), then poured down the side of this dwelling to the Wye Valley Walk. Evidence of this run-off can still be seen clearly on the lane. Due to the adverse effects of climate change this is highly likely to become the norm in the future. Any further felling in the woodland area itself will have a negative impact. The site has been already partially denuded with felled logs left on the ground (redacted). Any further removal of ground cover and trees could seriously impact on the stability of this woodland area, which would be to the detriment of (redacted) immediately below, and the residents located beyond the turning circle. Previous planning applications Planning permission was sought for the ruined barn in 2001 under Ref: SE2000/2838F. Planning permission was also sought in 1991 for a single-story dwelling in the adjacent woodland. Both applications were categorically refused. We would respectfully request that careful consideration be given to this site in view of the issues raised.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultation in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	
122	2/22/21	email	Please note our objections to Site 38 of the Walford Development Plan. We are aware that (name redacted) has proposed that a site located on Cherry Tree Lane in the Walford area be developed. We wish to state that this is wholly inappropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly, we believe that as a site located in an AONB area, this would have an adverse effect on the flora and fauna in the immediate vicinity. The site comprises of semi-ancient woodland of which several trees have already been felled by the applicant. This has scarred the landscape and the felled trees have been simply left to rot in situ. It is of major concern to us that any development of this site would lead to more felling denuding the plot further still. In addition to this, the site is on a very steep slope and further removal of trees would lead to landslip and run off water cascading into the grounds of (redacted) located below the site in question. This was evidenced this winter during periods of torrential rain caused by the creation of a very poorly constructed track adjacent to the derelict barn. Alarmingly, as the aforementioned property is located below this site, the torrent of run off water came alarmingly close to causing water ingress into the house. It must also be noted that the two access tracks created by the applicant and approved under permitted development by Herefordshire County Council based on a submission from the applicant that the land is being used as an agro-forestry business. (redacted) Cherry Tree Lane is a very narrow lane with virtually no passing points. The lane is 2.5 metres wide and is used by a large number of walkers on a daily basis as it leads up to the Wye Valley Walk. As it currently stands there are 10 dwellings down the lane and we feel that this is the maximum number of properties that can cope under the current infrastructure. We trust that our concerns will be taken into consideration.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultation in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	
123	2/23/21	email	Comments on Site Number 38 (small barn ruin & woodland) for Walford Development Plan We wish to object to the consideration of Site No 38 being suitable for housing development and will list the reasons below. However, to start with we would like it noted that there are inaccuracies in the statement put forward to be considered for housing under the Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is stated that the plot is clear of trees and hedgerows. It is not. On the plot are dozens of trees although some of them over the past 2 years have been felled and left to rot during which time the applicant has (redacted) run an agroforestry business (redacted). The boundaries are not correct and includes land which is not under the ownership of (name redacted). It erroneously includes: the Drovers path (regularly used by ramblers and local residents) and woodland which belongs to a local neighbour. The gradient of the land is not illustrated. The plot is on a steep slope that is not indicated on the plan. The WND Steering Group should be invited to a site visit as this is evident on inspection. There is no mains water (or drainage) already on the land. The objections: Environmental. Development would necessitate the felling of more trees and will strip this elevated and environmentally sensitive site of woodland in the Wye Valley AONB. It is critical that in the face of catastrophic climate change we protect the natural countryside and woodland as if it were the emergency it is. Following recent works to clear the vegetation and trees around the ruined old barn and lay down a gravel track, Cherry Tree Lane was flooded. The gravel track was washed away almost entirely by storm water from the higher ground. The forceful stream of water ran onto our and neighbours properties bringing with it significant amounts of gravel which blocked the drainage in the houses and also a recently installed drain at the end of Cherry Tree Lane (the gravel from the track had to be hand dug out of the drain after this episode). The run off has also caused disturbance to the road surface and the bank upon which the road sits. Removal of plants and trees will only cause further surface water to run from the higher ground down to the properties below in Walford. Accessibility. There are no amenities in Walford - no convenience store, post office, doctors, dentists, petrol station, farm shop or the like and indeed none in the settlement is above the village. Therefore every house and resident is forced to use their car to shop in Ross for even the smallest of purchases. There is no public transport or community bus that ventures up Bulls Hill so how can that road carry more traffic? Placing housing in the remote areas of the parish forces greater use of fossil fuelled vehicles. It will be many years before cleaner electric cars become affordable and the norm (this comment is relevant to all proposed housing developments in the Parish. From Walford there is one single bottle necked road (B4234) into the town of Ross where the food and convenience stores are. How is that congestion going to be addressed?	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 38 will undergo an assessment by an independent planning consultation in accordance with the procedures laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council once the lockdown restrictions allow.	
124	2/23/21	email	The Development Plan states that in order to avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3 development could be located in the areas of the fields not directly through which the main flood line runs. This would be development which would be in the existing small cluster of houses on Bulls Hill, old and new, which already exist. This would bring development even closer to Upper and Lower Wythall, with considerable impact upon them. The area would become defragmented and unattractive. Both of the sites proposed suffer frequent flooding which affects not only the immediate land but areas beyond towards Walford Church and the River Wye. The existing ditches and culverts within the fields, even though they have been extensively widened over the years, do not reduce the amount of flooding. Bulls Hill Lane floods directly at the existing access area to both of the fields and surface water is slow to drain away. Any development in these sites would be inappropriate as they are areas at high risk of flooding. Further development would increase the risk to existing properties, especially further along through the village, making these at a higher risk than they already are. Traffic Bulls Hill Lane is a narrow lane with the lower end towards the main road often restricted by residents parking cars outside their properties. With the expansion over the years of Walford Primary School, the school on-site parking is not sufficient to accommodate the amount of cars for parents dropping off or collecting their children from school. This means that at certain times of the day the lane and main road is also used for additional parking related to the school. The proposed development of additional housing on the sites will increase the number of cars using the lane. The area is not close to any local amenities or employment sites which are within walking or cycling distance and therefore there will be a lot of reliance on people using their private cars. The area is not a sustainable location and will not reduce sustainable travel or reduce carbon emissions which is considered by Herefordshire Council Local Plan, to be of importance. Point three of Policy RA2, identified in the Assessment, states that: 'development should be high quality, sustainable schemes which are appropriate to their context and make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting' and that development should be avoided if: 'any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in national policy taken as a whole'. The proposed housing development on sites 6 & 7, identified in the Development Plan, do not comply with the above and it is evident that the benefits do not outweigh any benefits. Therefore, I strongly object to the development of both.	The issues highlighted are acknowledged as concerns in the assessment presented in the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment report August 2020 and scored appropriately. The settlement has developed in a fragmented fashion over time and consequently the effect of development on sites 6 and 7, although not particularly sympathetic, is not totally out of character such that it might be considered major adverse. Mitigation measures set out in the planning concept statement, and should be covered by policy criteria should either or both sites be included as allocations, include (among others) provision of sustainable drainage schemes to accommodate peak greenfield flows so that land and properties further to the south are protected from increased flooding; provision of structural landscaping buffers of trees along the eastern edges of the sites to mitigate the effect on views from higher land to the east; and access points should be derived from studies including provision for storm water drainage to reduce flooding of the lane. However, the disadvantages are not considered such as to rule the reduced site out completely, a sufficient degree of mitigation should be possible especially given design policies expected to be included in the NDP, and the assessment looks at the relative suitability of the sites submitted in a proportionate way given all have advantages and disadvantages. It is stressed that a decision has yet to be made upon which sites are to be included in the NDP to meet the required level of housing growth.	
125	2/21/21	email	External Consultants The NDP committee has employed Bill Bloxsome, an Environmental consultant as he has previous experience of 3 NDP plans. What has been his role in the plan and the site assessments? To what extent was he aware of the information presented to the parishioners in Feb 2020 and the parishioners preferences from previous consultations?	The NDP Committee employed Bill Bloxsome because of his extensive experience as an environmental consultant and planning officer. He has assisted 30 parishes, many across Herefordshire, with the development of their NDP including several in rural locations similar to our own. Mr Bloxsome has advised on the structure and development of our NDP and undertaken the site assessments independently. He helped develop the 2020 consultation materials and has had full access to earlier consultation material.	
126	2/22/21	email	Large development NO small groups of houses will fit in with the area.	Thank you for your comments which are duly noted.	
127	2/21/21	email	New Government Planning Bill The new Government white paper and planning bill, seeks to protect rural areas and restrict development on farmland and in areas of AONB. The debating and acceptance of this paper has been delayed due to Covid. Is the NDP under pressure from those who will gain financially from large developments (the landowners) to push this plan through ahead of new planning regulations?	The NDP is under no time pressure from any landowners. Our aim is to complete the project as thoroughly and quickly as possible. The project, which has already undergone several lengthy delays, was started some nine years ago and still has at least 2 years to run. We want our parish to have a say in it's future, until our plan is adopted we have no say.	
128	2/21/21	email	Communication and Feedback At the Committee meeting on the 10th February it was acknowledged that Walford has a higher than average % of residents over 65 who may come under the definition of 'vulnerable' in the current pandemic. Whilst some are familiar with accessing information online, many are not. Given the importance of the parishioners support for the NDP and that there is 10 years to develop the required 54 houses we still do not understand the need to progress the NDP to Reg 14 at this point in time. What steps have been taken to ensure barriers to partaking and responding to the survey are removed. The perception is the NDP is looking to serve its own needs and its own self-imposed timescales rather than Walford Parishioners. Please explain the need to persist with progressing to Reg 14 at this point in time. Assessment under Covid For nearly 12 months commuter traffic has been operating at circa 35 - 65% of pre covid levels How will the return to normal levels be and the impact upon the environment, traffic, congestion road safety be correctly identified.	A lot of thought was given on how to ensure anyone who needs a paper copy of the presentations (i.e. slides and narration) and the questionnaire gets one. To facilitate this a return slip to request these was sent out to every household in the parish with a newsletter. We appreciate that this does not cover how anyone who is shielding, and would therefore not be able to get out and post this request or indeed to return the questionnaire so we have enlisted the help of the Walford Community Support Coordinator with her volunteers to contact / collect the return slips / questionnaires.	
129	2/22/21	email	In view of the enormous amounts of money that can potentially be generated for already-wealthy landowners represented on the Parish Council, one has to wonder whether the remaining three members of the Parish Council eligible to vote can be fully aware of the perceived implications of their determined championing of the respective unpopular proposals, with an inherent taste that can be seen as entirely unnecessary. They cannot fail to recognise the massive impact of such disproportionate further developments on the existing minor developments - which have subjectively been referred to as 'estates', when they are largely no more than a few individual cul-de-sacs accessed from the B4234. Indeed, these councillors appear to be ignoring all of the valid objections, including the balance of expressed public opinion and official guidelines. In all the circumstances, I feel the facts need to be referred to higher authority for consideration.	The Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. Any councillor with a pecuniary interest will have to declare an interest when the draft NDP comes before the Parish Council for debate and they will not be allowed to be present, express any view or vote on the outcome.	
130	2/22/21	Youtube	I cannot understand how the WNDP committee can reach the conclusion that this development plan is 'unbiased and independent'. I refer to -There is NO QUORUM ergo you can reach NO DECISION!!!	The quorum for any parish council is one third of the full contingent, and never fewer than three. The quorum for the WNC is one third of the full contingent of 13 members. Currently there are seven elected councillors, which means WPC is quorate. No conclusion or decisions are being made at this time. The NDP committee is undertaking a voluntary consultation to seek the views of the parish before putting our residents' views before the full council for debate.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 14

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
141	3/2/21	email	<p>Thank you for your response to my email dated 22 February 2021, though I have to say that it was not very informative and did not address the point I made with regard to the NDP Steering Group subjectively referring to the main sites proposed for development being within an already built-up area with a number of existing "estates". In my view, and probably that of most people who live there, it is a semi-rural area with some ribbon development set back from the main road (B4234) and a few cul-de-sacs accessed from this road - most of which currently back onto fields. The subjective description appears to be a means of justifying the degradation of the existing minor developments by imposing relatively massive further development, which would indeed amount to a large housing estate. It would seem far more justifiable for there to be some further limited development in the Leys Hill / Howle Hill areas, where impact would be much less damaging in relative terms. I am, of course, aware that parish councillors who have a pecuniary interest in any proposed development are not permitted to take part in any related discussions or vote. On the other hand, I am also well aware of the relationships that are built up within groups that are formed by members brought together as colleagues in any context. This includes parish councillors, who are all volunteers for various reasons. Some volunteer for the purpose of combining a social interface with the opportunity to assist in providing a service to the community, though most councillors will not be unaware of the mutual opportunities for influencing decisions that have a bearing on their own interests, whether pecuniary or environmental. For this reason, the declaration of an interest and self-disqualification from personal input is only a partial safeguard that satisfies legal requirements. It seems relevant that six parish councillors have already resigned on the grounds of there having been a lack of transparency within the Council, which in itself must raise significant doubts in the minds of residents. Of the seven remaining councillors, only four are eligible to vote (I had previously assumed it to be three) and all four reside at points remote from the large developments being considered (Leys Hill / Howle Hill areas, as I understand), and are therefore not representative of those who live in, or near to, the area that would be under threat of being overwhelmed. As regards the co-opted members of the NDP Steering Group, do they reside within the Parish and, if so, do they live within sight of the Coughton area in question? At the recent informal Zoom consultation meeting there was more repetition of the misleading figure of 91 dwelling sites required, despite the fact that only 54 of these remained to be found as of April 2020. What is more, there will have been a number of additional planning consents granted in the period since April, which the Parish Council must be aware of, and I am personally aware of additional applications pending in my own immediate vicinity. Would you therefore please publish a full update of the number of respective applications so far granted since the latest ones taken into account in April 2020, also the average number of applications approved within the respective catchment area each year under normal circumstances. Finally, one of the co-opted members of the NDP Steering Group who spoke at the most recent Zoom consultation appeared to be suggesting that the impact on the local school of further substantial development in the Coughton area should only amount to something like one child for every ten houses. Was this, in fact, what he was stating? If so, can it please be advised how this surprisingly low estimate was arrived at. I firmly believe, as I think others do, that this matter would be more justly and impartially dealt with by Herefordshire Council, which has in the past indicated reluctance to permit further substantial development in this area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are duly noted.</p> <p>In regards to the large site to which you refer, Walford Parish Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. It is also important that the Parish Council can show that all options have been considered. It must also show reasons for recommending the option entered into the draft NDP document and rejecting the other options.</p> <p>Members of the NDP committee and former steering group have no influence on the sites submitted nor the site evaluations, which are carried out by an independent planning consultant.</p> <p>The criteria and resulting scoring system on which sites have been assessed was derived from the responses received to prior public consultations from interested parishioners at that time. This has resulted in the order in which sites are ranked. Note that this is a ranking in suitability not an order of preference.</p> <p>The Parish Council now has to show good reason if any of these are to be excluded from the Plan so it is important that parishioners air their views in the questionnaire.</p> <p>No conclusion or decisions are being made at this time. Once the elections have taken place in May the parish council will have a more diverse complement and the decisions on the NDP will be made by this unknown diversity of councillors.</p> <p>Yes the co-opted members do reside within the Parish and either live within sight of the Coughton area in question or travel through it regularly as do the councillors.</p> <p>Regarding the granted applications in the parish these figures are verified by Herefordshire Council following updates issued each April and once this has been done these figures will be taken into account in the NDP. Past averages do not have any bearing on planning moving forward. Hereford Council will allocate a permit of 14% housing growth in the parish by 2031. Having an NDP adopted by Herefordshire Council means the Parish has some control of where these will be. Without it Herefordshire Council will grant permissions as the applications for suitable sites present themselves.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on the local school, the independent planning consultant mentioned that in rural areas he uses, as a rule of thumb, 1 school age child per 10 dwellings for planning purposes. The 2011 census shows 35 school aged children to 648 houses for Walford Parish. Rounded up that equates to 0.055 children per household. On this basis, 91 houses equals 5 more school aged children which is nearer to 1 in 20 households.</p>	
142	2/22/21	same as 1351	<p>Roads and Flooding More housing in Walford and Coughton will lead to increased traffic and congestion in these localities. What measures are you going to take, especially as the roads are in desperate need of repair now, should any large scale development take place? Have you also considered the need to ensure any development must have significant off-road parking? Roads will become congested and so there is a huge concern that the emergencies services will not be able to access our roads. At a local parish council meeting, the councillors objected to planning permission for five houses on Howle Hill, one reason being due to road access, another five houses in one part seems excessive; why is the NDP not considering the residents of Walford and Coughton in the same way? The area and agricultural fields have increased flooding in recent years. Has the NDP and its consultants visited the proposed areas in the last few weeks to see whether they are suitable for housing and how will the flood water be managed?</p> <p>Affordable Housing. Second Homes, Local Parishioners should any development take place in Walford and Coughton what measures are going to be made regarding: Local Parishioners to be able to buy their own home at affordable prices? Since the pandemic and working from home has become a norm; many residents from London and cities have been moving to the countryside/rural areas as the houses are more affordable and due to good broadband connections. How are you going to ensure that the residents in Herefordshire are going to be the target group for any new development? How are you going to ensure these developments are not used as holiday homes?</p> <p>The Environment: Agricultural land should be used for that purpose and so why would the NDP Members and our Councillors be encouraging transforming such land into housing developments. We need to help ensure land is used for crops and animals. Building on such land impacts the whole environmental to wildlife, natural habitats/vegetation and will cause adverse effect on health. Pollution will increase. Please advise on this point.</p> <p>Development Strategy The NDP have stated in their 'draft report' 'The settlement of Walford and Coughton will be the focus for housing during the Plan period through defining settlement boundaries and allocating housing sites' This goes against the questionnaire responses, so why is the NDP not focusing and investigating more on areas outside of Walford and Coughton? If there are 51 houses that have to be built, why does the NDP not consider making the spread of housing equally between all of the villages? For example, the council opposed a five house application just this month, if they had not, that would mean 46 developments need to be found between all of the villages; rather than just penalising the parishioners of Walford and Coughton. The NDP should re-visit the areas of Howle Hill, Hom Green, Leys Hill, Kern Bridge and so forth. Please provide explanations as to why this is not a feasible action or option. Surely the NDP will be able to think of new ways to deal with this matter and change its strategy based on its findings and the community views? What proposals do you have to increase facilities such as, health and dental care, traffic and parking, local amenities e.g. access to shops and public transport. How are you meeting the criteria of Regulation 14, as detailed below? '14. Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must – (a) Publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area – (i) Details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; (ii) Details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected; (iii) Details of how to make representations; and (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised; (b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and (c) Send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority'. Can the NDP committee provide us with the length of time that they are considering for the consultation period, prior to submitting the proposed plan to the local authority for independent examination? Walford Parish Council Three Councillors have expressed they have an interest, who are these Councillors? How will the NDP manage to complete the process without a full complement of Councillors, due to six resignations and with three, who should not be included in voting on this matter? What the decisions have been set for the NDP and by whom on all the project matters? Which are these set by other bodies and regulations?</p>	<p>Highway capacity is a legitimate concern and a consideration that was included in the site assessment. It is understood that there is likely to be sufficient capacity along the B4234 through the Parish to accommodate the level of development we are to meet. However, this, together with any impact on the wider network will be confirmed by Herefordshire Council, as Local Highway Authority when it is formally consulted upon the draft plan at the Regulation 14 stage. Should this indicate that the B4234 is not able to accommodate the development required, then this will restrict development within the whole plan area and used to agree a new level of housing growth within the NDP. Herefordshire Council has a range of residential design requirements that include off-street car parking.</p> <p>Flood risk is also a consideration that has been used in the assessment. There is much guidance upon this which is explained in the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report upon the NDP website. No land considered by the Environment Agency to be at risk of flooding is proposed for housing. Where sites are not such areas, it is most likely that more detailed work will be required to define the exact area and a policy is expected to be included in the NDP requiring this. The Environment Agency must be consulted on the NDP through the Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>Protection of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, again, was used as one of the criteria to differentiate between sites. Government requires this to be protected from substantial, inappropriate and unsustainable development. There is no definition of substantial although Natural England must be consulted upon development of sites of 20 hectares or more. No site is close to this size. However, the protection of sites smaller than this can be considered where there are sites of lower value. The weight given to the respective grades is considered appropriate given this advice and Natural England will be consulted at the Regulation 14 stage in any event.</p> <p>The site assessment included consideration of effect on wildlife and habitats and also pollution to differentiate between sites. Other organisations with responsibilities for the environment, services, housing and employment will be consulted formally at the regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>Government requires that the NDP must comply with the Core Strategy. As well as indicating the minimum number of dwellings that must be accommodated in the parish, the Core Strategy indicates that Walford and Coughton should be the focus for housing during the Plan period. It also indicates what are considered to be minimum set of housing growths should be located through the NDP and the only other defined area is Bishopwood (which in effect includes Kern Bridge) and Howle Hill. Some of those locations you refer to are not considered settlements where housing might be located by Herefordshire Council. Away from the defined settlements, applications for new dwellings will comprise exceptions that meet criteria set out in Core Strategy policy PAS (and those other policies referred to within it) which will be determined by Herefordshire Council through planning applications and not the NDP. The minimum number of dwellings required comprises the Parish's contribution to the total assessed for the County as a whole. That figure was established using a firm set of housing growth measures, Natural England, Herefordshire Wildlife Trust and the County's Housing Market Areas. There is a mechanism to require a proportion of dwellings on sites of more than 10 dwellings to be 'affordable' within Government's definitions. There are no planning mechanisms to restrict how market housing is distributed.</p> <p>Formal consultation under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations will commence when the draft plan is completed, and the Parish Council will consider all representations made and make such changes as are considered necessary. This consultation period must be a minimum of 6 weeks. It will not be before the Parish Council elections in May. We have yet to reach that stage and the current informal consultation is in advance of the formal stage to help the Parish Council to produce that draft plan. There will be another formal consultation after the Parish Council has carried out any revisions and this will be undertaken by Herefordshire Council after which an Independent Examiner will consider the representations made at that stage.</p>	
143	3/9/21	email	<p>Firstly, though, I would like to express my gratitude for all of the planning and organisation that you have done up to this point. It can't be an easy task and it is much appreciated that the viewpoints of the parish are being listened to.</p> <p>My concerns and questions relate primarily to Site 21 (and therefore to Site 11R too). They are as follows:</p> <p>Impact on Wildlife I know this was touched upon in the last meeting, but I feel that surely building so close to the reservoirs/Coughton Marsh would be detrimental to the wildlife from noise and disturbance arising firstly from the building and development of houses, and then from the residents who live in the new development. Do you not agree?</p> <p>This includes, but is not limited to loss of ecological habitats inc. hedgerows, disturbances from sound, and disturbances from smells. Swans, ducks, geese, and herons all frequent that site along with countless other species. If you were to build on Site 21 further from Coughton Marsh to minimise disruption to the wildlife, then that would mean the new houses would either be right next to pylons or closer to the footpath and houses that already exist in Coughton Place. This would then raise further concerns for the privacy of those residents, namely due to overshadowing and also all of the bathrooms along the back row of terraces face out onto Site 21 and the gardens would be overlooked by the new site. There is also wildlife in the hedgerows behind residents' houses including, for example, newts and slow worms.</p> <p>Furthermore, any nature/wildlife that exists in the gardens of current residents would also be impacted. For example, frogspawn in ponds - frogs would probably not revisit gardens after they are built in the field. We also have newts in the back of our garden, right next to Site 21. Site 21 is the only planned plot that backs directly onto pre existing houses; is this fair to these residents? Surely a site that would be less invasive and impactful on existing parishioners would be preferable?</p> <p>Farmland Both Site 21 and Site 11R are currently used for farmland. Again, I know this was touched upon in the last meeting, but how are you able to justify taking away prime agricultural land when other sites are available and you want to build on the lowest grade of land possible?</p> <p>Pylons Site 21 has pylons running throughout it. Surely, as with Site 11 which also has a pylon, it would be in the planners' and developers' best interests to build somewhere that did not have pylons? The pylons in that field will be flagged up on any house/building survey that potential house buyers request and would surely lower the value of the houses built there for that reason.</p> <p>Footpaths There is also a public footpath running through Site 21 and Site 11. These footpaths allow members of the public to walk through areas of beautiful countryside - areas that are, sadly, rapidly diminishing. The footpaths allow us to walk in nature, and not through housing estates! Surely the NDP could have footpaths running through it? We would be losing a public visual amenity, would we not? Don't you agree that sites that do not currently have footpaths running through them would be preferable?</p> <p>Furthermore, having a footpath running across the land could potentially create access issues for the homeowners in the proposed new properties, and again, potentially lower the value of any houses to be built there for this reason. I acknowledge that a footpath could be rerouted, however this particular path links up several walks very nicely and many, many people use it - even more than usual since the last lockdown and it would certainly receive a lot of opposition if permission were to be applied for to reroute it.</p> <p>Public Voice Finally, it has been drawn to my attention that, when public consultations were held, the Coughton sites 21 and 11R were voiced by the public as the least preferred sites for development. Why are these voices being ignored when you want the parishioners to give you clear views which steer you in the right direction? I notice that Site 21 is lowest on the rank order (8th) and that a certain amount of options need to be submitted, however if it is such an unpopular choice, which has now clearly been voiced on more than one occasion, why can't it be removed from the options?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and questions which are noted.</p> <p>The consultant has followed due process in assessing all of the sites and has taken account of the points you are making in arriving at the ranked list of suitable sites.</p> <p>Impact on Wildlife The site assessment included consideration of effect on wildlife and habitats and also pollution to differentiate between sites. At the regulation 14 consultation stage a Strategic Environmental Assessment will be conducted by Herefordshire Council and other organisations with responsibilities for the environment including the Environment Agency will be consulted formally.</p> <p>It is important to note that the importance to wildlife has been considered, both in terms of the land itself and the immediate surroundings. The sites you refer to comprise bare land and as such are sub-optimal and of low importance to wildlife. Hedgerow removal is not uncommon for the majority of housing sites in rural areas and the normal approach is to minimise removal and any loss to be compensated for. Again, in relation to the sites to which you refer, given their location adjacent to Coughton Wood and Marsh SSSI, account has been taken of Natural England's Impact Zones to minimise development to that where this Government agency would have least concern. Developments can, in fact, offer opportunities to increase the variety of wildlife within gardens as you suggest in your question, especially where previously the land was in arable use. In addition, developers will be expected to achieve net gains in biodiversity as a consequence of measures included in the current Environment Bill. Ecological surveys would be normal for sites such as these if included in the NDP and this would ensure appropriate protection to species according to their importance and set the base line for enhancement measures. Natural England, Herefordshire Wildlife Trust and Herefordshire Council's ecological specialist advice upon the chosen sites included in the NDP will be sought through the formal Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>Farmland Protection of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, again, was used as one of the criteria to differentiate between sites. Government requires this to be protected from substantial, inappropriate and unsustainable development. There is no definition of substantial although Natural England must be consulted upon development of sites of 20 hectares or more. No site is close to this size. However, the protection of sites smaller than this can be considered where there are sites of lower value. The weight given to the respective grades is considered appropriate given this advice and Natural England will be consulted at the Regulation 14 stage in any event.</p> <p>Pylons The presence of pylons was taken into account in the site assessments and reduced areas were considered for more than one site as a result.</p> <p>Footpaths Footpaths were considered during the assessment process and measures should be taken to address footpaths should sites 11 and/or 21 be included.</p> <p>Public Voice Regarding public opinion about sites 11(R) and 21, there have been no formal consultations about any sites, only public participation in NDP meetings and presentations. Many people have expressed the views you mention but in an informal way. By conducting the survey we will be consulting the whole parish in order to get the views of as many of the residents as possible about these matters.</p> <p>Walford Parish Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. It is important that the Parish Council can show that all options have been considered, along with reasons for recommending the option entered into the draft NDP document and reasons for rejecting the other options.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 15

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
144	3/9/21	email	Can you advise when the assessment of sites 37 to 39 will be completed? If they pass stage 1 and stage 2 of the assessment process will they be added to the Ranking of Sites Considered Suitable for Housing table before public consultations and/or decisions?	Thank you for your questions. Any sites that have been offered but not yet assessed will be dealt with once covid restrictions allow the consultant to get out to them. If any proves suitable for housing these will be added to the ranked list and considered along with the feedback from the questionnaire and will be included when decisions are made.	
145	3/11/21	clerk's email	We were dismayed to hear that sites 6 and 7 were to be grouped with all other small and medium sites being considered for house building, in the five-option plan. We feel strongly that the historic heritage environment around Lower Wythall and The Wythall Estate must be preserved. We propose that sites 6 and 7 be removed from the plan, and that the ten proposed houses be spread about all the remaining sites, including the larger sites, which could take a few houses without the damage to nearby residents that would have occurred with the building of large housing estates. This would also preserve the village environment, and prevent even the smaller sites from being crowded, by spreading the building density wider. We feel that this option would keep more villagers happy. Additionally, the proposed estate of ten houses on site 7 would have to be nearly half-way up the field, to be above the predicted flood line. The rest of the farmland would wrap around the estate, making farming with large machinery, more difficult, fiddly, and noisy, so close to the houses. Once houses are allowed in the lower field, the upper part of the field will become more vulnerable to building in the long term, becoming more suited to building than farming, a precedence having been set. Because the noise from the building site would be carried through our listed single-glazed windows, there would be a devastating blight on Lower Wythall's thriving Bed and Breakfast business, other local businesses that we support, and other residences nearby. If any building were to take place on site 7, we would be forced to close three of our five guest rooms, due to the noise, as most of our guests do not leave their rooms until mid-to-late mornings, and often return to relax after their outings, some staying in to relax all day. We experienced this disruption a few months ago, when two vehicles changed the landscape of the field in front of our guest rooms, over a few days, starting work just before 7am each morning, ruining our guests' holiday. We are not a city centre B&B with all the bustle of town traffic and life, but a quiet retreat for people to enjoy a peaceful time with us. Please read our online reviews to substantiate this. Considering that there is a good chance that we are about to come out of lockdown, would it be possible to delay any further presentations, meetings, and decisions? This would allow us to have face-to-face open meetings so that all residents can have the opportunity to listen and have their say, reacting to the discussions in a timelier way than by letter or email, as has been necessary under the current Covid-19 conditions. Also, a lot of our villagers do not have, or cannot work, online technology, so excluding them from the decision process.	Walford Parish Council are following a detailed process that is laid down by Parliament and Herefordshire Council. This is a legal responsibility placed on any Council that is producing an NDP. These rules state that all sites offered must be considered, and every suitable site should be included in the options to satisfy the examiner and to avoid a judicial review. It is important that the Parish Council can show that all options have been considered, along with reasons for recommending the option entered into the draft NDP document and reasons for rejecting the other options. Hereford Council will allocate a minimum of 14% housing growth somewhere in the parish by 2031. Having an NDP adopted by Herefordshire Council means the Parish has some control of where these will be. Without an NDP, Herefordshire Council will grant permissions as the applications for suitable sites present themselves. This is why the Parish Council wants to know the views of the residents. No conclusion or decisions are being made at this time. The NDP committee is undertaking a voluntary consultation to seek the views of the parish before putting our parishioners' views before the full council for debate following the elections in May when the Parish Council will have a full complement. All residents have the opportunity to make their views known on the questionnaire where there is a large section for any comments anyone wishes to add. A great deal of thought was given on how to ensure anyone who needs a paper copy of the presentations (i.e. slides and narration) and the questionnaire gets one. To facilitate this a return slip to request these was sent out to every household in the parish with a newsletter. We appreciate that this does not cover how anyone who is shielding, and would therefore not be able to get out and post this request or indeed to return the questionnaire so we have enlisted the help of the Walford Community Support Coordinator with her volunteers to contact / collect the return slips / questionnaires.	
146	3/14/21	Comment	"Why are you still pursuing large developments against public sentiment ? We do not believe there is a requirement to propose a development that goes against the wishes of the parishioners, despite this been inferred at the NDP meeting on Wednesday by (redacted). The Bridstow NDP, which has been submitted to Herefordshire council, removed the large sites from their proposed options as it was against the wishes of the parishioners, why?????"	Walford Parish Council is undertaking this additional voluntary consultation to gather the opinions of its parishioners before debating and voting at Full Council on which Housing option to use in the NDP following the May elections. Please take part and encourage others to complete the questionnaire too. The Parish Council can then use this information in its evidence base for the NDP when it is submitted to Herefordshire Council at Reg 14. Bridstow did not remove the large sites, they were withdrawn by the site owners which is what left them with an apparent housing site shortage.	
147	3/14/21	Comment	"Extract from Bridstow's NDP-- Option 1: A number of large sites that would enable this approach were available although they would have significant adverse effects upon the landscape of the Wye Valley AONB. Residents were strongly opposed to this approach and no suitable and available options were considered to provide sufficient public benefits to outweigh objections to 'major development' that would result, as required by NPPF paragraph 172. Why have we not followed suit?????"	The passage you quote from Bridstow's NDP is an extract showing a reason for excluding an option. Walford's NDP has not been completed yet. Please take part and encourage others to complete the questionnaire too. The Parish Council can then use this information in its evidence base for the NDP when it is submitted to Herefordshire Council at Reg 14.	
148	3/14/21	Comment	"We still haven't had a good enough justification from the Parish Council as to why they ignored the letter of the 3rd June 2020 to (redacted) from Ross Town Council which states-- Herefordshire Council does not support large developments to the South West of the Town due to the restrictions on the B4234? In addition proposed developments at Leys Hill were rejected siting concerns over increased traffic on the B4234. If this holds true for Arbour Hill and Leys Hill Road, surely it holds true for any site which substantially increase traffic and requires access to the B4234, such as 11R and 21 Why haven't the Parish Council taken this into consideration and challenged Hereford council on the number of houses required? If they have challenged the numbers, could they confirm when and confirm the response from Hereford Council. If they haven't, why not? Again we note this was done by Bridstow Parish Council and they had their housing allocation reviewed and changed."	All housing development in the parish will need to use the B4234 no matter where it is located, and Herefordshire Council will allocate a minimum of 14% increase by 2031 as laid down by Central Government. In producing an NDP, it may be that the constraints are so major as to indicate that the required minimum number of houses cannot be achieved. There must be strong evidence for this. Currently it is advised that we do not have the evidence to show there are insufficient viable, suitable and available development sites to meet the Core Strategy requirements. The numbers set for Walford Parish Council by Herefordshire Council have not been challenged because, unless a Parish Council can demonstrate that they have insufficient viable, development sites to meet the Core Strategy requirements then that provision cannot be challenged. The figures and relevant planning requirements are defined in the Core Strategy, which was open to public consultation from 2012 to 2015. The figures were open to question at that time but once the Plan was adopted, in 2015, they became mandatory on all Parishes. The Core Strategy is now being revised by Herefordshire Council and there will be opportunities, during that revision process, for Parish Councils and members of the public to submit comments on the content, including any housing development numbers. The statement made regarding Bridstow Parish Council is incorrect.	
149	3/14/21	email	As a Walford resident, I am concerned about proposals for large scale development ie. proposed 11R and 21. Herefordshire Council does not support large developments to the South West of the Town due to the restrictions on the B4234? In addition proposed developments at Leys Hill were rejected siting concerns over increased traffic on the B4234. If this holds true for Arbour Hill and Leys Hill Road, surely it holds true for any site which substantially increase traffic and requires access to the B4234, such as 11R and 21 Why haven't you the Parish Council, taken this into consideration and challenged Hereford council on the number of houses required?	No housing sites were rejected in Bishopwood because of increased traffic on the B4234. The issue raised by the highways authority was visibility from Leys Hill Road onto the B4234. Highway capacity is however a legitimate concern and a consideration that was included in the site assessment. It is understood that there is likely to be sufficient capacity along the B4234 through the Parish to accommodate the level of development we have to meet. However, this, together with any impact on the wider network will need to be confirmed by Herefordshire Council, as Local Highway Authority, when it is formally consulted upon the draft plan at the Regulation 14 stage. Should this indicate that the B4234 is not able to accommodate the development required, then this will restrict development within the whole plan area and used to agree a lower level of housing growth within the NDP.	
150	3/15/21	email	1. There are 2 sites yet to be assessed which could negate the need for the Windfall allowance and therefore the requirement of a larger site. Can the Council confirm that these sites, as stated in the meeting on Wednesday, will be assessed and the results of the assessments be taken into consideration prior to approval of the NDP by the Parish Council and submission of the NDP under Section 14 to Herefordshire Council. As stated this may negate the requirement for a larger site and when will the revised document then be published? 2. In reply to a question at the NDP Committee meeting on 10th March, Ruth Dolman replied that if the public gave a clear indication that smaller sites were preferable, then 11R and 21 would not be put forward. However (redacted) contradicted this by saying a large site would have to be in the plan. Please could you clarify the apparent contradiction. 2a. There is no requirement to include large sites within the NDP. By illustration the Bridstow Parish Council discounted larger sites, though available, from the finalised NDP. The relevant extract from their document is: T3.42 Option 1: A number of large sites that would enable this approach were available although they would have significant adverse effects upon the landscape of the Wye Valley AONB. Residents were strongly opposed to this approach and no suitable and available options were considered to provide sufficient public benefits to outweigh objections to 'major development' that would result, as required by NPPF paragraph 172. We therefore propose that you revisit your original questionnaire and results and then look at your proposed options, do they truly reflect the views of the Parish residents ? We feel that the original consultation with the Residents in Walford has been ignored, why have they not gone down the same route as Bridstow Parish. And therefore challenges remain as to the justification and impartiality in including proposed developments of the scale of 21 and 11R. 3. Has the Parish Council approached Herefordshire Council with a justification to reduce the housing allocation, taking into consideration the considerable impact on Ross Town with regards to Traffic, access and Services and that Ross-on-Wye has housing developments in excess of its quota. If not, why ? If you have and this was rejected what was the basis of your argument. We note Bridstow Parish Council in Herefordshire has had their allocation reduced due to the number of houses being built in Ross. 4. The NDP's suggestion that sites 687, 11r and 21 are best placed for public transport we would dispute. Many other sites are within walking distance of public transport. Additionally the service is not of the quality that would deter people from using cars. The bus service is every 2 hours for most of the day, and finishes at 6.30-7.00pm with no service on Sundays. This service is not utilised currently and increasing the housing is unlikely to change this, therefore a reduction in our carbon foot print is not a feasible argument and should be removed from the justification in the NDP. 5. It was pleasing to see the NDP have taken our comments about the questionnaire on board however we do not know to what extent, as we have not had sight of the changes. Appreciate there is probably no requirement to share this but given that you found our input extremely helpful, it was expected you would share it and at the least it would have been courteous to do so.	The 2 sites yet to be assessed will be assessed in April provided that the Governments' easing of lockdown stays on track and These will be included in an addendum the Housing Site Assessment Report along with any other sites that may be put forward for consideration by the Parish Council following the May elections. The full context of Ruth's words at the meeting on 10 March were that, the criterion used to evaluate the sites was derived from the previous consultations. Therefore public opinion of those that took part at that time. This criterion has resulted in site 11R being ranked top in terms of its suitability for development. Which is now unpopular with a proportion of our parishioners. Should the consultation results show the majority of public opinion being that a site of this size is opposed to, then Walford Parish Council will consider these results before deciding on which option to enter into the NDP documents. It is therefore important that we undertake this extra voluntary consultation to evaluate the current public opinion. Andrew was trying to explain why we have to include housing options which include a large site or sites, as Herefordshire Council will not accept the exclusion of sites which have been ranked as most suitable for development without good reason. So these large sites have to be included in the options for decision making and then included, or not, in the draft NDP with reasons for accepting or rejecting, which will be the job of Walford Parish Council after the elections in May. It is clear from the extract that you quote from the Bridstow NDP that Bridstow Parish Council considered a number of issues, particularly effect on the landscape, as well as residents views. Walford Parish Council has yet to make a decision upon what it considers to be major development within the context of the NDP. The response to the current consultation from all residents of the Parish will assist with this. All the relevant issues will be considered by the Parish Council before it decides what approach it should advocate in the NDP. Again it is stressed that no decision has been made upon the choice of sites. The level of development set by the Core Strategy cannot now be challenged. We would need to show that there are extremely sound reasons, such as highway capacity, indicating that the parish is unable to accommodate the proposed level of development. We are not at that stage yet as this should come through the formal consultation with Herefordshire Council and other statutory consultees. It is understood that Bridstow Parish Council has not had its housing target reviewed. It does, however, have particularly challenging constraints highlighted through the formal consultation with statutory consultees. The reason for not sharing the questionnaire at the committee meeting held on 10 March was to avoid questions received on the night of the 2nd presentation being about the questionnaire rather than concentrating on questions about the presentation itself. Anyone wishing to ask questions to help complete the questionnaire can do so by email, online through the NDP website or by post to the Clerk.	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
151	3/15/21	email	Regarding your answer, Para 3.6 of Addendum 1 states the windfall allowance has dropped to 13. Also, does not the minimum required dwellings calculation of 51 have had the windfall allowance deducted already? If so, you cannot use the windfall allowance twice. I have re-read the documents and realise that I misunderstood the windfall allowance. I can now see that this is not yet counted in the requirement for 51 dwellings. Please ignore my email from earlier today.	No reply needed	
152	3/15/21	email	There are 137 parish councils in Herefordshire. If every parish council has to build 30 houses this equates to 4110 houses if 2 people live in these houses 8220 people will be coming to Herefordshire. The core strategy says that all developments must be sustainable. I fail to see how 8220 people is sustainable as there are no jobs a hospital that is too small for the current population and a transport policy that is non-existent once off the main roads. Herefordshire is a commuter county and this goes against Herefordshire's climate emergency policy. I feel that Herefordshire is trying to build its way out of the deficit it has. Have contacted Herefordshire council about council tax but no reply as it seems that Herefordshire council is a secret society and only them with a vested interest get answers.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.	
153	3/15/21	YouTube	have the parish council managed to get an up to date figure for housing	The figure for granted applications in the parish are verified by Herefordshire Council following updates issued each April and once this has been done these figures will be taken into account in the NDP. The last figures produced by Herefordshire Council were for April 2020. We have used Herefordshire Council's website showing planning decisions to identify more recent planning permissions. However, we have not been able to ascertain whether and if so which planning permissions have run out of time and hence are no longer valid.	
154	3/15/21	YouTube	How much influence does an agreed NDP have with Herefordshire Planners?	Once an NDP has been adopted, it has to be considered alongside the NPPF and Core Strategy by Herefordshire planners. They should not ignore the NDP policies in considering planning applications.	
155	3/15/21	YouTube	The independent examiner agreed with Bridstow NDP not to include large sites as it was against the wishes of the residents.	The Bridstow NDP is currently at Regulation 16, which precedes the Independent Examination stage.	
156	3/15/21	YouTube	Why does Option 2 run the risk of rejection, Bridstow's NDP has been accepted using an Option very similar to the Option 2 you have just stated	Option 2 has not been rejected but carries a greater degree of uncertainty that the required minimum level of housing required will be met. As a consequence, it is possible that Herefordshire Council and/or an External Examiner of the NDP may consider that the NDP does not meet the requirements of the NPPF to 'positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area'. If they draw this conclusion the NDP stands a good chance of being rejected.	
157	3/15/21	YouTube	Surely the site reports should be available for residents to comment upon as part of consultation requirements	The site reports have been published on the NDP website and are therefore freely available. The NDP process does not require any Parish Council to consult on site reports although views have been expressed on such reports through the Regulation 14 consultation undertaken on other NDPs. Residents are given 3 opportunities to formally register their views on all parts of an NDP. This is during the processes defined against Regulations 14, 16 and 18 (The first is the formal public consultation to be undertaken by the Parish Council; the second the formal consultation by Herefordshire Council; and the third is the referendum).	
158	3/15/21	YouTube	Ross is in excess of the requirement can that not be taken into account. We do not have the infra structure to cope with more houses, i.e. doctors, roads, schools	The Planning Inspector made it clear that the minimum housing requirements set for all parishes is a minimum. The fact that one parish exceeds the required level has not yet been accepted as a mechanism for others to plan for less. This is especially the case as Herefordshire Council has not met its housing target for the County as a whole. It is true that Ross Town Council's NDP shows that it is likely to exceed its housing growth requirement and that Council has a Memorandum of Understanding with Bridstow Parish Council that the latter can use some of its excess. However, that is on the basis that Bridstow Parish Council uses its best efforts to meet its required minimum level of housing growth. It would be expected that a similar requirement would be made if Ross Town Council were to offer a similar arrangement. It is not yet possible to show that Walford Parish cannot meet its housing requirement, in fact the opposite is the case as we can more than accommodate the required growth on the sites put forward. The formal consultation at Regulation 14, which will seek the views of the community, neighbouring parish councils and other stakeholders, including those responsible for providing key infrastructure, should indicate whether there are any major constraints upon the level of growth required.	
159	3/15/21	YouTube	In the presentation, 'affordable housing' was mentioned a number of times especially for 11R and 21. What do you mean by affordable housing and how will you ensure it is affordable?	Affordable housing is established using a formula set defined by Government, and Herefordshire Council has set requirements for this with its distribution made in accordance with an assessment for the County's Housing Market Areas. There is a mechanism to require a proportion of dwellings on sites of more than 10 dwellings to be 'affordable' within Government's definitions. Please follow this link to information on affordable housing. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-7747/	
160	3/15/21	YouTube	If I understand Bill Bloxome's comments correctly the NDP could effectively only give a 2 yr guarantee	Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless there are good reasons why this should not be the case. An NDP, once that has been passed at a referendum and adopted by Herefordshire Council, forms part of the Development Plan along with the NPPF and Core Strategy. NDPs have to be reviewed, and potentially updated, on a 2-yearly basis if they are to retain full weight in the planning process for housing development. No NDP can conflict with the requirements of either a Local Plan or the National Planning Policy Framework so the influence is limited to expressing a local perspective on those higher level Policies.	
161	3/15/21	YouTube	Based on Bill's comments regarding site 14, why is the same not applicable for 11R and 21? Why send a questionnaire in the first place and not take into account for the NDP report, residents	The assessments for the three sites and conclusions drawn by the planning consultant for all sites is included in the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report, Appendix 6, in particular, highlights the setting and landscape characteristics for all the settlements. This was used to define the level of importance of the fringe areas against which the judgment was made. Other criteria were also considered. No doubt these judgments will be considered by those with specialist knowledge, including landscape and heritage specialists at Herefordshire Council, when consulted formally at the Regulation 14 stage.	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 17

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
162	3/15/21	email	<p>Please confirm that when the questionnaire is sent out that both presentations and narrative will be included with the document. Not all have access to IT, and due to Covid restrictions have not been able to get stamps etc; this is evidenced by a few being returned without stamps as stated at the last meeting and by only a very small number of residents requesting them. This will ensure all residents have the information in order to be able to consider the responses as required by the questionnaire.</p> <p>As concerned residents why are large housing developments still being considered by the NDP; it is clear to us following attendance at the public communications; this is going against the views and sentiments of the public in Coughton/Walford?</p> <p>Wishes of the parishioners should be supported by our Councillors and the NDP committee members; thus, with the concerns raised could the NDP challenge the number of houses required in one site or locations; i.e. stop pursuing large developments and consider other options? We understand other NDPs have raised similar challenges with the Council.</p> <p>Please respond on the points raised in the letter of the 3rd June 2020 to Andrew De La Hay from Ross Town Council which states 'Herefordshire Council does not support large developments to the South West of the Town due to the restrictions on the B4234? In addition, proposed developments at Leys Hill were rejected citing concerns over increased traffic on the B4234. If this holds true for Arbour Hill and Leys Hill Road, surely it holds true for any site which substantially increase traffic and requires access to the B4234, such as 11R and 21'.</p> <p>Should the NDP recommend housing developments on the agriculture fields; what actions can the Councillors and the NDP Committee take to prevent additional houses or other developments being built on the current or adjacent fields?</p>	<p>Both the presentation slides and scripts are being sent out together with the questionnaires to all those who have requested a paper copy.</p> <p>Challenging Housing Growth/Highway capacity</p> <p>All submitted housing sites should be considered through a robust yet proportionate assessment process in order to avoid legal challenge and meet the requirements set out in Government's Planning Practice Guidance, which Herefordshire Council and the NDP External Examiner will wish to be assured of. The required minimum level of proportional housing growth for the Parish is set out in Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) which has been subject to examination and approved by a Planning Inspector. It is not possible to challenge the Core Strategy. Herefordshire Council will continue to determine planning applications within the Parish based upon Core Strategy policy RA2 which requires housing to be within or adjacent to the built-up areas of its settlements where this does not compromise environmental and other major constraints. Should the Parish not be able to accommodate even the minimum required level of housing growth, the Parish Council would need to show, through evidence, that this is the case. At the present time it is not able to do so. It is recognised that there are no perfect housing sites within the Parish but the Regulation 14 consultation with relevant bodies, such as those responsible for the highway network, will confirm whether the constraints identified for the sites considered suitable are so major as to rule them out. This will include whether development anywhere on the B4234 within the Parish or between the Parish and Ross town centre is a major constraint or whether they consider the traffic will be dispersed more widely upon the network to a satisfactory degree.</p> <p>Consistency with Development elsewhere</p> <p>Sites have not been rejected along Leys Hill Road because of capacity along the B4234. A number of sites have been included in the table of potentially suitable sites. Other sites along this road have been rejected because the environmental consequences of achieving suitable access would be major. In addition, it is understood from a decision on a planning application along Leys Hill Road that its junction with the B4234 does not have sufficient sight lines and may affect development potential. Again, should any of the sites along Leys Hill Road be included in the draft NDP, the advice of Herefordshire Council's Highways section will indicate whether it is concerned about the additional traffic at the junction. Arbour Hill is not identified as a settlement within the Core Strategy and hence is considered open countryside and outside of the scope for consideration as a location for new housing within the NDP.</p> <p>Restricting Further Development</p> <p>The NDP will indicate where the Parish considers new housing to meet at least the minimum housing requirement should be located. Should the NDP be adopted then it will form part of the Development Plan and Herefordshire Council is required to determine applications in accordance with that Plan unless there are good material considerations to do otherwise. Government's National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF) provides a framework that may be relevant in such instances.</p>	
163	3/15/21	email	<p>I read with interest the following from the Walford NDP website pages..... "These policies have already set out the increase in housing the Government believes is necessary, with Walford Parish required to provide 91 new dwellings between 2011 and 2031. In the absence of an NDP, that requirement will be implemented without any local input." It would seem to me that whether we use an NDP or not the Parishioners will NOT have any input when basic questions as to why the Walford NDP are still pursuing large developments against public sentiment? I do not believe there is a requirement to propose a development that goes against the wishes of the parishioners, despite this been inferred at the NDP meeting on Wednesday by (redacted). The Bridstow NDP, which has been submitted to Herefordshire council, removed the large sites from their proposed options as it was against the wishes of the parishioners!!!</p>	<p>It is unfortunate, though not unexpected, that much of the public involvement with the NDP has been to protest at the possibility of development taking place close to their own properties.</p> <p>The topics of your arguments show that you have read and researched thoroughly. Your questions are good and we recognise the frustrations that those arguments have not resulted in sites being removed from the options.</p> <p>The Parish Council need to consider the opinions of all of the parish, not just some, before deciding on which development sites, if any, to include in the draft NDP.</p> <p>We are following a standard NDP process according to Herefordshire guidance notes and within the target set by Herefordshire Council and the constraints of planning policies detailed within the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding Site 11(R), site 11 is the only available site in Walford Parish that has been considered suitable by Herefordshire Council via assessment through their SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) process. More over our independent consultant undertook an even more detailed appraisal of the site, using criteria and rankings defined by parishioners, and concluded that this site ranks highest in terms of planning suitability. Therefore it would not be considered appropriate to remove the site from consideration at this stage.</p> <p>Please bear with us so that we can get to the best result.</p>	
164	3/15/21	email	<p>Please confirm when the count of houses already built was last updated i.e. Do we still need 51?</p>	<p>Herefordshire Council updates it annually, after every April.</p>	
165	3/15/21	email	<p>Site 14 seems to have many huge benefits:</p> <p>Close to good roads links Close to regular public transport routes Within walking/cycling distance of town and schools Close to sewer works – requiring less potential upgrades</p> <p>Should these benefits be weighed more heavily?</p> <p>What is the difference between the effect on scenic beauty between site 14 and the site 21?</p> <p>How was the ridgeline defined? i.e. from which direction is this site extremely prominent?</p> <p>Site 14 – the effects on the landscape, setting of Ross-on-Wye and scenic beauty of the AONB would be so significant that the site was considered major development with no public benefits. Nor was it considered that a reduced site was possible because any access to developable land would need to be located a significant distance beyond the current settlement edge, would require major works to Lincoln Hill Road and development would either be isolated from the settlement edge and still extremely prominent upon the skyline. It would alter the current character of Ross-on-Wye which sits below the ridgeline.</p>	<p>Sites 11, 14 and 21 have been assessed by Herefordshire Council under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) programme and that their assessment conclusions are shown in the 'SHLAA conclusion' columns of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report.</p> <p>The consultant has referred to any SHLAA assessment together with all other environmental aspects on the site assessment forms so we refer you to the detailed site assessments and conclusions drawn about sites in the report.</p>	
166	3/15/21	email	<p>There appears to be a problem with the questionnaire in that it can be completed multiple times by a single person, rendering results unreliable.</p>	<p>We can confirm that the survey is being conducted anonymously. Tracking facilities are in place to prevent potential fraudulent entries while allowing multiple entries from the same household. While this is not 100%, research shows normal accuracy of the method employed to be in excess of 95%. Responses to question 4 will be grouped into common themes and counted to provide an indication of the strength of opinion about any issues raised. The results will be independently collated so we are not sure of the timescale at this stage.</p>	
167	3/16/21	email	<p>I agree (redacted), they have rejected other sites because of traffic on the B road also, so why is that different for 11R and 21. This site assessments seem to alter to fit what the council want, I really cannot understand when they have had a letter from Ross Town Council saying they want no more traffic on the B road, and that is supported by Herefordshire Council, why they have not discussed with both Ross and Herefordshire the reducing the numbers. Ross has built well in excess of their requirement.</p> <p>Bridstow had to find about 51 houses and had it reduced by 15!! It makes you doubt if they are working on our behalf.</p>	<p>Sites 11, 14 and 21 have been assessed by Herefordshire Council under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) programme and that their assessment conclusions are shown in the 'SHLAA conclusion' columns of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report.</p> <p>Highway capacity is a legitimate concern and a consideration that was included in the site assessment. It is understood that there is likely to be sufficient capacity along the B4234 through the Parish to accommodate the level of development we have to meet. However, this, together with any impact on the wider network will need to be confirmed by Herefordshire Council, as Local Highway Authority, when it is formally consulted upon the draft plan at the Regulation 14 stage. Should this indicate that the B4234 is not able to accommodate the development required, then this will restrict development within the whole plan area and used to agree a lower level of housing growth within the NDP.</p> <p>The reference to 51 dwellings is incorrect. The required level of housing growth for Bridstow is 57 and that remains the case. If you look at its Regulation 16 Submission Draft NDP, this shows that it is able to achieve 59 dwellings although this includes an estimate of 10 through a windfall allowance. Its Regulation 14 draft plan did not have to rely upon any windfall allowance, and allocated all the sites that were considered suitable at that time. These met its outstanding requirement. However, advice from Herefordshire Council's Environmental Health section indicated that two sites were unsuitable because of the effect of noise from the adjacent trunk roads, however, the areas have been left inside the proposed settlement boundaries.</p>	
168	3/16/21	email	<p>I have just completed the NDP Questionnaire. After adding my comments at Q4 I pressed the DONE button. I received no confirmation from SurveyMonkey that my questionnaire had been sent or received. Can you tell me if you have received my completed questionnaire. There does not seem anything stopping me answering the questionnaire again, which may skew the results. If you cannot tell if my questionnaire arrived how many other people might complete the questionnaire press DONE thinking their comments are noted only to find, or maybe never find out, they are lost in the 'cloud'.</p>	<p>Thank you for your observation. We recognise that we did not confirm completion and have added this in to the survey tool on the 18th March.</p>	<p>Added a completion notice.</p>

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 18

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
169	3/17/21	email	<p>There are a number of questions/observations from those who have completed the questionnaire and I am writing on their behalf. Specifically clarification of the following is requested:</p> <p>That the responses are anonymous as no personal details are required It is critical that all parishioners, who wish to, complete the questionnaire, which will mean more than one person per household in most cases How responses are being tracked How potential duplicates are being dealt with How Question 4 will be recorded and assessed The timescale for publishing the results including the stats around the number of questionnaires submitted and their source</p> <p>We would very much appreciate confirmation from the committee to these points mentioned.</p>	<p>We can confirm that the survey is being conducted anonymously. Tracking facilities are in place to prevent potential fraudulent entries while allowing multiple entries from the same household. While this is not 100%, research shows normal accuracy of the method employed to be in excess of 95%. Responses to question 4 will be grouped into common themes and counted to provide an indication of the strength of opinion about any issues raised. The results will be independently collated so we are not sure of the timescale at this stage.</p>	
170	3/19/21		<p>1) I do NOT live "close to the proposed development". Do NOT make assumptions when replying to me, ONLY FACTS! 2) You state that you "Need to consider the opinions of all the parish, not just some". And yet you will not put the process on hold until we are free from Covid Restrictions and ALL PARISHIONERS can participate, WHY??? You do not need a result until 2031. 3) Why did the "Independent Consultant" need to "Undertake an even more detailed appraisal of the site 11R" when the vast majority of parishioners I speak to do NOT want "large" developments, it seems a few landowners want such developments and they are being pandered to in this "consultation" 4) Has anyone considered the safety aspect of building large numbers of houses opposite a school, 40 homes = 80 vehicles (most homes have 2 vehicles) all pulling out of a housing development onto a busy "B" road!! 5) What are the qualifications of William Bloxsome? Was anyone else considered for this role?</p>	<p>1) We apologise if the first paragraph of our last email has caused any offense. The statement is one of generality and was not directed at you personally. 2) If we wait until 2031 the 91 houses will already have been allocated by Herefordshire Council. 3) The independent consultant undertook a more detailed appraisal in order to have the site evaluated with the criteria defined by Walford's parishioners. 4) Any access to site 11(R) would need to meet Herefordshire Council's standards for new development. It is considered that the standards for any junction and sight-lines onto the B4234 should be capable of being met close to the northern end of the site where it meets that road. This should be a sufficient distance from the Primary School and its associated parking. Herefordshire Council will be formally consulted upon the draft plan when it has been prepared and should this site be proposed, then its views upon any safety concerns will no doubt be given significant weight and used to revise the plan accordingly. 5) The consultant is a Chartered Town Planner and is registered RTP1. He has worked for a number of Local Authorities before setting up in private practice in 2012. All available consultants, provided in a list by Herefordshire Council, were considered before making the choice.</p>	
171	3/20/21	email	<p>1. You have again side-stepped the point I made concerning the nature of the area in respect of which there are proposals for large development. You subjectively referred to this as a "built-up area", apparently to justify further overwhelming development that would, controversially, be to the substantial pecuniary benefit of one or more persons who are represented on Walford Parish Council. I have pointed out that the area is at present largely no more than some partial ribbon development along the B4234, together with a few cul-de-sacs accessed from that road. As the great majority of all the properties back on to fields, the area should more realistically be described as semi-rural - though it would most certainly become a built-up area if the proposals you appear to be championing were to be permitted. Would you please now address this specific point - why you refer to the area as "built-up" when there is only a density of building in relation to fields and open spaces as would presently identify it as semi-rural.</p> <p>2. At a later date I made the point that all of the existing parish councillors eligible to vote (4 in number) live in the Leys Hill / Howle Hill area, and as such are not representative of anyone in whose area substantial further development is being advocated. I also asked whether the co-opted members of the NDP lived in, or near, the proposed substantial development area. Your response was that "Co-opted members do reside within the parish and either live within sight of it or travel through it regularly, as do the councillors". I find it incredible that you should suggest the situation of those whose immediate environment would be blighted would in some way be shared by those responsible for the blighting, simply because they have to pass through it. We all drive through areas we do not live in, but how does this affect our own environmental situation?</p> <p>I turn now to the issue of attaining the further development target for this parish:</p> <p>From the Herefordshire Council website I have extracted the attached details of relevant Walford Parish planning applications that have become approved or pending decision since September 2020, which I see was the month of the most recent update to the figures notified by Hereford Council, leaving 51 sites to be found out of the original target of 91.</p> <p>If one numbers them from 1 - 10 top to bottom, it can be seen that items 1, 2, 3 and 5 are still pending. Of the remainder, item 7 relates to a new build for a dependent relative, which would seem to count as a new residence; item 9 is presumably classed as a replacement for an existing residence that is to be demolished, and I'm not sure that item 10 would count (but would you please clarify), as it is not clear who would be able to live there.</p> <p>That seems to leave approved items 4, 6, 7 and 8 to take into account, which is a total of 5 new residences.</p> <p>There are also the pending applications, which may have been delayed due to the Covid restrictions, but should be decided upon in the very near future, and they represent a total of a further 9 potential additions. Even if only 4 of these were to be approved, that would make a further 9 to be deducted from the present figure of 51, leaving only 42 to be found out of the original 91. That alone would be significantly beyond the halfway mark and must suggest that future windfall sites of a similar nature should suffice on the basis of the available evidence.</p> <p>However, there are already a good many small sites that have been put forward and judged valid. For instance, if the minor sites 24,26,32 and 34 were proposed for use, that would deduct a further 16 sites from the figure of 42, leaving the remaining 26 as a target that was unquestionably achievable over the next ten years - and most likely over four or five years. That must surely rule out a justification for any major development that was against the wishes of the community.</p> <p>What is more, I understand that Ross Town Council, which provides the infrastructure for Walford, has already exceeded its target allocation, and it would seem sensible to make a joint approach with Ross to Herefordshire Council with a view to offsetting some of this excess against our official target.</p> <p>Would you please let me have your comments on the above.</p>	<p>1. Herefordshire's Core Strategy RAZ classes Walford (Coughton) as the settlement which will be the main focus of proportionate housing development. 2. WPC Councillors are required to represent the whole parish. WPC will have up to 6 new councillors after the elections in May. That council will be making the decisions relating to whether housing will be allocated and where. 3. You are right that the situation is changing and new applications are being approved. We cannot count applications that have not yet been approved and it is possible for applications to lapse. We have been doing the same work as you with the intention to submit a list to Herefordshire Council to aid them in re-assessing the figures in April.</p>	
172	3/21/21	email	<p>" It is understood that there is likely to be sufficient capacity along the B4234 through the Parish to accommodate the level of development we have to meet."</p> <p>How is this determined? There is a significant number of cyclists that use this highway on a regular basis. As a pedestrian who uses this route to and from Ross regularly, I have been witness to many near accidents between motor vehicles and cyclists due mainly to overtaking on this road. Further large scale development will significantly increase traffic on this stretch of road. I hope that when "sufficient capacity" is being considered, the safety of all road users is taken into account.</p>	<p>The judgment is based upon consideration of the characteristics of the road where it runs through the Parish in comparison to experience of similar roads elsewhere, including where development proposals have been advanced. Should Herefordshire Council, as Highway Authority, disagree with this assessment, then no doubt it will indicate this when consulted upon any draft plan.</p>	
173	3/22/21	email	<p>Walford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan Comments concerning Site 39 of Further Sites Submitted As shown on Further Sites Submitted - updated 19th January 2021 https://walford.ndp.co.uk/further-sites-submitted/ https://walford.ndp.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/39-39.pdf</p> <p>The proposal: Site Address: Former pavilion and land, Howle Hill, Ross on Wye, HR9 5SH. The proposal claims the site is a former pavilion and changing room with 3.6a of land. The site plan indicates that the field area is 1.45Ha (35.73%). The proposal indicates that there is a 6.1m (20ft) gateway onto the road. This access has recently been created without permission, and is subject to enforcement by the Herefordshire Council. The new access way replaces a 2.4m (8ft) field gate. The proposal indicates that there is an existing building on the site. The building referred to is a plywood shed, constructed with retrospective permission some time ago. The shed has no foundations, and appears to have no foul drainage, no electricity supply and no water supply as claimed. East side South Side Rise at West side Under side The Herefordshire Planning Enforcement Officer states that work recently carried out requires planning permission, and that the access and existing building is considered detrimental to the amenity of the area. Walford NPD site 39 - Page 2 of 4</p> <p>Map from Pugh's Estate Agent November 2020 Site Development Potential: No housing numbers are proposed. At the required density stated within the Draft NPD the site would accommodate between 43 and 44 dwellings. The site is isolated from the built up area indicated in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site lies entirely within the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site is located in an elevated position at 171m (562ft) above Ordnance Datum. Topographically, the site slopes gently to the south west. Development at this site would be visible from a distance, and has the potential to result in significant negative impacts on the local landscape character. The northern edge of the site is within 25m of the Great Howle Camp Scheduled Ancient Monument. As such, development of the site has the potential to impact on the setting and character of these designated features. Existing uses: Currently, the site is agricultural land and has no uses other than grazing. For many decades the field has been used for hay and seasonal grazing. This site is not adjacent to any of the existing settlements of the Neighbourhood Plan area. The Agricultural Land Classification map (ALC09) published by Natural England in August 2010, updated 2019, indicates the site is composed of grade 3 agricultural land. The BFFRA MAGIC map indicates that the site is outside the site map area. MAGIC indicates that the site is entirely within the area of High Groundwater Vulnerability. It is entirely within the Priority area for Habitats for Upland Calcareous Grassland; and is within a Higher Level Stewardship target area for environmental land management. Walford NPD site 39 - Page 3 of 4</p>	<p>Thank you for comments which are noted.</p>	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
173	3/22/21	email	<p>Transport: It is assumed that the proposed access to the site would be from the unnamed unclassified minor road to the east of the site (the lane between Howle Hill and Bishopwood). Considerable off-site highway improvement will be required to provide safe and suitable access. There is a bus stop approximately 1.6km from the site, but this has not been served by any public transport service for more than 6yrs. The nearest bus stop with an existing service is 2.3 km distant.</p> <p>Services and facilities: The site is at some distance from services and facilities. 3.1km from the nearest primary school, 6.3km from the nearest secondary school, 6.4km from the nearest supermarket, and 6.3km from the nearest GP surgery. It is likely the majority of journeys generated will be by car. There is a single phase 240v overhead power supply in the lane. It is likely this will be inadequate for potential development. There is an existing 25mm diam water supply pipe in the lane; it is likely this will be inadequate for potential development. Upgrading of utility services will be required to avoid detriment to existing residents.</p> <p>Environmental Considerations: As shown on the plan submitted with the proposal, and as above, there are two ponds within 50m of the site. The pond to the north appears to be a seasonal pond. The field comprises species rich unimproved grassland with Spotted Orchids, Devils Bit Scabious, Autumn Hawkbit, Carex Pendula, Cut Leafed Cranes Bill, Common Sorrel, Common Knawweed, Wood Forget-me-not, Germanium Spinedash, Torikake Hog, Sweet Vernal Grass, and Bugle. The boundary hedgerows are species rich, and include Hazel, Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Dog Rose, Dog wood, Field Maple, Blackthorn, Elm, Sycamore, Beach, Ash, Elder, Wild Privet and Blackberry. For several years the hedgerows have been allowed to grow to around 3.5m tall and at least 1.5m wide, and provided a very valuable contribution to the habitat of the locality. Records the hedgerows have been closely failed. If once again left undisturbed, or sympathetically managed, they will continue to provide a valuable habitat resource. The site is frequented as a key resource for bird and bat species recorded in association with the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Special Wildlife Sites (SWS) and woodlands nearby. The Herefordshire Biological Records Centre (HBRC) indicates widespread bat records. Within 500m of the site there are records of Western Barbastelle bats, Chiroptera bats, Soprano Pipistrelle bats, and Noctule Barbastelle bats. Within 1.2km of the site there are records of Horsehoof bats, Common bats, Natterer's bats, Lesser Horsehoof bats and Long eared bats. Great Crested Newts, Smooth newts, Pinnate newts, Toad and Frog have been recorded within 750m of the site. Slow worm have been recorded within 1km of the site. The site is located within the impact risk zone for the River Wye SSD. The Coughton & March Wood SSD is within 1.2km radius of the site. Walford NDP site 39 - Page 4 of 4</p> <p>These zones relate to all planning applications (except householders) outside or extending existing settlements / urban areas affecting greenspace, farmland, semi natural habitats or landscape features. The site is within 2km of the Hope Mansell Special Wildlife Site (SWS). There are several ancient woodlands close to the site. These include Howle Hill woodland 0.5km, Marks Well ancient wood 0.5km, Chestnut Wood 0.6km, Warm Hill Wood 1.2km, Deep Dean ancient wood 1.5km, Hengrove wood 2km, Upper Perlieu ancient wood 2.5km, Harechurch ancient wood 2.7km. There are several Local Geological Sites around Howle Hill.</p> <p>Ground water protection: There is frequent surface ponding, even in light rainfall. It appears that the field does not have any form of improved drainage. There are no streams, brooks or culverts in the vicinity of the site. There are no food or surface water reservoirs within 300m of the site. The site is within the River Wye Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) Catchment, with potential to leach phosphate into the surrounding area. The site is within the defined Nitrate vulnerable area for protection of ground waters.</p> <p>Foul and Surface Water Management: For nearby drainage investigations the Percolation Rate (Vp) has been determined to be 39.7. This is thought to be representative of the likely percolation rate for this site. If 45 dwellings are located on the site, with an average occupancy of 2.4 persons per dwelling the required drainage area will be 0.11ha for foul water alone. With surface water runoff from roofs only, the requirement for a soakaway drainage field increases to 0.2ha. This represents 13.8% of the site area. Careful design, installation, and permanent ongoing maintenance will be required to maintain sanitary conditions, prevent pollution and localised flooding. Increased housing occupancy will require a commensurate increase in provision for drainage.</p> <p>Human Health: The site is within 100m of a closed landfill. Contamination investigations should be completed before the site is considered for potential housing development.</p> <p>Recommendations: It is considered that this site is unsuitable for development, primarily due to its location within the AONB, its isolation in relation to existing dwellings, lack of public transport options and services and facilities. Development will lead to significant negative impacts on local landscape character, and affect views of, out from, and within the Wye Valley AONB. Development is likely to have significant adverse impact upon the sites environmental status.</p>	Thank you for comments which are noted.	
174	3/24/21	Comment	<p>Regarding the "Independent Consultant" being used for the Walford NDP. Mr. W.Bloxsome, can you furnish me with details of his qualifications and does he have any links with Hereford Council or Data Orchard, as I understand he is, or should be, an independent consultant.</p> <p>I understand the comments made by several members of the NDP Committee regarding Mr Bloxsome's track record with some 30 NDPs to his credit, but that does NOT make him suitable, they may have been 30+ NDPs with bad results for the Parishioners concerned!!</p>	<p>The consultant is a Chartered Town Planner and is registered with the RTPI. He has worked for a number of Local Authorities before setting up in private practice in 2012.</p> <p>WPC has good references from our neighbouring parishes of Goodrich & Welsh Bicknor and Whitchurch & Ganarew.</p>	
175	3/26/21	email	<p>Are paper copies of the questionnaire available? I have a neighbour who doesn't have a PC but would like to complete the questionnaire.</p> <p>If they are available, how can my neighbour get hold of a paper copy?</p>	Paper copies are available from the clerk.	
176	3/27/21	Comment	I am sorry but I disagree with the statement above please re visit the principles of the NDP, the whole ethos is to take the public with you and their views must be taken into account and used in the NDP.	Thank you for comments. The whole purpose of the consultation is to engage with the public to obtain their views.	
177	3/27/21	Comment	<p>Has anyone on the committee considered that the use of site 11R opposite a primary school will cause a major safety problem? Given that the proposed site will yield 40 plus properties, this will create in excess of 80 motor vehicles (based on average of 2 vehicles per household) all trying to exit this unacceptable site (11R) at peak hours whilst 200+ young children are making their way to school.....?????????</p>	<p>Highway capacity is a legitimate concern and a consideration that was included in the site assessment. The suggested entrances/exits for all sites are outside of the 20mph school related speed zone that has been established along the B4234.</p> <p>Any access to site 11(R) would need to meet Herefordshire Council's standards for all new development. It is considered that the standards for any junction and sight-lines onto the B4234 should be capable of being met close to the northern end of the site where it meets that road. This should be a sufficient distance from the Primary School and its associated parking. Herefordshire Council will be formally consulted upon the draft plan when it has been prepared and should this site be proposed, then its views upon any safety concerns will no doubt be given significant weight and used to revise the plan accordingly.</p>	
178	3/29/21	Comment	<p>why, in your last presentation, did you cover only 8 development sites when I believe there are about 16.</p> <p>We need to know the location of each site you have selected and the potential housing density on each site.</p> <p>Can you supply me with this information please</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. In all 37 submitted sites were assessed, of these only 11 passed basic selection criteria and were taken forward into the Stage 2 assessment. Three more sites were rejected on more detailed assessment, leaving 8 sites that were considered as potentially suitable for development.</p> <p>Details of the 8 sites, their location and suggested housing numbers are included in the presentations HERE and Meeting Housing Needs report HERE.</p>	
179	3/30/21	email	<p>Can someone let me know what qualifications does Mr. William Bloxsome hold to become "consultant" on Walford NDP?????</p> <p>Can you also assure me that the afore mentioned gentleman has NO ties and does no longer work for Herefordshire Council???</p> <p>And, also, has NO ties and no longer works for the Data Harvesting company Data Orchard?????</p>	The planning consultant is a Chartered Town Planner (MRTP) and independent of any organisation. There is no conflict of interest.	
180	3/30/21	email	Can you please tell me why my recent questions via Walford NDP web-site together with questions asked via Walford NDP email HAVE NOT BEEN ANSWERED?????????	It's because we are all volunteers and do this on our own time.	
181	3/30/21	email	<p>1. In reply to your first point, I refer you to page 4, item 1.4 of your own draft Walford NDP which clarifies as follows: "The Core Strategy identifies three settlements within the Parish. These are indicated as Walford (Coughton), Bishopwood and Howle Hill. It is understood that the reference to Coughton is to distinguish Walford to the south of Ross on Wye from another settlement named Walford in the north of the County". We both know that we are talking about this Walford, so there can be no misunderstanding about that. Therefore, there could have been no point in your referring to Walford (Coughton) unless you were implying that Coughton was intended to be the main focus for housing development. Consequently, it is clear that the whole of Walford is what the Core Strategy is referring to and your response is erroneous, as well as subjectively misleading.</p> <p>2. As regards your second point: Yes, of course councillors are supposed to represent the whole Parish. That is not in question. What is in question is whether they are fulfilling that obligation. Of the seven councillors remaining after the resignation of the other six on the grounds of a lack of transparency, three have a very substantial pecuniary interest in the main sites that have been put forward for consideration - and, indeed, account for the majority of the residences that are represented overall. Of the other four existing councillors, none of them would be impacted by the proposed large sites for development, and at least three appear to be actively in favour of one or more large sites that would undoubtedly be to the detriment of the existing residents. Your response could therefore be regarded as rather meaningless. It is also to be noted that all of the existing seven councillors will remain in place.</p> <p>3. Whilst you acknowledge that the statistics on windfall planning consents to date are promising and progressing, you resist the obvious conclusion that the Parish seems probably on course to meet the target of 91 without any contrived development, let alone large sites. Instead, you evade the further point that there are valid minor sites that would more than guarantee the target figure, as well as the added availability of some of the surplus development from Ross Town Council, were it needed. What is more, you introduce the rather dubious negative argument that no pending applications can be counted on, as well as the somewhat far-fetched defence that some applications might lapse. As regards this latter, it seems reasonable to suppose that, assuming you are referring to planning approvals given, any that might have lapsed to date would have been reflected in the figures produced by Herefordshire Council - as would any lapsed approvals that were reinstated.</p> <p>For the benefit of all those who will read these exchanges, would you please give your early attention to addressing points 1 - 3 above more comprehensively. In particular, I would appreciate your detailed comments on the important issue at (1) above.</p>	<p>(Walford (Coughton) is the term used by Herefordshire Council and we are merely clarifying what this means and continuing to use the same term as used in the Core Strategy. We would direct you to Core Strategy Policy RA2 which refers to settlements listed in Figures 4.14 and 4.15. Figure 4.14 is entitled 'The settlements which will be the main focus of proportional housing development'. This lists Walford (Coughton) under the Ross-on-Wye Housing Market Area list of settlements. Figure 4.15, entitled 'Other settlements where proportionate housing is appropriate' includes Bishopwood and Howle Hill. It is clear that the references are to settlements and not the Parish. Only 2 parish councillors have previously declared a pecuniary interest, the third has previously declared a non pecuniary interest. The four other existing councillors have not expressed any preference for large sites. If the existing councillors did not wish to take the parishioners' views into account, they would not have asked for this public consultation, which is a voluntary one and not required under the rules. We can not use any of the surplus development from Ross Town Council unless we can not fulfil our quota. Clearly we can exceed this number. The housing planning numbers must be verified by Herefordshire Council Planning Dept. Once this has been done these figures will be used in the draft plan. The most up to date figures will be part of the evidence base presented to the council when it considers the options for inclusion in the draft NDP.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 20

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
182	4/6/21	Comment	Please update parishioners on the outstanding balance of the number of houses required (91 - by 2031) against those already built or pending. It would also be useful to know the average number of applications approved annually to inform the discussion on the number of additional houses that will be required if applications are approved at the same rate over the next 10 years.	As of April 2020 there are 36 properties either completed or with planning permission granted since 2011 leaving 55 properties to reach our minimum requirement of 91. In September 2020 we added a further 4 houses which had planning permission at Waryfield Barns, leaving the remaining target at 51 properties The housing numbers are confirmed by Herefordshire Planning each year after April and may go up or down depending on the number of new applications granted since the last figure was confirmed and permissions that have expired during that period. Section 5 of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report provides a guide to a reasonable estimation of the windfall allowance that might be included within the NDP - currently 17 properties. Unfortunately, it is not as straightforward as applying a fixed number per year based on historical rates, as is explained in the report.	
183	4/7/21	email	We have viewed the recent reports - thank you. We have two questions: 1) Which Potential Development Sites are yet to be assessed? 2) How & when will the assessment results be made available to view? When we have seen all the assessments we will be pleased to complete the Informal Consultation Questionnaire. We look forward to hearing from you. With many thanks.	Sites 38 and 39 are yet to be assessed and we are hopeful that this will be in the next couple of weeks. The assessment is done partly as a desk assessment and partly by a site visit by the consultant doing the assessment, after which he will write an addendum to the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report which will appear on the website. The likelihood is that this will be completed after the deadline for the questionnaire which is why the questionnaire has been designed to gather views which are independent of individual sites.	
184	4/7/21	email	1. The correspondence on this point to date has specifically concerned the location of the proposed sites for major and medium-sized developments, as set out in the draft Parish Plan, and your reference to it as a "built-up" area - i.e. Coughton. I am fully conversant with the fact that Herefordshire Council's Core Strategy uses the term "Walford (Coughton)" to distinguish the settlements in this Walford from another Walford in the County, and that the settlements in Bishopwood and Howle Hill are distinguished separately. However, it would have made no sense for the NDP Committee to be justifying large and medium-sized developments in Coughton, specifically, by pointing to a reference that applied to all the settlements in Walford Parish, other than Bishopwood and Howle Hill. In the absence of clarification, the term Walford (Coughton) implies Coughton specifically, as the explanation buried away in the 59 pages of the draft Parish Plan acknowledges. Had the Committee member (s) concerned wished to clarify this, they would surely have quoted that explanation; but they did not, presumably because that would not have served the purpose of justifying the particular developments proposed. It was I who did the clarifying, as is plain for all to see. 2. As regards your point that the voting councillors have not expressed preferences for large sites, it seems relevant that all four are members of the NDP Committee and that three have featured in the Zoom online consultations, fielding arguments from residents against large developments. In the context of one such argument, the Chair of the Committee was heard to comment rather dismissively, "Well, there will always be opposite opinions". Also there is a substantial slant in the draft Parish Plan towards development options that include large / medium sites, as well as some suggestion that the target figure should be exceeded - this being contrary to the evidence of progress to date in achieving the target, the emerging evidence of scope for further spontaneous development and the lack of any significant local need for housing. In this regard, could you please advise whether there is a deadline date for submission of our Parish Plan and whether there has been an available extension of any such deadline to compensate for problems posed by the pandemic. 3. Thank you for clarifying the point concerning surplus development achieved by Ross Town Council, though it is a pity this could not have been addressed in the earlier response. Could you please direct me to the source which sets out the provisions under which surpluses of development quota may be set off against foreseen shortfall in other locations.	1. Herefordshire Council used the term Walford (Coughton) in the Core Strategy. WPC has had to clarify the meaning of this with HC and it became clear that Walford (Coughton) refers to Walford AND Coughton. So Walford and Coughton is the term that NDP project has subsequently used in it's work. 2. There are only 3 councillors on the NDP committee and only one of them was in the online consultations. We assume you mean Neighbourhood Development Plan rather than The Parish Plan, which was never adopted. The target figure is a minimum and does not necessarily need to be exceeded. There is no deadline date for NDP submission. It's validity would be until 2031, subject to biannual review. 3. The Core Strategy lays out the requirements for the housing targets throughout the county. There is no explicit written source about sharing development between parishes. In relation to Bridstow, we understand the suggestion came from the Head of the Neighbourhood Planning Team at Herefordshire Council. Representatives of the two town/parish councils met to discuss the arrangement and agreed upon a Memorandum of Understanding. This is shown as an appendix to the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment report for Bridstow parish. It would appear that Herefordshire Council has accepted this arrangement although whether the External Examiner will be similarly minded has yet to be known. The NDP has yet to be Examined.	
185	4/7/21	email	Arguments against Walford Parish Council being permitted to determine a Parish Development Plan that includes any large or medium-sized developments 1. Walford Parish Council is comprised of thirteen councillors. Of these, six arbitrarily resigned in 2020 on the grounds of there being a lack of transparency within the Council. Of the remaining seven, three had disclosed interests in major / medium sites that were offered for consideration; the other four live in locations remote from the focus of the main developments that are being proposed in the "rankings" set out in the draft Parish Plan Addendum 2. The target figure of 91 new dwellings by 2031 had already been reduced to 54 by the end of March 2020, and to 51 by the end of September 2020 and, despite there being a demonstrable lack of local demand due to the demographics of the area, the Parish Plan appears to suggest development in excess of the already substantial target figure, which would seemingly be for the benefit of no-one other than the landowners. Of the eight sites ranked for preference, there are four large and medium-sized sites representing up to 120 dwellings, all designated for Coughton. Only four minor sites elsewhere have been ranked, amounting to sixteen potential properties, although there were more small sites that were deemed valid 2. Only 17 "windfall" dwellings were allowed for in preparing the draft plan, regardless of the fact that all of the planning approvals to date had been windfall applications that had nothing to do with the Parish Plan. This was purported to be on the ground that the number of potential sites available for windfall development could be expected to diminish between September 2020 and March 2031, resulting in only about 1.5 planning approvals per year. However, there were a further six new-build planning consents (subject to official clarification) in the six months to 31 March 2021, with a further three applications (relating to eight new dwellings) overdue for a decision at that date. Again, none of these have anything to do with the Parish Plan, which has yet to be completed and approved. The target remaining at this halfway point is therefore down to 45, with ten years yet to run and eight more potential windfall dwellings yet to be decided on. 4. The two major sites being considered by the Walford PP Committee comprise one of forty dwellings and another adjacent lot of up to sixty dwellings (though not necessarily both), envisaging development density of 30 dwellings per hectare (152 per acre). Even the smaller one of these 40 dwellings would be an unreasonably disproportionate percentage addition that blighted the character of the area. Both together would overwhelm and severely impact on the existing developments they stood alongside and to the rear of, in terms of environment and property values, as well as being out of keeping with the semi-rural character of the area as a whole. Quite apart from being wholly disproportionate, such development would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which stipulates that planning permission for major development should be refused, other than in exceptional circumstances 5. There was no shortage of valid minor sites volunteered, whose acceptance should more than assure compliance with what remains of the target figure. Some of these, although deemed suitable, appear to have been omitted from the rankings in preference for a large site. 6. There has been no opportunity for a face-to-face public consultation with the NDP Committee and this appears to have been taken advantage of by that Committee. Such Zoom consultations as have been held have been quite inadequate and have consisted of the Chair of the NDP Committee (a parish councillor) selecting the questions that were to be answered, with scant provision for follow-up questions. All very unsatisfactory. As for questions and arguments emailed to the Committee by individuals, the responses have not only been substantially delayed, but have also been superficial, incomplete, vague, evasive, blatantly misleading and padded out by repeated (stark) statements that add nothing to what is already known. It has been a very tiresome and frustrating effort altogether. In order to enlarge on and clarify some of points I have made above, I would further comment as follows: There have been misleading implications by the Committee that Herefordshire Council's Core Strategy intends Coughton to be the main development focus for the whole of Walford's settlements, though Walford's own draft Parish Plan clarifies that the Core Strategy's reference to "Walford (Coughton)" simply distinguishes this Walford from another Walford in the north of the County. This might encourage a perception that Coughton is the area in which the existing major interested parties have their surplus land. It is both absurd and outrageous that the semi-rural area of the parish that is Coughton should be treated as the chief development whipping boy for the whole Parish, and particularly so in view of the size and types of development that are being considered. The progress to date towards meeting the target of 91 dwellings over the next ten years provides no pretext whatever for the need of any large development that will gratify only the desires of landowners at the expense of many existing residents within the community. Even if one were to assume a 50% reduction in available windfall applications - which is extremely far-fetched in a rural parish whose properties have more than their fair share of large gardens and other small parcels of adjacent land - that would still only leave around 22 or 23 dwelling plots to find, ignoring the planning applications for eight dwellings yet to be determined. The valid minor sites volunteered should easily cover that. Indeed, the indications to date suggest there should be no compelling need for a parish plan, as the normal forces of supply, demand and prudent control would easily deliver the desired result. When I queried with the NDP Committee their estimate of ten new properties giving rise to only one child of school age, this was confirmed as being the experience of the independent planning consultant, who used it as a rule of thumb in rural areas. The writer then went on to press home his point by adding that the 2011 census showed 35 school-age children to 648 houses in Walford Parish, which was actually nearer one child of school age to every twenty households. This quite clearly identifies the demographics of Walford Parish residents as consisting predominantly of people around fifty years of age and above, whose children have grown up and live elsewhere, including a large number of retirees. That being the case, it is difficult to sustain an argument of there being any significant local need for more housing, and thus there can be no justification for exceeding the target figure of 91, the remainder of which is itself likely to be largely taken up by a new influx of similar age groups, rather than younger people whose primary need is to find decently-paid employment in all the circumstances enumerated above. I believe that any attempt to pursue aims for a large development, as implied by the rankings and options offered, would justify strenuous representations from residents for the matter to be taken out of the hands of the Parish Council and dealt with by the County Council.	1. A few of the councillors who resigned gave interviews to the press. The reasons for the others resigning are only known to the Chair of the parish council and the Clerk as these documents are confidential. 2. The target was 55 in April 2020, not 54. Local demand is not relevant to the process of making an NDP, the target figure is given by the local planning authority. The eight sites ranked includes ALL of the sites that have been deemed suitable (so far). 3. Indeed windfall is not something that the NDP project contributes to. However it can be used towards the target if it is sufficiently certain of happening. To determine a figure that is sufficiently certain the planning approval trend has been allowed to take account of this uncertainty and the likely diminishing number of sites available. For instance there is a finite number of redundant rural buildings sites in open countryside available. 4. This argument is to be considered by WPC when choosing an option. 5. Of all of the minor sites submitted ALL of the suitable sites appear in the ranking list. All of the other small sites would be subject to individual planning applications under RA3, rather than the NDP, which would be down to Herefordshire Council to determine. The windfall allowance seeks to cover an estimate for new dwellings that might come forward through that means. 6. Your comments are noted. Your comments will be taken into account when the council decides how to finalise the draft NDP. It is essential for the council to follow the correct process and work within the standards and constraints given by national and county planning authorities and we recognise that this has given rise to frustration within the parish. We do our best to explain and regret that this is not always accepted.	
186	4/7/21	email	Can you advise if the minutes from the March NDP Committee meeting have been published. Also, please advise the date of the April NDP Committee meeting. If these 2 are on the site can you provide me directions to them. Thank you.	The minutes are now at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/category/minutes/ and the meeting notice is at https://walford-ndp.co.uk/ . The next meeting is however postponed until 28th April at 7:30pm.	
187	4/11/21	email	Thank you very much for replying to our email. We assume from your email that site 37 has been assessed. We have looked through the documents on the website and can't see any reference to this site. Apologies if the site is mentioned and we are missing it. Do any of the NDP documents refer to this site - other than the application from the owner/potential developer? If there are any references we would appreciate if you could you direct us to them.	You are correct. Site 37 has been assessed and will be included and published in addendum 2 when sites 38 and 39 have been assessed.	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
188	4/13/21	email	<p>1. I'm afraid that your reply yet again fails to address head-on the argument I am making - a practice that would not be possible in face-to-face public discussion. I shall make one more attempt to elicit a rational reply; if that fails, then the matter must be left there for all to see:</p> <p>(a) Item 1 in my email of 20 March 2021 questioned the Committee's reference to the particular area of settlement being considered for very substantial further development (ie: Coughton) as a "built-up area", which appeared to imply subjective justification on the part of the Committee.</p> <p>(b) The Committee's response to this on 29 March was: "Herefordshire's Core Strategy RA2 classes Walford (Coughton) as the settlement which will be the main focus of proportionate housing development" .</p> <p>(c) That reply, in the absence of any clarification, would plainly give one to understand that Coughton, specifically, was intended by the Core Strategy to be the focus of such development - and would have been accepted as justification by anyone who was unaware of there being an important clarification that was available.</p> <p>(d) Had your Committee member provided the clarification, or simply used the clarified terminology, "Walford and Coughton", which you now explain has been adopted by the Committee, that would not have made sense in the context of a justification for focus of development on Coughton in particular.</p> <p>(e) In the circumstances, the conclusion must be that the Committee member concerned was attempting to justify the focus of development at Coughton by deliberately using the misleading term "Walford (Coughton) out of its genuine context and without the necessary explanation of what it meant.</p> <p>2. It has only recently become generally known that the Chair of the PC resigned from the Committee prior to the March meeting of the NDP Committee. However, I do recall seeing Councillors Monica Van Lienden (Chair of PC), Ruth Dolman and Joanne Akers appearing at recent Zoom consultations. (Your website still shows Cllr Monica Van Lienden as a member of the NDP Committee). I quite accept that the target figure of 91 is a minimum, but as that target had already been drastically increased from an original target of 31 and was then regarded as large, there can certainly be no valid justification for deliberately exceeding it to meet the desires of landowners. From my own experience of the ever-increasing prices of building land, and the readiness of everyone who can to exploit them, there is little doubt in my mind that there will be no problem in meeting, and exceeding, the target figure without there being any large and unsightly additions that will degrade the character of the existing neighbourhood.</p> <p>As there is no deadline for an NDP submission, the perceived indecent haste to make one whilst we are still in what is, hopefully, the latter stages of a pandemic is bound to fuel suspicion that the pandemic is being used to evade close scrutiny and face-to-face public debate, for the benefit of influential individuals. Whilst there is a conspicuously disproportionate contingent of landowners, or their close family members, within local authority councils, few residents are going to regard that as a coincidence. Surely, the most prudent way to determine whether there is going to be any appreciable decline in valid minor new-build / conversion applications is to wait and see for one or two years - particularly in view of the evidence to the contrary over the past year.</p> <p>3. Thank you for your clarification concerning the setting-off of development target deficits against the surpluses of related areas. My reason for raising the point was the fact that Ross on Wye is the provider of infrastructure for our satellite Parish, which is a very relevant relationship in that context.</p> <p>As regards your comments on my attachment:</p> <p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. I'm not sure now where I came across the figure of 54, but if the outstanding target figure in April 2020 was 55, then that slightly enhances the further progress made in achieving the target over the past 12 months.</p> <p>3. There is no evidence of any slow-down in the windfall approvals over the past 12 months (around 10). I believe that to base any projections on data that includes the period from 2000 to 2011, without specifying the numbers applicable to that period, may give a misleadingly low basis for projection between 2021 and 2031. If one were to take the last 12 months alone and halve that figure as a projection over the next ten years, that would imply a further 50 residences by 2031. Even if it were to be divided by 4 (which would be in the realm of subjectively plucking figures out of thin air), it would still be a further 25, which would only leave 20 more to find. Seventeen is absurdly unrealistic over ten years. Could you please supply the respective figure for new / conversion residence applications approved between 2000 and 2011.</p> <p>4. You have not yet provided a justification for any large sites, having regard to the fact that we now only need around 45 residence units to meet the target over the next ten years.</p>	<p>1. You have received nothing but rational replies to your emails.</p> <p>According to the Core Strategy Walford and Coughton IS the main focus of development in Walford parish, however it entirely depends on sites offered for development and in this case the offers have been substantial in Coughton and nothing suitable in Walford.</p> <p>Nobody on the committee is trying to justify anything in terms of development. That will be entirely for the parish council to consider.</p> <p>2. Your views are noted. We trust you added these to your questionnaire response.</p> <p>A large part of having an NDP is to ensure that development is done according to the wishes of the parish in so far as is allowable by planning law. If the process is delayed then the landowners have the right to put in planning applications and have them decided without reference to the parish's policies. This would have the effect of not protecting the desired policies of the parish.</p> <p>Regarding windfall allowance, the NDP housing policies will be scrutinised by an independent examiner who will be looking for certainty in our housing plan. We cannot use single year figures because they will be unrepresentative and we should use figures in the plan period, which is from 2011 to 2031. So we have used figures from 2011 to 2020. To bring a level of certainty we have halved the running rate during this period.</p> <p>The draft plan has to include all suitable sites with reasons for rejecting any to meet the regulations. It will be for the parish council to decide on which sites to include and they will have the express views of the parish, as well as the facts, figures and planning laws to consider in making that decision.</p>	
189	4/13/21	email	<p>5. Noted.</p> <p>In the December 2020 version of the "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report" the map on page 13 shows the proposed sites in purple. A slide in one of the presentations showed a similar map but with the areas of some sites reduced by showing the unsuitable areas in a lighter shade of purple (From memory sites 11, 14, 6 and 7). I have been unable to find this later adjusted plan on the website, I may have simply missed it, but if available please would you forward me the link?</p>	<p>Thank you for your inquiry, in order to help you and others looking for this information, the maps can be found in the presentations on the NDP website which can be found here https://walford-ndp.co.uk/project-documents/engagement/consultation/.</p>	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
190	4/15/21	email	<p>Please see the attached which I received from Herefordshire Council in response to my question as to whether there was a time limit for the submission of NDPs. You have recently clarified this for me yourselves; however, the reference to parish councils now needing to be mindful of "the emerging Herefordshire Local Plan, which will replace the current Herefordshire Core Strategy, when preparing their NDPs....." must surely be a compelling reason why the Walford NDP should not now be finalised before the Herefordshire Local Plan has been made known. Do you agree?</p>	<p>We refer you to a report that was discussed and accepted by full council. The report contents are:</p> <p>Report on Herefordshire Core Strategy Review/NDP Briefing - 20th December 2019</p> <p>On 20th December Herefordshire Council held a second briefing session, for Parish Councils, on the potential impact that an ongoing review of the Core Strategy could have on Neighbourhood Development Plans.</p> <p>The briefing was held at Plough Lane and was given by Kevin Singleton (Strategic Planning team leader) and Samantha Banks (Neighbourhood Planning Manager).</p> <p>This was an additional briefing to one held on 6th November and arranged due to the high level of interest from Parish Councils.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council are required to review their Core Strategy, by October 2020, as a part of the current iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework. They have already started this process and expect the review to be complete by February 2020. The review must examine the Core Strategy and determine whether it is still entirely relevant and compliant with the current NPPF. As a result of this review process the strategic planning team are likely to conclude that the Core Strategy should be revised and will make that recommendation to the Council members. In the event that the Council decide that the Core Strategy requires revision then the process is likely to take around 5 years to complete, meaning that the earliest that a revised Core Strategy would come into force is 2025. In fact the current Core Strategy took nearly 7 years before it passed final examination. A revised Core Strategy Plan would cover the period 2021 to 2041.</p> <p>Since the current Core Strategy was developed the NPPF has undergone some significant revisions and the impact on both a revised Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Development Plans could be substantial.</p> <p>In particular the NPPF now requires NDPs to make provision for development sites, sufficient to meet at least a 3 year dwellings target, if they are to have full consideration as part of the planning process. The NPPF also requires Planning Authorities to demonstrate that they are meeting dwelling completions rather than just providing adequate land for that development. What this may mean is that it will not be sufficient to just identify locations for the required development but it will also be necessary to demonstrate that those locations are viable in terms of getting the dwellings built.</p> <p>In terms of Independent Examination of both Local Plans and NDPs we were briefed that Examiners are now looking for much more evidence to support policies and development locations. This includes obtaining landowner's agreement that any land that is identified in an NDP for development is actually available for that purpose. Some early NDPs apparently identified sites without gaining the landowners agreement.</p> <p>The NPPF also now suggests that all Local Authorities use a standardised process for assessing and calculating need. Whilst this is not mandatory it is clearly the preferred approach. An initial assessment of the total housing target for Herefordshire using this new process, over a 20 year period, resulted in a figure of around 17,400 new homes. Although 900 dwellings greater than the current Core Strategy target it does not appear to yield significantly different figures and it is only a first pass assessment.</p> <p>In revisiting the current Core Strategy it is likely that the Strategic Planning team will recommend reviewing all aspects of the policy including the Spatial Strategy. This could be significant as it might result in a substantial revision of the rural housing policy and the relatively flat settlement structure that is contained in the current Strategy. The Council are likely to revisit all the supporting information such as the Local Housing Market Assessment and the Rural Housing Background Paper.</p> <p>It was those papers that largely resulted in the current list of settlements and a reassessment could well mean that some settlements might be removed from the list as they are no longer considered to be sustainable. The Strategic Planning Team suggested that they would wish to liaise closely with Parish Councils in revising these papers and it would clearly be advantageous to try and assist them with this process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process the Planning Team will be sending a Local Services questionnaire, to all Parish Council clerks, during January 2020.</p> <p>A revised Core Strategy will have an impact on all extant NDPs and it is likely that all of them will have to be revised to conform to the new Core Strategy. However the NPPF now requires all NDPs to be reviewed, and potentially revised, within 2 years of adoption if they are to retain full effect in respect of planning matters. After that 2 year point the NDP will given less weight when making planning decisions.</p> <p>For Walford our NDP is expected to be adopted towards the end of 2021. Therefore, if it was to retain full effect it would need review and revision by 2024. The NPPF defines 3 potential levels of change for NDPs and only the most minor of changes avoids the need for consultation and external examination. Changes involving development land or settlement boundaries will necessitate both external examination and a local referendum, which is the Schedule 16 process that we are currently following and takes around 18 months to complete. In effect the requirement for a 2 year review cycle means that within a few months of an NDP being adopted a review process needs to be started.</p> <p>In our case it may be that if we complete the current NDP process by the end of 2021 then we would need to start tracking the Core Strategy revisions, with the aim of updating our NDP as soon as a revised Core Strategy is adopted. If the Core Strategy were to implement a different Spatial Strategy then it will most likely affect every NDP in the County.</p> <p>As a result of this briefing it is recommended that:</p> <p>The NDP Steering Group draft a response to the Herefordshire Council questionnaire, when it is received in January, 2020</p> <p>The NDP Steering Group continue to attend any briefings on the Core Strategy review process and to draft responses to any consultation documents</p>	
191	4/19/21	email to clerk	<p>I attach the first of two videos showing the extent of flooding at the bottom of Bulls Hill, the proposed entrance to Coughton sites 6 & 7.</p> <p>This is all surface water which runs through my property, (name redacted) in the valley between Bulls Hill and Howle Hill.</p> <p>Over the years the council have put various inlets off the road that direct surface water through the valley in which (name redacted) is situated. This causes our lake to rise to a point where flooding has potential to become an issue. This issue has got noticeably worse over the last few years. It now reaches a height every winter where I feel I will have no option but to lift our sluice gate (Note that the flood water in the videos is without our sluice being lifted). There was a time when lifting our sluice was not an issue as the land below was meadow land, however, if the proposed housing where to go ahead lifting the gate would cause serious consequences. Furthermore, I feel it necessary to say our lake is a recognised fire hydrant for 6 half timbered properties within its immediate vicinity, including both (names redacted).</p>	<p>Your emails have been forwarded to the NDP committee and this is our response.</p> <p>Thank you for your email the contents of which have been noted and passed on to the consultant for consideration regarding the sites that you have highlighted.</p>	
192	4/21/21	Comment	<p>I have lived in Walford for 25 years. Last year the bottom of Bulls Hill was desecrated by the landowner. Now the brook is no more all for the sake of planning permission in the field the brook runs through. I 100% object to planning on sites 6 and 7. The road is fer to narrow for the amount of traffic. Plus the wildlife around here kingfisher has just returned,also I have bats living in my back garden gate. I cannot understand why anybody would want to sell land around this area apart from greed</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>	
193	4/19/21	email	<p>Can the NDP Committee explain if and how affordable and social housing is included in the NDP. Just discussing plots does not address this issue. We surely do not need 90+ five bedroom homes. It may be necessary to accept a medium to large development with a national developer in order to get a range of houses that meet the needs of social housing, new buyers, small and larger families.</p>	<p>It certainly is an option to have some sites over 10 houses in order to provide a proportion of affordable housing. Any site of more than 10 houses is expected to provide 40% affordable houses (Core Strategy policy H1). Affordable housing is referenced in sections 3.11 and 7.2 of the NDP. During public opinion surveys and questionnaires there has been limited interest expressed in affordable housing.</p>	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
194	4/20/21	email	<p>1. Whilst I would agree that most of the replies from you have not been other than rational, there appears to have been a certain reluctance to address the question as to why development should be focussed in the Coughton area, quite apart from the obvious factor of there being substantial sites there on offer by parties that include members of the Parish Council. In particular was the clear implication by one of your respondents that Coughton, specifically, was intended by the Core Strategy to be the focus of development for the Parish as a whole - which would have deceived anyone who was unaware of the fairly obscure fact that the Core Strategy's reference to Walford (Coughton) was merely intended to distinguish this Walford from another Walford in the same county. Few could have been expected to know that, as you'd previously had to clarify it for yourselves, yet the writer of that email made no attempt to make the fact clear. I have tried several times now to spell out to you that point, and you have the sequence of correspondence to hand for reference, yet you have persisted in deflecting it by affecting not to understand. This apparent determination to gloss over the issue leaves me no alternative other than to refer the correspondence to the Herefordshire Council Standards Committee.</p> <p>2. I'm not sure what you are trusting I would have added to my questionnaire response. As regards landowners being able to put in planning applications outside the scope of the NDP, I would assume they have always been able to do that, just as Parish Councils have likewise always had the right to decline recommendation in the event that developments are not considered necessary or in keeping. In this case, the sizes of the main sites in question would be out of keeping with the present modest and well-spaced developments, as well as being quite disproportionate to any rationally estimated shortfall in windfall developments over the next ten years. Nor can there be any justification to exceed the target figure in view of the absence of any significant local need. I agree that you cannot use the planning approvals for one year as basis for projection, but there can be no logical reason for excluding a year in which there are around ten such approvals. That makes no sense, as the period from 2011 to 2021 represents the half-way point. Also, the provisional figure of ten planning consents in the single year to 31 March 2021 completely demolishes the credibility of your estimate of only 17 windfall approvals in the 11-year period to 31 March 2031. Finally, the arbitrary halving of the rate of approvals in a period of nine years (as well as leaving the very significant tenth year out of reckoning) to arrive at an estimate for the next eleven years, plainly goes much too far in a rural parish. One can project just about any outcome if one makes use of enough unrealistic assumptions and excludes inconvenient data. All in all, and having regard to the fact of there being three relevant landowners represented within the Parish Council, who have tendered sites of a size there should be little need for, there would be compelling grounds for a belief that the calculations made were subjective, as well as unrealistic - especially if there were to be continued exclusion of Year 10 and no revision of the already-discredited halving adjustment. What is most definitely required is a revised projection based on up-to-date figures.</p> <p>There are two further issues I would appreciate your clarification of.</p> <p>3. Could you please advise the figure of confirmed additional planning consents between 1 October 2020 and 31 March 2021.</p> <p>4. Sites 6 and 7 are currently shown as being in the name of "The Estate of (name redacted)". I understand that the two sites were originally disclosed as constituting a pecuniary interest of at least one of the Parish Councillors. As a matter of transparency, could you please advise which, if any, of the Parish Councillors has a current pecuniary or personal interest disclosure in place relevant to these sites.</p>	<p>1. We sought clarification from HC and here are the responses: 7th August 2019: WPC: The settlements include Walford (Coughton). Does this include Coughton or just Walford? HC: I would expect both. It is expected as Coughton is larger and has a good road network for more development to be within this area, and Walford still as a settlement. HC: Walford needs to stick to the identified areas for proportionate growth as identified in CS policy RA2, but the NDP can decide on the extent of growth within these areas through settlement boundaries/ policy criteria. The identified areas may or may not change in the Core Strategy review, but for now you should continue to plan for development within the identified areas of Walford, Coughton, Bishopswood and Howle Hill.</p> <p>The Core Strategy reference to Walford (Coughton) is in figure 4.14 of the Core Strategy. 2. The decision on granting of planning permissions rests solely with the Local Planning Authority and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. Walford Parish Council is only a consultee and thus has no power to limit the size or form of developments beyond making relevant planning comments. As with any estimate, it may vary according to the assumptions used. In relation to suggesting a windfall allowance for the remaining plan period we are conscious that Government indicates "Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends." Hence, we have looked at the trend rate for 2000 to 2020 for dwellings outside of settlement. Bearing in mind many were rural building conversions which will be a diminishing resource, and in order to give Herefordshire Council and the External Examiner a high degree of confidence that the suggested allowance is deliverable we suggest a contribution of 50% of the suggested trend. It remains to be seen whether that Council and Examiner are happy to accept that a windfall allowance should be taken into account, and if so whether they would be happy with the approach suggested. We are awaiting the updated figures for 2020/2021 and will use these when they are provided. We expect these in May 2021 and expect the target to change as a result. HC have a set process to decide whether a permission is counted as a dwelling or not and they also review whether extant permissions have lapsed. The fact that some councillors have either pecuniary or non pecuniary interests in some sites, of which there could be more following the elections, has no bearing on the calculation for the projected windfall allowance. 3. We don't hold that information. Herefordshire Council are the Local Planning Authority and they provide NDP teams with annual updates, usually in May or June. Also refer to response to Q182. 4. We do not hold that information. It is a personal matter for individual Councillors to decide whether they have a Pecuniary or Personal Interest in any Council business and this is noted in the minutes. It is not the role of the NDP Committee to police such disclosures.</p>	
195	4/21/21	email	<p>There has been repeated reference to the Core Strategy in a number of responses to challenges raised by residents. These references to core strategy have been used as justification of the the Herefordshire Local Plan, only continued reference to a core strategy which is under review and why there continues to be a determined effort to push through proposals before that review is completed.</p>	<p>It is understood that the core strategy review will take approx. 5 years. In fact the current Core Strategy took nearly 7 years before it passed final examination. Based on this the present review may come to fruition somewhere between 2025-2027, which based on our timeline would be when the NDP would also be under review, so any changes in the core strategy would be taken into account at that time. WPC committed to an NDP in 2012 and intends to proceed within the current plan period. So far HC haven't published a timetable for revising the Core Strategy - this is how far they have got: https://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/DecisionDetails.aspx?Id=7296</p>	
196	4/27/21	email	<p>Thank you for your reply. Only 2 sites fit in the more than 10 houses category. Given Government policy on affordable and social housing is weight being given to these 2 sites in the selection process? If not, there is the potential for Walford Parish to offer no affordable housing with its' NDP. Has the lack of comments, regarding affordable housing in surveys, been because the question has not been asked? In hindsight, should affordable housing have been a question in the recent survey? Had the question been asked, and a proportion of respondents were in favour of affordable housing, the use of larger sites would need to be considered.</p>	<p>In the draft parish plan survey in 2004 forty seven per cent (47%) of people raised the matter of the need for affordable homes for young people and in the residents questionnaire of 2014 the results indicated the following</p> <p>Majority Against:- 81.35% Against (11.51% For) Flats - Others don't know. 60.78% Against (40.78% For) Luxury Housing 56.98% Against (27.52 For) Social rented housing is owned by the local authority and private registered providers and will be subject to guideline target rents set by the local authority</p> <p>Evenly Split:- 42.91% Against (41.73% For) Intermediate housing is for sale and rent at a cost above social rent but below market levels such as shared equity (shared ownership & equity loans)</p> <p>Majority For:- 90.2% For (5.74% Against) Family Housing 72.45% For (20% Against) Bungalows 58.86% For (26% Against) Self-builds 55.88% For (29.78% Against) Smaller market housing will be subject to planning restrictions that safeguard occupation for identified local housing needs and will continue to do so in perpetuity.</p> <p>The presentations in February and March 2021 outlined the pros and cons of the housing options including the impact on affordable housing and yet the survey that followed showed a strong preference for small and medium sized sites.</p> <p>Sites offering more than 10 dwellings are expected to provide a degree of affordable housing. This fits in with some of the medium size sites being offered.</p>	
197	4/28/21	email	<p>In reference to the above, I reply as follows, using the same numerical sequence:</p> <p>1. I'm afraid your response is not coherent and once again does not address the issue I was referring to. What is "7 August 2019" a reply to, please? As for the rest, I was not seeking clarification of what "Walford (Coughton)" means, etc., but was trying to elicit an explanation of what seemed very much like an attempt by one of your Committee members to use deceit in justifying Coughton as the main focus for development, and the subsequent attempts to gloss over the matter. Would you please refer to the paragraphs numbered (1) within the following email communications:</p> <p>My email to you dated 20 March 2021 Your response dated 29 March 2021 (the initial deceit) My reply to you dated 30 March 2021 (my challenge to the attempted deceit) Your response dated 6 April 2021 My reply to you dated 7 April 2021 Your response dated 13 April 2021 My reply to you dated 13 April 2021 Your response dated 19 April 2021 My reply to you dated 20 April 2021 Your most recent response dated 27 April 2021</p> <p>2. With regard to planning applications, I am well aware that parent local authorities pay a great deal of attention to objections and recommendations received from town and parish councils - particularly if they are made aware of pending NDPs, and much more particularly where the applications concern large or medium-sized developments of the contentious kind being considered here. I think the evidence of progress to date in achieving the target figure of 91 new dwellings by 31 March 2031 speaks for itself. As for the estimate of 17 newbuild windfalls during the eleven-year period from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2031, it already seems certain that this was substantially flawed. More than half that estimated figure was apparently achieved in the first year to 31 March 2021, leaving around 45 - 47 left to find in the ten-years to 31 March 2031. Even if one assumes that only half of those will be achieved by windfall applications, which is highly unlikely in a rural parish of this size, regardless of whether there are old buildings ripe for conversion, that would still not justify accepting any of the large developments being considered, which would be to the detriment of the locality. The word is obviously out that new planning applications are being favourably considered and there should be no need to appease the opportunism of substantial landowners. Having read through my questions, it is difficult to understand why you should think I was conflating the issue of pecuniary interests with windfall allowances in particular. The Code of Conduct makes it perfectly clear that all individuals within parish councils who are deemed to have prejudicial interests (as defined therein) should be strictly excluded from any input, debate, influence or presence in such discussions, and it is up to everyone to ensure that this policy is carried into effect. However, I am referring this matter to the Chair of Walford Parish Council, as it is specific to parish councillors and has no relevance to co-opted members of NDP committees - who should obviously not be interested parties or connected persons.</p> <p>3. Noted, thank you.</p> <p>4. As mentioned at (2) above, I am referring this matter to the Chair of the Parish Council.</p>	<p>1. 7th August was when the question was asked of HC.</p> <p>Your comments are all noted.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 24

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
198	4/28/21	Letter	<p>We refer to your Report titled Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031 Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report (Report) updated August 2020.</p> <p>We hereby formally object to any proposal or application for planning permission on Sites 6(R1) WNDP6 and 7(R) WNDP7 (collectively "Sites").</p> <p>The Report detailed the following significant constraints on both Sites 6 R1 and 7(R) at page 14:</p> <p>a. "Site 6(R) - Site 6 in its entirety contains a considerable area subject to flooding and the Stage 2 assessment does not consider the whole site. In relation to the reduced site 6(R), there is a combination of adverse effect on the visual landscape and landscape character, potential to increase flooding to other properties to the south, and adverse effect on the setting of a Listed Building. A further reduced site was considered to have the potential to mitigate some of these effects - Site 6(R1).</p> <p>b. Site 7(R) - Site 7 in its entirety contains a considerable area subject to flooding and the Stage 2 assessment does not consider the whole site. A reduced site 7(A) has been considered."</p> <p>Furthermore, both detailed assessment Reports of Sites 6(R1) and 7(R) at pages 61 and 69 respectively state that: "Flooding from both Castle Brook and storm water affect land and properties further to the south (downstream) and development of the site should not lead to increased flooding elsewhere. Provision will need to be made to accommodate storm water drainage from the site to ensure these remain at greenfield flow levels from the developed area"</p> <p>The Report specifically mentions Daycroft Lane at page 54 of the Report in relation to Site 3 (this Site is just downstream of Daycroft Lane):</p> <p>"The Environment Agency's Storm Water Map identifies a number of areas that flood outside of the Flood Risk Zones shown on the Flood Risk Map for planning. Local knowledge has identified a significant area of flooding upon both these maps at the junction of Daycroft Lane with the B4234"</p> <p>We object, inter alia, on the basis that these sites, if developed, will increase the flooding risk elsewhere, the listed properties of historical significance to the south (downstream) in Daycroft Lane.</p> <p>It remains for the Landowner and or any and all consenting bodies to expressly discharge its burden to demonstrate that any activities, including the works already undertaken to the watercourse within both Sites and any proposed developments have not and will not cause as a consequence a nuisance to other landowners and or residents specifically properties further to the south (downstream) and subsequently indemnify from any harm any affected parties, if these sites are to be progressed. The Landowner has not discharged this burden nor given such an indemnity.</p> <p>Despite the significant constraints outlined above, the landowner of these sites during 2020 taken unauthorised and illegal measures to attempt to mitigate flood risk at the Sites including diverting the course of Castle Brook, increasing the width, depth, flow and building up the banks of Castle Brook, reducing the flood plain zones and removing trees/foliage within these sites. These measures have, inter alia, removed the natural flood alleviation features of the Castle Brook.</p> <p>These unauthorised works have already resulted in a significantly increased flooding risk to properties further to the south (downstream) and any subsequent development would only increase this risk, in and around Daycroft Lane.</p> <p>The consequences of the flooding have been devastating on the properties at Daycroft Lane and caused unprecedented flash flooding on two separate occasions on the 230 24th December 2020 and 25027 December 2020. These recent flood events were characterised by greatly increasing water volumes and velocity causing catastrophic consequences putting lives at risk and caused hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of damage to the historically significant and listed buildings dating back to 18th century in Daycroft Lane, including:</p> <p>(property name redacted) suffered major damage due to the flooding event with the whole property being submerged in over a foot of water and the loss of two cars.</p> <p>(property name redacted) first floor was flooded and (property name redacted), garage and grounds were flooded and submerged in water.</p> <p>(property name redacted) suffered Flood damage to its basement.</p> <p>(property name redacted) suffered flood damage to its grounds garage; and</p> <p>The increased waterflow and bank destabilisation has also heavily eroded the brook banks alongside (property name redacted) which is located directly opposite Sites 6 and 7, there is now a significant risk this property may collapse into Castle Brook.</p> <p>In summary this letter confirms an objection to the proposed inclusion of the Sites, Sites 6(R1) and 7(R), within the Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011 - 2031 for the reasons set out herein and invite you to support this objection and remove the Sites from any proposals.</p> <p><i>In addition, please advise what action is planned to remediate the Castle Brook to reinstate the watercourse at Rulle Hill Lane to its former condition</i></p>	<p>All sites submitted for consideration have to be assessed in order to ensure the Plan's preparation meets the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. We are aware of the flooding issues associated with Castlebrook. In relation to sites 6 and 7, the areas subject to flooding as indicated on the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map, have been excluded. In relation to the remaining areas, should development be proposed upon these, this would need to ensure that it did not result in increased flooding to other properties. Their development may even provide the opportunity to address localised flooding in the vicinity as a potential benefit to be explored through the consultation process.</p> <p>However, no decision has yet been made upon which sites are to be included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The Parish Council will need to consider the options available, including weighing the levels of constraints and potential benefits. When this is done, a draft plan will be prepared upon which all residents will be consulted, as will relevant agencies, including those responsible for drainage.</p> <p>In relation to the works already undertaken, this is not a matter for the NDP. You may wish to take these up with Herefordshire Council as both local planning authority and local land drainage authority.'</p>	
199	4/28/21	Questionnaire	<p>I would like to know what benefits our Parish would gain from, should 51 houses bring to just one area, next to the school?</p> <p>Will some form of traffic control be included, if plot 21 or 11R go ahead?</p> <p>Can we also allow that it is not a "given" that any children from the new houses will automatically go to Walford school?</p> <p>My two daughters' classes have 14 and 16 children who also have siblings either there or will be joining over the next few years (around 50% of the class). Specific needs and vulnerable children, from around the catchment would also be considered for placements before any other child who happens to live in the Parish.</p> <p>Has the school been consulted on how this would be tackled?</p> <p>Will an improved pavement be seen, from Walford village hall, all the way through the village, past Coughton, to the Vine Tree? Has it been assessed and passed as being safe to be used, for all people of varying abilities - prams, mobility scooters etc?</p> <p>Would we see some form of lighting throughout the pavement, between Walford village hall and the school, as well as Coughton corner to the Vine Tree?</p> <p>Will we see a significant improvement to recreational options, such as a new park or expanding what is currently a very basic park at Walford village hall?</p>	<p>Infrastructure and amenities are not a direct part of the NDP, though the NDP can influence these in the longer term. However, the process of developing an NDP provides local councils with the opportunity to identify the issues of importance to residents and incorporate these into their plans for the area. The core strategy requirement for homes in the parish represent a proportional part of the national need. The Parish Council may wish to consider whether the advantages of placing development in one or two larger sites offers the best approach. Benefits may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites of more than ten dwellings are expected to include a proportion of affordable housing. Something that is unlikely to take place on smaller sites. They may also be required to contribute towards certain facilities such as Walford Primary School and John Kyrle School in accordance with Herefordshire Council's Scheme for Planning Obligations. 2. Putting all of our required development in one or two suitable sites may reduce visual and access impact elsewhere in the parish where roads are narrower and there are no footways. 3. The potential larger sites at Coughton are also more accessible to the primary school, existing amenities, mains drainage, main road and bus services. 4. A larger site may increase the opportunity to add to local amenities such as a community green space. <p>The impact of any site regarding access and traffic volumes will be assessed as part of the planning application for that site.</p>	
200 201 202 203 204 205	4/28/21	Questionnaire	<p>Named individual has kindly provided some insight into some recent planning applications, between 9.11.20 - 18.3.21, of around 15 new dwellings, of which 7 have been approved. 7 new dwellings approved in 5 months.</p> <p>Where does there appear to be a likely decline in this run rate of applications and approvals.</p> <p>Could you share the supporting facts that outline a future decline please? Could the WNDP provide the same information for the period of January 19 to December 20, so that we can see if this current rate bucks the trend, or 5+ dwellings in 5-6 months is pretty consistent?</p> <p>The need is to achieve the latest 5 month average, each year, for the next 10 years - or if the current rate continues, it will be reached in 5 years. Why does there appear to be a sudden need to fast track the last 51 now?</p> <p>Can we see some substance that is compelling enough to show that there won't be enough "local applications" (individual applications from across the Parish), that supports the need to suddenly get 51 signed off, with the best part of 10 years still to go?</p>	<p>The decline in rate of applications is likely to be within the area of barns or outbuildings in the parish available for conversion as these are not a replaceable resource.</p> <p>We don't hold details of the numbers for the period Jan '19 to Dec '20 because we don't know how many extant permissions will have fallen off the list and which applications Herefordshire Council will consider dwellings. There are and always will be peaks and troughs. The housing numbers are confirmed by Herefordshire Planning each year after April. We are awaiting their confirmation and once this is received the windfall allowance estimate will be updated. It is for Herefordshire Council and the External Examiner to decide whether the estimate is acceptable or not.</p> <p>The NDP is not being "fast tracked". We are currently at the same point in the process that we were in August when a presentation was about to be given to councillors prior to full council debating the options available and deciding what to put into the NDP. Since then the NDP committee have undertaken an additional voluntary public consultation which is not required under the regulations in order to gain an insight into the public's feelings on the options available to councillors prior to full council debating what should go into the plan. The results of this consultation will now be included in a presentation placed before full council in due course.</p> <p>Herefordshire Council have no obligation to limit the number of planning application they approve within Walford Parish.</p> <p>All of the proposed sites can apply for planning permission at any time. The decision to build or not upon these sites lies with Herefordshire Council not Walford Parish Council. WPC are only a consultee in the process and without an NDP in place, WPC have limited criteria upon which it is able to comment. The purpose of pursuing an NDP is to ensure that the parish has more influence regarding where these dwellings are placed.</p> <p>The assessment of windfall allowance needs to meet the provisions of the NPPF which requires there to be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply being realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends. The assessment in the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment report is based upon trends since 2000. There will be yearly variations over a trend period and there is a need to average these out in order to present the trend. It is an estimate. There is also a need to present a level of certainty to Herefordshire Council and the External Examiner if an option is chosen that relies upon a windfall allowance rather than available allocated sites. When considering the suggested windfall development figure set out in the main report, the Steering Group felt there would be a high degree of confidence in that figure from knowledge about potential opportunities.</p>	
206	4/28/21	Questionnaire	<p>Sites 21, 11, 7 and 6 are adjacent to each other, separated by public roads or a track. If adjacent sites are included in the NDP together, geographically, and from the village's point of view, they move from medium or large sized sites to either a large or very large site.</p> <p>Under the NDP regulations, how does the committee take this into consideration when deciding the combination of sites in the NDP, if the village indicates that they prefer smaller sites?</p>	<p>Sites 6, 7 and 11 do not rely upon each other to be developed nor do they have common boundaries. Hence are considered individual sites in their own right. Site 21 requires access through site 11 and hence the combination is such that they need to be considered as one. The NDP Committee is not making any decisions on the combination of sites in the NDP. This is a matter for Walford Parish Council.</p>	
207	4/28/21	Questionnaire	<p>Has any approach been made to Herefordshire to challenge the overall quantity of housing required?</p>	<p>The approach to calculating the required level of proportional housing growth has been agreed by a Planning Inspector following a Public Examination of The Core Strategy and cannot be changed until the Core Strategy is reviewed. It is a legal requirement for the NDP to comply with the Core Strategy. The numbers set for Walford Parish Council by Herefordshire Council have not been challenged because, unless a Parish Council can demonstrate that they have insufficient suitable and viable, development sites to meet the Core Strategy requirements then that provision cannot be challenged.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 25

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
208	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Please can Map 6 be replaced with a better quality map from MAGIC as recommended by Natural England? That map does not show all the ancient woodlands and protected habitats that the up to date MAGIC Map does.	<p>We will place the Map 6 on the web and with this you can zoom in to greater detail.</p> <p>We are aware that information provided by Herefordshire Council in its draft Strategic Environmental Assessment Report for the Parish did not contain all ancient woodlands and we have used the Natural England master file of ALL registered Ancient Woodland to plot (in Map 6 of the NDP draft) those we felt were missing. If there are some we have missed, perhaps someone will be able to direct us towards those woodlands. We are also aware that there are a number of other priority habitats identified upon the Magic Map, including other types of woodlands, such as wet woodland at Coughton Marsh and Woodland SSSI. In addition there are other important habitats included in Herefordshire Biodiversity Action Plan, such as hedgerows, traditional orchards and a range of other woodland types. These contribute towards the ecological network of sites that run through the Parish and connect more widely. Where they have been identified, they have informed the site assessments, although not all fall within Government's hierarchy for protection, but may be relevant when it comes to determining between sites in the NDP and determining compensatory measures should they be affected by development. The documents referred to above can be found in the NDP Website Evidence Base under environment. Magic Map is available through the internet</p>	
209	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Look again at any offered land not now in the NDP as it was only suitable for 1 or 2 houses, can any of these be increased to 3 dwellings and included?	The levels of development for each site suggested are for the purposes of the contribution they are likely to make towards the required level of proportional housing growth. It is an estimate based upon the density of dwellings at the particular location and maintaining the character of the settlement and landscape setting. They may vary when a planning application is made, upwards or downwards. It is a judgement that will be tested no doubt by Herefordshire Council and the External Examiner for whichever sites are included in the NDP.	
210	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Please could map 6 be replaced with an up to date better quality map so we can see all the small ancient woodlands as these are protected habitats and just because they are under 2 hectares it does not make them any less important?	<p>We will place the Map 6 on the web and with this you can zoom in to greater detail.</p> <p>We are aware that information provided by Herefordshire Council in its draft Strategic Environmental Assessment Report for the Parish did not contain all ancient woodlands and we have used the Natural England master file of ALL registered Ancient Woodland to plot (in Map 6 of the NDP draft) those we felt were missing. If there are some we have missed, perhaps someone will be able to direct us towards those woodlands. We are also aware that there are a number of other priority habitats identified upon the Magic Map, including other types of woodlands, such as wet woodland at Coughton Marsh and Woodland SSSI. In addition there are other important habitats included in Herefordshire Biodiversity Action Plan, such as hedgerows, traditional orchards and a range of other woodland types. These contribute towards the ecological network of sites that run through the Parish and connect more widely. Where they have been identified, they have informed the site assessments, although not all fall within Government's hierarchy for protection, but may be relevant when it comes to determining between sites in the NDP and determining compensatory measures should they be affected by development. The documents referred to above can be found in the NDP Website Evidence Base under environment. Magic Map is available through the internet</p>	
211	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Also with the large scale developments already happening in Ross on Wye, which is hardly an employment hotspot, where will these new people be working?	<p>Herefordshire Core Strategy sets out a range of complementary policies to promote employment as well as housing with the aim of achieving sustainable development. These include land for employment, tourism, retailing and working from home. At present the local demographic is very diverse in terms of working with many small businesses being run from home and in the leisure industry, and although Walford is primarily a farming area it is surrounded by villages and towns which offer employment within the leisure industry, manufacturing, retail and many other businesses. There is no knowing or predicting whether people moving to the area will be working in these areas or further afield but working remotely from home, or indeed retired.</p> <p>Population growth across Herefordshire over the past twenty years has been almost entirely through people moving to the area. It is an attractive place to live, work and retire. We have one of the lowest population densities, one of the lowest rates of unemployment, and are one of the most successful small business start-up areas in the country.</p>	
212	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Other criteria such as community facilities (play areas, school places, Hereford cycle scheme) must also be considered. Why is the community not being asked about other aspects of development?	The public were asked about these aspects of development in previous consultations and the criteria upon which the site assessments were evaluated was drawn up from the responses received in these earlier consultations. Policies to maintain and enhance community facilities have been included in the Walford draft NDP (Policy WALF13). There will be another opportunity to comment on these and other aspects when the plan goes into Reg 14 formal consultation.	
213	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Who comes up with the housing requirements numbers? Do they have local knowledge or take into account the real-world impact of their decisions?	Please refer to FAQ's H6 and P1 on the NDP Web site.	
214	4/28/21	Questionnaire	How is anyone (including, in this economic climate, singles and couples deep into their 30s) able to get on the property ladder if all developments are of 4 to 5 bedroom houses?	The sites are assessed to determine the number of dwellings not their size. The sizes of dwellings within each site is determined at the planning application stage, not by the NDP. These could be a mix of 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses. Larger sites offer greater opportunity for Herefordshire Council planners to negotiate a range of house types on a site through Core Strategy policy H3, and affordable housing through Core Strategy policy H1.	
215	4/28/21	Questionnaire	The council can't even be bothered to clean the pavements and gutters, let alone repair the roads - which aren't going to get any wider and are already pumelled by a large volume of traffic for a B road as it is - so why should anyone believe they have invested even a modicum of thought into suitable development plans for our area?	Highways Maintenance is not a matter covered through a Development Plan (Local Plan or Neighbourhood Development Plan). Herefordshire Council must prepare a Highway Maintenance Plan for that purpose and it can be found upon that Council's Website. Herefordshire Council's Highways section will comment upon the effect of proposals included in the NDP upon the local highway network. Herefordshire Council's Development Plan (Core Strategy) was subject to a public examination where the evidence it prepared on all aspects of the plan was tested. A Planning Inspector appointed by Government approved the current Core Strategy having taken into account all representations. There is a method of reporting problems to HC through their website, or through a link on Walford PC website.	
216	4/28/21	Questionnaire	In terms of footpaths, will these remain in place or will they be re-directed if the development goes ahead?	Public rights of way are legally protected. Where development might affect a public right of way, it may be possible to vary the route. There is a process for this and it is understood that there are legal tests to be passed and there must be a suitable diversion route.	
217	4/28/21	Questionnaire	As Ross Town council and Hereford has stated that they want no further development in the Walford direction due to the traffic problems with the road into Ross, why has the council not gone back to Hereford to request a reduction in the number of houses it has to develop?	Herefordshire Council set its housing target for Walford in its Core Strategy (which is the key document for development planning). It set the target at 91 houses for Walford Parish, so it is not true that they want no more houses here. Ross-on-Wye is bound by the same Core Strategy and so cannot decide development in Walford Parish. It is understood that there is likely to be sufficient capacity along the B4234 through the Parish to accommodate the level of development we have to meet. However, this, together with any impact on the wider network will need to be confirmed by Herefordshire Council, as Local Highway Authority, when it is formally consulted upon the draft plan at the Regulation 14 stage. Should this indicate that the B4234 is not able to accommodate the development required, then this will restrict development within the whole plan area and used to agree a lower level of housing growth within the NDP.	
218	4/28/21	Questionnaire	Can the Natural England's recently published maps on Magic Map please be used as these show the ancient woodlands priority habitats under 2 hectares that are not otherwise included in inventories? These ancient woods date back to the sixteenth century and are an important habitat for wildlife and flora. Why not let this be seen?	Ancient Woodlands and Priority Habitats on Magic Maps are not quite the same thing. Under planning law we must protect ancient woodlands but there is no requirement to offer the same protection for all Priority Habitats. All ancient woodlands on Magic Maps have been included in our mapping. We have however taken account of nature conservation sites including SACs, SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves, local wildlife sites, local geological sites, Wildlife Trust reserves in the site assessments.	
219	5/1/21	Comment	Can we see these "Good References"?	<p>The Chair of Goodrich NDP group confirmed their view that Bill Bloxsome had been helpful in moving things along, not least with HCC and had definitely not contributed to delays. Indeed, his contribution seems to have been particularly important for preparing and expediting the pre and post Article 14 submissions.</p> <p>The Chair of Whitchurch NDP group was full of praise for Data Orchard and, regarding Bill Bloxsome, and mentioned how useful Bill had been at resolving potential hold-ups and delays. Virtually all the delays they experienced had come from HCC and Bill's experience there had apparently helped considerably in resolving issues quickly and straightforwardly.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 26

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
220	5/1/21	email	<p>Thank you for your reply.</p> <p>I would first like to comment on the indignant remarks voiced publicly at the Zoom meeting on 28 April - which were clearly aimed at my reference to there having been some intention to mislead me by a member of the Committee when responding to a question I raised. It needs to be noted that I tried no less than six times to seek an explanation of the misleading nature of the response I received, yet the only replies I had were explanations of issues I was not questioning - and now expressions of indignation. All that has been missing is an explanation of the seemingly misleading justification cited by the Committee member in question, which appears to render the indignation a little premature.</p> <p>I'm not sure who is supplying the NDP Committee's responses, but from the series of replies I've received, together with something that was mentioned at the Zoom meeting I've referred to, it would seem that there is no real provision for follow-up questions, as the questions raised are handled randomly by whoever picks them up - and there is difficulty in linking the questions back to the earlier communications that they stem from. Had I been aware of this, I would have downloaded the relevant email exchanges and attached them for reference to a new email, so that whoever read it could see exactly what I was talking about.</p> <p>I have no wish to seem abrasive towards those on the Committee and am aware that its members are undertaking a lot of work, in return for what must seem like a stream of undeserved rancour from sceptical members of the community; on the other hand, there are many community members who feel there is much at stake as regards their existing environment.</p> <p>If you could let me have a particular email recipient reference, I shall be happy to forward the relevant email exchanges under cover of a new email, so that you are able to understand exactly what has been said and form an opinion.</p>	<p>Correspondence is handled by the Correspondence Working Group consisting of members of the NDP Committee and replies are agreed by all members before being sent.</p> <p>Some enquiries are straight forward and some are not so clear. Apologies if we have not yet understood your enquiry. Please tell us exactly what you are citing from the</p>	
221	5/6/21	Comment	<p>I have read the comments on the questionnaire and it is obvious that almost everyone objects to houses being built close to where they live (me included). However, I find it frustrating that those who live away from the B4234 object to one of two houses in their vicinities, but seem to think it is alright for large quantities to be built in the northern and central clusters. They state these are near to facilities such as buses, footpaths, sewers. Well, the buses are too infrequent for anyone to use them, most sail past with no or hardly any passengers. It is cloud cuckoo land to suppose that new residents will use them to go shopping, to work etc. The footpaths are overgrown with vegetation and walkers are bombarded with traffic, including container lorries whizzing past them. Cyclists also take their lives in their hands along this busy road. New residents will simply use their cars as everyone else does. That they won't is just wishful thinking. Planners don't deal with reality. With regard to mains drainage, would this be able to cope with any extra houses along with the many being built in Ross?</p> <p>As for Coughton and the settlement near to the primary school, if all four proposed sites are approved (11r, 21, 6r and 7r) this would amount to at least 106 houses when at present, according to the draft report, there are 160 houses in these two clusters. This is totally unacceptable and would ruin the countryside in these areas. We value our open spaces just as much as those in the hills do.</p> <p>There is also the flood risk to properties in these areas, which is just as important a reason not to rip up the countryside.</p> <p>Finally, residents of these areas are fully justified in objecting to such a nightmare scenario whereas those threatened with only very small numbers are not.</p> <p>It isn't people we object to, but the desecration of our surroundings</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p> <p>With regard to your question in relation to mains drainage, Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water is a statutory consultee on the NDP and will advise upon the ability of the mains sewer and wastewater treatment works to accommodate development. Reinforcement works to the latter have just been completed.</p>	
222	5/4/21	email	<p>Thanks so much for considering our site.</p> <p>I appreciate all the hard work you have put into this project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	
223	5/9/21	Comment	<p>In response to news post: "Addendum 2 to "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report" Published"</p> <p>I still do not understand given the documentation I have recently seen that states a further 31 houses are required why a development of 40 houses is ranked as number 1? Residents are not opposed to further housing however have repeatedly made their views clear that small developments, over multiple sights are the preferred option.</p>	<p>The remaining target is 51 not 31.</p> <p>Indeed the preference is for small and medium sized sites and this will be put to the council for their decision making.</p>	
224	5/9/21	Comment	<p>In response to news post: "Addendum 2 to "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report" Published"</p> <p>I agree with this assessment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	
225	5/10/21	email	<p>Can you conform the date, time and location for the next NDP Committee Meeting please? I can see nothing in the website calendar, nor the notices. Also, when will the minutes from the April 2021 meeting be available?</p>	<p>The date for the next NDP committee meeting has yet to be set. This is likely to be following the annual Parish Council meeting when membership of all committees is decided upon. The issuing of the minutes is the responsibility of the clerk.</p>	
226	5/11/21	email	<p>Further to your email received yesterday, please refer to the attached four emails in the following sequence, in conjunction with my respective narratives set out below: Mine dated 20 March 2021; Yours dated 29 March 2021; Mine dated 30 March 2021; Yours dated 6 April 2021.</p> <p>This issue dates back to 20 March 2021 and relates to the first numbered paragraphs in a series of exchanges between myself and the Walford NDP Committee. Please refer first to paragraph 1 of my email to yourselves dated 20 March 2021, then to paragraph 1 of the three succeeding emails.</p> <p>My email to you dated 20 March</p> <p>At the time of writing this, I had been in correspondence with yourselves seeking an explanation as to why the particular Coughton area concerned (the area potentially earmarked for substantial development) had been subjectively referred to by the Committee as a "built-up area", when in its present state it was well spaced out and no more than semi-rural. My question had been ignored more than once and I was now re-stating it for the third or fourth time.</p> <p>Your email to me dated 29 March</p> <p>Yet again paragraph 1 side-steps the issue of your subjective "built-up area" reference, but switches to a single-sentence justification for developing the particular area at Coughton: "Herefordshire's Core Strategy RA2 classes Walford (Coughton) as the settlement which will be the main focus of proportionate development."</p> <p>Quite clearly, this brief response was intended to clinch the matter decisively in your favour, as it gave every appearance of citing Coughton, specifically as the intended area of focus.</p> <p>I duly checked the respective reference within Herefordshire Council's Core Strategy and was able to confirm the wording given by your respondent, but I remained puzzled as to why Herefordshire Council should have specified such a small area. As it happened, my wife had read through the whole of the Draft Walford NDP and had come across a quite different interpretation of the term "Walford (Coughton)" somewhere within the text. On looking through the draft NDP myself, I soon found the reference at paragraph 1.4 on page 4 of the 59-page document - and I quote:</p> <p>"The Core Strategy identifies three settlements within the Parish. These are indicated as Walford (Coughton), Bishopswood and Howle Hill. It is understood that the reference to Coughton is to distinguish Walford to the south of Ross on Wye from another settlement named Walford in the north of the County.....For the purposes of clarity, this NDP refers to the settlement as Walford and Coughton, reflecting descriptions used to define the settlement by Herefordshire Council's planning officers."</p> <p>My email to you dated 30 March</p> <p>It seemed abundantly clear from the above that your respondent could not have been unaware of the true meaning of Walford (Coughton) and was using the term to mislead me and to clinch the issue in his favour. Had the Core Strategy used the term "Walford (Nr Ross on Wye)", can it be believed that he/she would have quoted that reference to me? No, of course not. For one thing, we both knew which Walford we were talking about; for another, it would obviously not have been a rational reply to me, as it would not have justified the specific area of potential development I was referring to. There could therefore be little doubt that your respondent used the term "Walford (Coughton)" on the reasonable assumption that I would have been unaware of its actual intended meaning. Had it been assumed that I did know the intended meaning, then your respondent's reply would have been incoherent.</p> <p>If the writer of your email dated 29 March had wanted to clarify what Walford (Coughton) meant, it would have only been necessary to explain the term by reference to the clarification given at paragraph 1.4 of your draft NDP. Evidently, that was not his/her intention.</p> <p>Your email dated 6 April</p> <p>It can be seen from this reply that it is apparently written by a different member of the NDP Committee and that the writer is under the misapprehension that it was not I who had actually cleared up the question of what "Walford (Coughton)" meant, but yourselves.</p> <p>Subsequent emails received from your Committee were equally detached from the realities of the matter.</p> <p>With regard to your reply to my question regarding Bill Bloxsome's references, and I quote, "The Chair of Goodrich NDP group confirmed their view that Bill Bloxsome had been helpful in moving things along, not least with HCC and had definitely not contributed to delays. Indeed, his contribution seems to have been particularly important for preparing and expediting the pre and post Article 14 submissions.</p> <p>The Chair of Whitchurch NDP group was full of praise for Data Orchard and, regarding Bill Bloxsome, and mentioned how useful Bill had been at resolving potential hold-ups and delays.</p> <p>Virtually all the delays they experienced had come from HCC and Bill's experience there had apparently helped considerably in resolving issues quickly and straightforwardly."</p> <p>This is NOT what I asked, I and other parishioners want to see his references and to be assured that he is not passing on information of any sort regarding the village or villagers to Data Orchard</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It appears that the definition and meaning of Walford (Coughton) is clear to you, as it was indeed a matter that confused us for quite a while too. The committee is keen to ensure that matters of content are understood and we are glad that you feel the subject has been clarified.</p> <p>Regarding the term "built-up area", we have taken the Core Strategy's reference to 'main built-up area' to be the grouping or clusters of dwellings in a characteristic form for the particular settlement. We are adding this definition to the glossary of terms on the website.</p> <p>This question and answer forum is for parishioners to gain an understanding of the NDP process and documents, and how having an NDP can benefit the Parish along with expressing their views on any part thereof and any possible outcomes. It is not the place of this committee to engage in debate over who said what and how.</p>	
227	5/15/21	Comment	<p>With regard to your reply to my question regarding Bill Bloxsome's references, and I quote, "The Chair of Goodrich NDP group confirmed their view that Bill Bloxsome had been helpful in moving things along, not least with HCC and had definitely not contributed to delays. Indeed, his contribution seems to have been particularly important for preparing and expediting the pre and post Article 14 submissions.</p> <p>The Chair of Whitchurch NDP group was full of praise for Data Orchard and, regarding Bill Bloxsome, and mentioned how useful Bill had been at resolving potential hold-ups and delays.</p> <p>Virtually all the delays they experienced had come from HCC and Bill's experience there had apparently helped considerably in resolving issues quickly and straightforwardly."</p> <p>This is NOT what I asked, I and other parishioners want to see his references and to be assured that he is not passing on information of any sort regarding the village or villagers to Data Orchard</p>	<p>The contract between Walford Parish Council and the Consultant contains a robust confidentiality clause that prevents any disclosure of data other than for the purposes of execution of the assignment.</p>	
228	5/16/21	Comment	<p>I live in a house off of a bridal path along Leys Hill. Each house has the same postcodes all seem to send delivery drivers and Wye Valley Spa users to my house. Over time bad driving has caused cumulative damage to my property as turning is difficult. How will you make sure this problem is not added too.</p>	<p>If the NDP proposes houses in that location then HC will advise on the capacity of the highways network to accommodate such development when consulted upon the plan.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 27

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
230	5/23/21	email	Are you as yet able to advise the updated figure of new housing approvals still required as at 31 March 2021, please? The latest figure publicised was 51 as at 30 September 2020.	We have contacted Herefordshire Council and they have confirmed that updated housing figures should be known in "the summer" and once they have been confirmed the parish council will be informed.	
231	5/26/21	email	We have noticed that there is a meeting of the NDP committee on Friday 28th May which appears to have been called at very short notice yet there has been no notification of this to parishioners, other than posted on the NDP website. Furthermore you will be aware this is a bank holiday weekend and school half-term when many parishioners will have made arrangements to go away/meet with family and friends, especially at it is the first bank holiday for many months that we have been able to do so fully. Additionally, there does not appear to be any arrangements to join this meeting online. Could you please therefore explain the urgency for this meeting? It does feel that the meeting has been arranged so as to discourage the public from attending and regrettably further embeds the perception of lack of openness, transparency and trust within the NDP committee and Parish Council. We regret we feel the need to write this on behalf of a number of parishioners.	I am sorry and saddened that you feel this way. The meeting was posted on the WPC and NDP websites on Monday, along with notices on notice boards at Bulls Hill, Walford Village Hall and Walford Primary School. This is more than the required 3 clear days notice. The items to be discussed are clearly outlined on the agenda and I am not permitted to discuss any of these topics prior to the meeting. There are no arrangements to join online because from 7 May this is no longer permitted for parish council or committee meetings. The meeting will be held at Walford Village Hall and I sincerely hope that some if not all of you will be able to attend.	
232	5/26/21	email	Thank you for your prompt response. Appreciate the meeting complies with the 3 days notice. We are saddened too as our point is that it's a Friday evening of a Bank Holiday when many won't be able to attend in person and it would be good to know why it's so urgent. Is it also the case that progress made in communication by posting meetings on Facebook and sending emails to those subscribed to the NDP is no longer applicable either and we need to rely on notice boards? We too hope that a number of Parishioners will be able to attend.	The method of posting notices has not changed. FaceBook and the NDP newsletters have included notices of live consultations and new information posted on the NDP website, but Committee meetings only appear in the website calendars. They have never been posted on Facebook or newsletters other than a link to the calendar in the WPC newsletter. The newsletter is published automatically on Saturdays, but can take two days to deliver to subscribers. This meeting is overdue and we need all 3 councillors present to be quorate. We wanted to avoid next week as it is half term and 28 May was the date which everyone could make. I'm sorry if this is inconvenient to any of you. The purpose of this meeting is to inform the public of developments, not to discourage public involvement. We were going to call a meeting on 12 May, but because of the change in legislation from being able to hold online meetings from 7 May it was put on hold pending more information on how meetings are to be conducted. It was some time before, how physical meetings could be held between 7 May and 21 June while still complying with COVID rules, was fully understood. I think you were all present at our first physical council meeting last week so you can appreciate the difficulties. We were very lucky that the rain held off but it was still very cold even inside the room.	
233	5/27/21	email	Please accept my apologies for jumping in on your reply to Patricia, but given the on line attendance and engagement at previous meetings, I do find the publishing of the notice of the meeting on notice boards somewhat at odds with the recent meeting precedents. Can you clarify what the procedure is should more than 6 residents attend the meeting on Friday and want to ask questions.	Until 21 June if more than 6 members of the public attend then we can supply seating outside as we did last week at the council meeting. We will adopt the same format and anyone wishing to speak can come to the door and do so. Public participation is normally limited to 15 minutes with a max of 3 minutes for each person. Being a regular attendee you will have noticed that I have often lengthened this and adopted a more flexible approach to suit the audience on the day and ensure everyone has an opportunity to air their thoughts, even allowing people to speak more than once.	
235	5/27/21	email	Proposed changes to site 11R still leaves the backdoor open for development of site 21. I believe that this size of development is not wanted by the vast majority of Parishioners in Walford/Coughton. This would leave Parishioners to conclude that the urgency of the NDP to make 11R happen there must be some form of incentive, be it monetary or other. I shall be contacting Herefordshire County Council at the highest level to express my concerns over this matter as it appears that the owner of site 21 is related to certain Parish Councillors and I cannot see how the Parish Council can reach an unbiased result in this matter. Also I have not been informed as to the connection between Mr.W.Bloxsome and Data Orchard???????	Your comments are noted. The contract between Walford Parish Council and the Consultant contains a robust confidentiality clause that prevents any disclosure of data other than for the purposes of execution of the assignment.	
236	5/28/21	email	I have noticed that there is a meeting of the NDP committee on Friday 28th May which appears to have been called at very short notice yet there has been no direct notification of this to those parishioners who have invested time in engaging in the development of the NDP, other than posted on the NDP website. I have checked an my email address is registered with your update service. Was this used to notify of the meeting? Being a bank holiday weekend we have planned to meet with family, like I suspect many other parishioners. I do not fully understand the current government guidelines regarding meeting places but suspect there may be issues if a significant number of parishioners were to attend. What are the arrangements for ensuring our safety? The use of online systems such as Zoom worked well previously. There does not appear to be any arrangements to join this meeting online. This is effectively excluding people. If the 'Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan is committed to ensuring digital accessibility' should an online attendance be made available? It does appear that this meeting has been arranged in haste and without due consideration for the involvement of parishioners which could lead to the perception of lack of openness, transparency and trust within the NDP committee and Parish Council. Could you please also explain the urgency for this meeting?	Alas the high court ruled that all meetings of county and parish councils involving voting must be made in person and can no longer be conducted over the internet. This changed on 7th May 2021. This meeting is overdue and we need all 3 councillors present to be quorate. We wanted to avoid the following week as it is half term and 28 May was the date which everyone could make. We are sorry if this caused you any inconvenience. The purpose of this meeting is to inform the public of developments, not to discourage public involvement. We were going to call a meeting on 12 May, but because of the change in legislation from being able to hold online meetings from 7 May it was put on hold pending more information on how meetings are to be conducted. It was some time before, how physical meetings could be held between 7 May and 21 June while still complying with COVID rules, was fully understood. There is hand sanitizer available at the entrance, a track and trace system in operation, seating for the public is arranged to allow for social distancing and face masks should be worn. Should there be more than 6 members of the public in attendance then seating can be arranged outside and the doors opened to enable all to hear the proceedings. Anyone wishing to speak during the public participation session can come to the door and do so when invited.	
237	5/28/21	email	Following my earlier question as to why no online access has been provided for the meeting tonight I see that a commitment was made in the Q & A Correspondence Log on 17/04/20 which states 'In future the steering group meetings will be open to video attendance for residents using WebEx.' Why has this commitment not been upheld?	Alas the high court ruled that all meetings of county and parish councils involving voting must be made in person and can no longer be conducted over the internet. This changed on 7th May 2021.	
238	5/29/21	email	Can I just ask why we didn't receive an email to say this meeting was taking place? I noticed nothing was put on the facebook page either? It was on the off-chance I noticed it on the NDP website.	The method of posting notices has not changed. FaceBook and the NDP newsletters have included notices of live consultations and new information posted on the NDP website, but Committee meetings only appear in the website calendars. They have never been posted on Facebook or newsletters other than a link to the calendar in the WPC newsletter. The newsletter is published automatically on Saturdays, but can take two days to deliver to subscribers.	
239	5/29/21	email	Apologies, I've just noticed these are the minutes for the April meeting. My question is in reference to the meeting held at the village hall last night		
240	5/29/21	email	I am somewhat baffled by your comment on public participation. They in no stretch of the imagination cover or even relate to the questions brought up by the public. Please re do them with an accurate representation of the views expressed. I look forward to reading the correct ones.	Can you please clarify to what you are referring?	
241	6/1/21	email	Following on from our notification to the NDP in March 2020, I can confirm that our Agent (name redacted) has today submitted our Full Planning Application to Herefordshire Council for development of part of (house name redacted) It has been quite a journey since September 2019, regularly consulting with Herefordshire Council during the Pre-App stage since December 2019 until recently, but with the guidance of (name redacted) and the many other specialist consultants engaged during our project, we believe that we have arrived at an excellent scheme for future development. Alongside working with Herefordshire Council, the consultants were very aware of the assessment that the Walford NDP undertook when assessing the site and have developed a scheme that has addressed the key concerns that were raised by them. What has been a key part of this journey, is seeking the advice of the independent Landscape Consultants, (name redacted) and the Architects (name redacted), who have been instrumental in proposing a scheme that in their opinions, is optimal for the site. Please see attached a proposed site layout incorporating our proposal for 3 houses, as suggested by the NDP report, instead of the 4 houses that were initially under consideration. In the usual way, many other associated reports will be available for your review on the Herefordshire Council website portal for	Thank you for keeping us informed of your decision and progress.	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
242	6/1/21	email	Please advise the date of the June NDP Committee Meeting.	There is no June meeting yet set for the NDP committee. Notification will be via the website and public noticeboards. The topic of the NDP will be on the full council meeting agenda for 23 June 2021	
243	6/1/21	email	Now that the p3 initiative has finished and Walford parish council do not get funds to upkeep PROW who now is responsible for their upkeep and maintenance.	This is not a matter for the NDP project. Please address it to the parish clerk.	
244	6/3/21	email	With regard to your reply ~ "Your comments are noted. The contract between Walford Parish Council and the Consultant contains a robust confidentiality clause that prevents any disclosure of data other than for the purposes of execution of the assignment." I take it then that he is connected with 'Data Orchard' and will be passing on information to them regarding the Parishioners and Walford/Coughton given the closing line of your reply "data other than for the purposes of execution of the assignment." I regard your reply as being 'economical with the truth' and would suggest that there is a link between the afore mentioned parties and that data is being passed over, unless you specifically deny this for the Parishioners to rest assured.	Please rest assured, this is not the case.	
245	6/9/21	email	SECOND REQUEST ~ Will you please furnish me with contact details of the DISTRICT AUDITOR as I wish to make a complaint regarding the Walford NDP councillors handling of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Complaint forms are available from the resources box on the Council's Standards and Ethics web page: http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/council_gov_democracy/36346.asp Forms can also be obtained directly from the Monitoring Officer (Head of Governance), Brockington, 35 Halod Road, Hereford HR1 1SH, or by contacting our offices on 01432 261829. This complaints process can only deal with complaints about the behaviour of a member. It will not deal with complaints about matters that are not covered by the members' Code of Conduct. Dave Berry Clerk to Walford Parish Council	
248	6/13/21	email	I have read the comments reference the change in the way the meetings have to be held. I have to agree that it was very short notice to be given for something so important, even if this fell into the 3 day notice period you are obliged to give. Is there any directive that prevents the council and NDP committee meetings being filmed as well as being held in person? This could subsequently be put on-line for those members of the public who are unable to attend? A maximum of 6 members of public being allowed in is too small a proportion of our parish to be a very democratic way of having access to these events. A further thought would be to invest in a large notice board or banners advertising the next date, which could be placed in the village hall grounds that are visible as people drive through the village. This would at least be more easily accessed for more people than the populated noticeboards around the various remote localities. Many people work and/or do not have the ability or time to mobilise to these outposts of information. Particularly with such very short notice. I know many people locally who are not even aware that there is a NDP being drawn up. I knew Ross on Wye was doing one because it is frequently posted in the press and on social media sites. Perhaps something to consider as there seems to be a trend in some of the comments from the public. This was always going to be a massive undertaking for a sprawling village without a central meeting place, and I appreciate the work the committee has to undertake to complete the plan. Many thanks for your time.	Thank you for your comments. At the last full council meeting it was resolved to revert the NDP Committee to a NDP Steering Group. This affords us much more flexibility in notifying the public of meeting dates. While we were a committee we were reliant on the Clerk issuing the Agenda and Meeting Notice which was done giving the regulated 3 full working days notice. The Steering Group will endeavour to give as much notice as possible, and aim for a minimum of one week. It was also agreed at the same meeting that the next steps in the process will be that councillors will receive a presentation on the NDP at the meeting scheduled for 21 July. This presentation will then go live for all parishioners to view. Following this there will be a Council Meeting dedicated for councillors to ask questions relating to the NDP. The date for this has yet to be fixed. Please note that these are meetings which will be posted by WPC not the NDP Steering Group. At present the Steering Group has completed all of the assigned work and is now awaiting the Q&A session of the council before any further work is required, therefore there is no set date for a Steering Group meeting. We are all hopeful that by the time it is necessary to hold another meeting the rule of 6 will no longer apply and so the problems we have faced through this pandemic will be firmly behind us. Prior to the NDP public consultations earlier this year a newsletter with the NDP featuring on its front page was delivered to every household in the parish. Of course we cannot know how many actually read the newsletters.	
249	7/7/21	email	When are you going to answer my question on sustainability. <i>Email on 15th March:</i> <i>There are 137 parish councils in Herefordshire. If every parish council has to build 30 houses this equates to 4110 houses If 2 people live in these houses 8220 people will be coming to Herefordshire. The core strategy says that all developments must be sustainable. I fail to see how 8220 people is sustainable as there are no jobs a hospital that is too small for the current population and a transport policy that is non-existent once off the main roads. Herefordshire is a commuter county and this goes against Herefordshire's climate emergency policy. I feel that Herefordshire is trying to build its way out of the deficit it has. Have contacted Herefordshire council about council tax but no reply as it seems that Herefordshire council is a secret society and only them with a vested interest get answers.</i>	Your email of 15 March was replied to on 19 March, where we mistook your email to be comments rather than a question and thanked you for them and noted them in the correspondence log at No. 152. We understand that the issue of whether the rural housing strategy upon which we must plan is sustainable was considered by the Planning Inspector at the Public Examination of the Core Strategy. There is a Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Plan on Herefordshire Council's website that looks at all relevant aspects of that plan including housing, employment, transport and other facilities. The Planning Inspector sought amendments to the Core Strategy which resulted in the minimum target housing figure of 5,300 dwellings to be located in the County's rural area. This having been set and apportioned by the Core Strategy, we are obliged to make provision for at least the proportional housing growth target (91 dwellings between 2011 and 2031) in any NDP we wish to prepare. The Core Strategy includes policies to promote employment, services and transport.	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action												
250	7/9/21	email	<p>It is understood that the Parish has been required by the Herefordshire Council Core Strategy to provide 91 additional dwellings during the twenty-year period from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2031 and that, subject to confirmation, some 44 of these had been found by 31 March 2021, which was the halfway point - leaving 47 further planning approval still to be found during the ten-year period from 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2031. On the face of things, therefore, it would seem there should be little cause for concern, and that a broad continuation of the prevailing rate of windfall planning approvals should result in there being only a minor augmentation required by the use of sites that would be unlikely to be the subject of windfall applications, even allowing for some reasonable margin of reduction in such windfalls.</p> <p>Appendix 10 to your document, "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment", together with Herefordshire Council's official information on respective planning consents achieved since 31 March 2011, provide the following data on the appropriate historical planning consents in the two decades from 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2011 and from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2021:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>01/04/2001 to 31/03/2011</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>As per Appendix 10</td> <td>44 (including 23 arising from rural building conversions)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>01/04/2011 to 31/03/2021</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>As per HC official figures to 30/09/2020</td> <td>40 (including 12 arising from rural building conversions)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Calculated figure - 6 months to 31/04/2021</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>44</td> </tr> </table> <p>As can be seen, both decades show a total of 44 respective planning consents, despite a virtual halving of the number of those arising from rural building conversions in the second decade, as compared with the first. This reduction in the second decade was compensated for by an additional 11 newbuild consents, indicating that there was certainly no evident decline in the availability of windfall sites and that there was a continuing appetite for individual and small developments.</p> <p>Consequently, there is considerable cause for alarm over what seems a grossly excessive margin for error being recommended in Section 5 of the NDP document I have referred to (paragraph 5.5) - and it is to be noted that the calculations have been based on a nineteen-year period to 31 March 2020, without taking any account of a comparison of figures for the two decades separately. Furthermore, the projected trend that has been assumed has already been substantially demolished by the results for the following year to 31 March 2021 alone.</p> <p>In conclusion, the suggested figure of 17 dwellings as a windfall provision for the 11 years to 31 March 2031 was quite inconsistent with the data available at 31 March 2020, and is even more unrealistic on the basis of the data and situation at 31 March 2021.</p> <p>Residents of the target settlement are not going to thank the NDP Committee, or the Parish Council, for a demonstrably timid assessment of future windfall planning consents that could be perceived as being calculated to over-reassure the assessors, facilitate the Parish Council's resistance to planning consents in other areas, and deposit the additional burden of unnecessary development on a settlement that will have little or no impact on the environment enjoyed by members of the Parish Council and the NDP.</p> <p>Your comments are invited and it would be appreciated if you could advise whether Herefordshire Council has yet notified the official situation as at 31 March 2021.</p>	01/04/2001 to 31/03/2011		As per Appendix 10	44 (including 23 arising from rural building conversions)	01/04/2011 to 31/03/2021		As per HC official figures to 30/09/2020	40 (including 12 arising from rural building conversions)	Calculated figure - 6 months to 31/04/2021	4		44	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted. The housing figures you are relating to are not confirmed. We are still awaiting final figures from Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>As you will be aware, the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment report identifies two components for windfalls. One comprises dwellings in rural areas which must meet a number of exceptional criteria (see Core Strategy policy RA3 and/or NPPF paragraph 79), the most commonly used one being rural building conversions. The other comprises those planning permissions granted on otherwise unallocated housing sites (Core Strategy policy RA2) associated with settlements. Currently all permissions granted within the Parish fit into one or other of those policies. Hence all permissions granted during the Core Strategy plan period are effectively windfall permissions. The approach is developer/landowner led with the local community making representations at the time of any planning application.</p> <p>NDPs can expand upon the approach under Core Strategy policy RA2 by defining sites that fall within or adjacent to the built-up areas of the three settlements and encompassing those within settlement boundaries. Outside of these, policy RA3 would apply. However, if the Parish Council wishes to rely upon windfalls then it can choose Option 4 which was presented in the recent community consultation. This is effectively the continuation of the current approach that Herefordshire Council takes to policy RA2, for which there is no minimum housing requirement. It has been shown that NDP Examiners will not agree to policies that indicate a maximum number of any dwellings but they will agree to the inclusion of sites that should allow for the required level of proportional housing growth.</p> <p>You also need to be aware of NPPF paragraph 14b) which is one of the criteria that gives NDPs its full weight in terms of considerations when dealing with planning permissions for housing, i.e. they should have housing allocations to be given their full weight.</p> <p>One further consideration is that unfortunately Planning Permissions granted don't necessarily equate to dwellings delivered, with some planning permissions granted never materialising. The 91 dwellings referred to are required to be built by 2031. So far only 10 dwellings have been delivered, hence the need for a high degree of certainty to satisfy Hereford Council. In preparing a NDP, the Parish Council must show that it can deliver the number of dwellings required. Not to do so would allow developers/planners to argue that the plan is not delivering as it should, and hence further sites should be permitted.</p>	
01/04/2001 to 31/03/2011																	
As per Appendix 10	44 (including 23 arising from rural building conversions)																
01/04/2011 to 31/03/2021																	
As per HC official figures to 30/09/2020	40 (including 12 arising from rural building conversions)																
Calculated figure - 6 months to 31/04/2021	4																
	44																

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
251	07/14/21	email	<p>The introduction to the Housing Land Assessment 2011-2031, within the above mentioned document, sets out as follows:</p> <p>1.1 The NDP Steering Group worked with its consultant to undertake an assessment of potential housing sites within Walford Parish to determine whether there are sufficient sites to meet Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy requirements and which sites, if any, might be proposed as allocations within the NDP.</p> <p>1.2 The Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 91 dwellings to be built within the Parish over the period 2011 to 2031, representing proportional growth within the Parish of 14%. The majority of these are to be located within, or on the edge of, the built-up area of its named settlements. These are listed in Tables 4.14 and 4.15, with Walford/Coughton listed in the first, and Bishopswood and Howle Hill listed in the second. The difference between settlements listed in the first and second table is that the latter are small settlements where:</p> <p>"proposals will be expected to demonstrate particular attention the form, layout, character and setting of the site and its location in that settlement, and/or they result in development that contributes to, or is essential to, the social well-being of the settlement concerned."</p> <p>(A quote from Policy RA2 within the Core Strategy)</p> <p>The following factors seem relevant to the integrity and impartiality of the NDP and its supporting documents:</p> <p>(a) The members of the NDP who were responsible for preparing the draft plan and its supporting documents all reside at locations that are remote from the major target area - as do all members of the Parish Council, other than one who was recently elected.</p> <p>(b) Most of the medium and large sites that were tendered by their owners for consideration relate to agricultural land which particular members of the Parish Council have a pecuniary interest in.</p> <p>(c) Walford / Coughton contains two settlements, which are separated by a distance of some half a mile or so of the B4234, alongside which they are situated. The settlement to the south has some severe limitations on development, due to a high proportion of land that is in flood risk areas; also, and in common with most other parts of the Parish, other than the northern settlement within Walford / Coughton, there are no mains sewerage facilities. The northern settlement of Walford / Coughton also has some areas of flood risk.</p> <p>(d) The above quote in italics from Policy RA2 within the Core Strategy, emphasising the additional aspects of care which must be exercised in any development proposals relating to small settlements, omits to mention the relevant criteria for permitting development in all settlements outside Hereford and the market towns: viz:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proportionality with the existing settlement. 2. Developments should be of high quality, appropriate to their setting and make a positive contribution to their surrounding environment and its landscape setting; and, 3. Should deliver the size, type and range of housing that reflects local demand. <p>(e) With regard to (d) above, it will be seen in the document "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment Report" that Section 3, para. 3.12 makes reference to Walford / Coughton being the largest settlement in the Parish, adding that it has seven medium-sized "estates", whose densities vary between 16 and 20 per hectare. This gives the quite misleading impression that these so-called "estates" are actually measurable in terms of hectares, and no more specific details are provided. Therefore, anyone unfamiliar with the two settlements that exist in Walford / Coughton might conceive of something quite different to the two quite separate semi-rural areas of ribbon development along stretches of the B4234 - neither of which has any infrastructure, other than a primary school in the northern settlement (which largely serves children who have to travel from outlying areas) and a gastro-pub in the southern settlement. The scene is thus set for an assumption that a few dozen more houses would make little difference.</p> <p>The facts of the matter are that there are two sizeable developments within the northern settlement - one of 41 houses at the far northern boundary, which were built in 1947 to alleviate a post-war shortage, and another that consists of an old hotel building which was converted into 5 apartments, together with 22 houses built within the grounds of the former hotel. Both of these established developments are fairly inconspicuous, as they are largely concealed behind high walls, trees and shrubs. The only other developments in the northern settlement are four closes, etc., accessed from the B4234, consisting of 9, 10, 8 and 11 houses, respectively, all of which presently back on to agricultural fields, as do the larger developments. The southern settlement within Walford consists of some ribbon development of established houses along 200 meters or so of the B4234, plus one relatively more modern development of 16 houses to the far south, accessed from that road.</p> <p>(f) In view of all the above, it would be quite unfair and unreasonable that the northern settlement of Walford / Coughton should bear a share of the required target development figure that is disproportionate to its existing housing count as a ratio of the total for the whole of the Parish. If other settlements are unable, for whatever reasons, to bear their own proportionate share of the total additional housing allocation, then it must be the duty of the Parish Council to represent the extent of the respective limitations to Herefordshire Council and request a reduction that reflects these problems. One may feel sure the members of the PC would be motivated to do so in order to prevent adverse impact on their own environment. The offloading of large portions of further development on the same single settlement, time after time, must inevitably result in it undergoing an adverse change in character and intruding ever further into the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>(g) The NDP Steering Group argues that it is Herefordshire Council which decides on the targeting of development in its core strategy and that it has identified Walford / Coughton as a key target. However, it must seem unlikely that the Core Strategy planners would decide such specifics, regarding settlements outside the main market towns, without some consultation with, or input from, the respective parish councils themselves, whose members have a far more intimate knowledge of their localities. If there is, in fact, no such liaison, then all the more reason why our Parish Council should be making its own spontaneous representations of the limiting factors.</p> <p>(h) What is more, suggestions that the Steering Group has little authority in progressing the draft plan and its supporting documentation, and that the independent consultant effectively makes all significant assessments and decisions, are inconsistent with the narratives within the document I have referred to, the composition of the Steering Group and the very title of the Group.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted.</p> <p>Reference to housing density per hectare is a standard planning practice and in no way indicates the area of any site. As the NDP is a planning document it would seem appropriate to use accepted planning terms.</p> <p>The Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report looked at the issue of densities for our three settlements in order to indicate what would be appropriate in the local context bearing in mind the much higher densities promoted in the Core Strategy (30 to 50 dwellings per hectare). It would be expected that any Examiner of the NDP, or planning officer/inspector in relation to any planning application, will take into account Government's policy on densities set out in the NPPF. This indicates that the issue of densities will be examined robustly to achieve the efficient use of land. Hence, it is important that we support our use of lower densities with sound evidence which is what the report has tried to do.</p>	
252	07/16/21	email	<p>Have read this report and must say it is now out of date and redundant. COVID has happened online shopping has exploded since this report was written there are far too many maybes and perhaps to make this document viable. There is no mention of doctor's hospitals or schools or is this just lumped in with infrastructure. Also, the type of employment this report mentions are low paid and no way will they be buying a house. The whole idea of this document is that it should not adversely affect what we have now but this is going to destroy our county and for what. What about all the seasonal workers that do not appear anywhere in the report as at the time we were still in the EU. Surely, they deserved a mention as they are or were a drain on our resources. Affordable housing earned a large section of the report but no affordable houses have ever been built in Walford or are you going to change that.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the "Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Plan" which are noted. It is understood that the Planning Inspector that considered the Appraisal concluded that it was adequate for its purposes in informing the Core Strategy for the period up to 2031 and carried out in accordance with the Regulations including consultation with relevant organisations. It is not within the remit of the NDP Steering Group to review any outcomes within the Appraisal or the matters covered. Regulations require that a NDP must comply with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Decisions on what housing options are to be included within the NDP will be made by Walford Parish Council. Some options include sites over 10 houses which would require a proportion of affordable housing. Any site of more than 10 houses is expected to provide 40% affordable houses (Core Strategy policy H1). Affordable housing is referenced in sections 3.11 and 7.2 of the NDP. During public opinion surveys and questionnaires there has been limited interest expressed in affordable housing.</p>	

210816_NDP Correspondence Log.xlsx, Page 31

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
253	07/16/21	email	<p>Thank you for your responses to my email sent to you on 9 July 2021.</p> <p>I understand what you say as regards the sources of windfall planning consents and the fact that all the planning consents that count towards the target figure since 1 April 2011 have been from windfall. Also, we seem to be in agreement on the following:</p> <p>(a) Subject to confirmation of the HC figures of relevant planning consents in the year to 31 March 2021, the situation is that there have been 44 planning consents in each of the two decades to 31 March 2011 and to 31 March 2021, respectively, including 23 rural conversions in the first decade and 12 in the second. As I have pointed out - and you have not contradicted or commented on - the latter decade shows no falling off in the total of windfalls, despite there having been 11 less building conversions - this having been compensated for by a corresponding upsurge of 11 more newbuild windfalls than in the first decade.</p> <p>(b) The achieved figure of planning consents shown in the assessment at 31 March 2020 was 37, which was updated to 40 by HC at 30 September 2020, and a calculated figure of 44 at 31 March 2021 - a total of 7 further dwellings consented to in the one year. This followed a proposed windfall allowance after 31 March 2020 of 17 dwellings over the whole of the next 11 years.</p> <p>The quote from NPPF paragraph 70, within the Assessment of Windfall Allowances, states: "Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. An allowance should be realistic, having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends" There is nothing in that which suggests the figures for the latest two decades, which remained consistent, should be reduced by a factor of 60% or more to err on the side of caution - and if there were to be such a derisory allowance made, then there could be little point in residents agreeing to any NDP.</p> <p>However, you have now said, ".....if the Parish council wishes to rely on windfalls, then it can choose Option 4, which was presented in the recent community consultation."</p> <p>Presumably, you are referring to the scenario where it is intended to rely entirely on windfalls. Option 4 is defined as: "Not to include any housing land allocations, but rely on a policy to define how new dwellings will be accommodated. This might utilise specifically related policies for settlements in Walford Parish or, if not possible, Core Strategy RAZ." But who would determine such a policy?</p> <p>I'm afraid the more one looks at the situation, the less it seems there can be any incentive for the residents of Walford / Coughton to agree to any NDP. To have no NDP and leave matters to Herefordshire Council might well mean an ultimate need for a medium-sized development somewhere to augment windfalls, if and when that seemed necessary, but at least there would be less likelihood of the need for such a drastic safety margin in estimating windfalls. Against that, agreeing to an NDP would make the prospect of promissory notes being immediately issued to landowners a virtual certainty, with the added burden of a generous upward adjustment as a margin for error (as well as, most likely, the earmarking of yet more sites, within and adjacent to the settlement, for development well into the future beyond 2031).</p> <p>The composition of the Parish Council comprises partly individuals whose pecuniary interests as a whole relate to most of the major agricultural sites submitted for consideration, and almost exclusively parties who reside in locations remote from the main target area, in respect of whose environments there has been considerable resistance to development proposals. The interests of parish councillors and Walford / Coughton residents therefore conflict and it may be deduced that there would be much potential scope within such parish councils for lateral reciprocity as regards planning issues. In the circumstances, there is little probability that Herefordshire Council would be any less rigorous in promoting the interests of the environment generally. Nor might Herefordshire Council be less likely to take account of public opinion than objections raised by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Finally, it was advised at the latest Parish Council meeting that the updating of the planning consent figures by Herefordshire Council was indicated to be imminent. Has there been anything whatsoever advised since then?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted.</p> <p>It is not within the remit of the Steering Group to interpret any of the evidence. We are here purely to assist the parish council in collating the evidence and preparing the plan. It is for WPC to determine what should go into the plan and then for HC and the Independent Examiner to determine if the contents are acceptable. And finally for parishioners to decide whether to adopt the plan through referendum.</p> <p>If you have any questions about the NDP we can respond with factual information but it would not be appropriate to debate any planning policies or express any personal views.</p>	
254	07/17/21	email	<p>5300 houses to be built 137 parish councils. This equates to 38 houses per parish council. Why has Walford got to provide nearly 3 times this figure.</p>	<p>The parish of Walford is one of the largest in Herefordshire, and is subject to exactly the same proportional increase, 14%, as the other rural parishes in the Ross area to achieve the overall rural allocation figure of 5,300 houses as shown in policy RA1 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>More details can be found in FAQs P1 & H6.</p>	
255	07/24/21	email	<p>I refer to your email dated 20 July 2021 in response to mine of 14 July, both of which are attached.</p> <p>My email to you set out in detail eight points, (a) - (h), which demonstrated the diametrically opposed interests of parish councillors (and members of the NDP Steering Group) in relation to those of the residents of Walford / Coughton - as well as focussing attention on a number of instances where the NDP report documents play up the suitability of Walford / Coughton for further development and the impracticalities of development elsewhere.</p> <p>You have responded to a part of just one of the points I raised and, as for the rest, your reply was simply to thank me for my comments, which were noted. As these exchanges are to be circulated to Walford / Coughton residents, and yours appear to suggest a rather taunting arrogance and unconcern, could you please let me know whether you have anything further to add in response to the points I raised.</p> <p>At the Parish Council meeting on Wednesday, 21 July, I was advised that there was still no update from Herefordshire Council as regards relevant planning consents given as at 31 March 2021 - despite there having been a report some four weeks earlier that such an update was imminent. Also, on July 19 the Clerk to the Parish Council sent out an email to certain people, including myself, attaching a message from Judy Perks of Herefordshire Council that included a note from Samantha Banks, dated 16 July 2021; this advised that proportional growth figures at April 2021 were now available from the Neighbourhood Planning team and would be placed on the website shortly "to assist parishes in meeting the requirements of Policy RAZ of the Herefordshire Core Policy".</p> <p>After leaving the PC meeting on 21 July, I got into conversation with a gentleman whom I understood to be a member of the NDP Steering Group, in company with another member of the public. He (the NDPSG member) explained a number of factors relating to housing development allocations and planning consents, which both of us members of the public found very interesting. This gave some fresh insights into the development demands being made of the Parish, adverse factors influencing constructions achieved and inconsistencies as regards local needs, etc. - with which one could readily empathise. Nonetheless, there still remains the rather indifferent attitude of parish councillors, certain of whom stand to gain very substantially from development in Walford / Coughton, whilst most of the others stand to benefit from the dumping of the problem in one area that is remote from their own respective environments.</p> <p>As it is the function of a parish council to address the concerns and interests of all parishioners, and not just those of the councillors themselves, the major alternative might be to make firm representations to Herefordshire Council, emphasising that Walford / Coughton is part of a major river valley, most of which is an AONB, increasingly prone to flash flooding, lacking infrastructure, lacking in employment, lacking local housing demand, entirely dependant upon Ross for local shops and other services, lacking railway communications, and with bus facilities that are almost irrelevant in practical terms. If Herefordshire Council were to remain implacable, there is the further option of referring the matter to the Housing Minister for rational intercession - or, ultimately, agreement of a more equitable sharing of the burden throughout the Parish, as there seems to be no shortage of smaller sites on offer elsewhere, outside the flood risk zones.</p>	<p>The NDP Correspondence WG conducts its task with humility, care and diligence and in no way taunts or lacks concern. We believe the draft NDP and supporting reports to be a fair and balanced reflection of the information gathered over the life of the project to date. Where possible we attempt to answer any questions put to us, where comments are made we record the information as evidence for councillors to consider.</p> <p>We can only respond to technical matters that fall within the remit of the NDP process and the majority of your recent queries go far beyond that as they appear to question Local and Central Government policy. The NDP SG has no remit to comment on policy issues and such matters would, perhaps, be better directed towards Herefordshire Council or your local Member of Parliament.</p> <p>The document you refer to in para 4 was concerning the performance of Herefordshire as a whole and it also stated "These will be made available from the Neighbourhood Planning team and will be placed on the website shortly." Details on individual Parishes had not been released at that time.</p> <p>It is entirely legal and above board for councillors to own and offer land to the NDP, as well as to gain from it, as long as they continue to follow the rules and regulations that apply.</p> <p>It is totally unfair to make accusations that councillors have a "rather indifferent attitude" and "most of the others stand to benefit from the dumping of the problem in one area that is remote from their own respective environments." when councillors have yet to study the evidence and hold a debate before deciding upon which, if any, sites will be included in the NDP!</p>	
256	07/21/21	Comment	<p>Could you kindly advise. Why is Church Road, Howle Hill still being classified as the centre of the settlement. Clearly it is not. It may have been historically. I note there was a public house, Church and a Sunday School. Over time, and not very recently the settlement has evolved. The "historic premises" previously mentioned are now residences and have been for some considerable time. Church Road is far from the centre of the settlement. A more current idea of the centre surely has to be the crossroads. It has the old bus shelter, which is now used as the settlement notice board inviting people to gather for local updates and displays the Christmas tree. Church Road is a No Through Road, very narrow hedgerow lined lane with no resemblance to days gone by. It is a dead end, leading to open countryside and not the main activity hub on Howle Hill. Surely, NDP and other planning must evolve also. Is there not an opportunity with the NDP to officially change this outdated idea?</p>	<p>Church Road is not defined as the centre of the settlement of Howle Hill in either the NDP draft or in the Meeting Housing Needs Report. Perhaps you could let us know where you have seen this?</p> <p>The built-up areas for Howle Hill have been defined using information included in planning decisions made by Herefordshire Council and the Planning Inspectorate. Extracts from decisions made referring to Church Road and the area at Little Howle Farm are set out in paragraph A3.6 of the Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report (pages 24 and 25).</p>	
257	07/24/21	email	<p>Walford might be one of the largest parishes but due to the topography of the parish most of the land is not suitable to build on. This will mean that the only way to meet our quota is large developments something that parishioners do not want but will have them inflicted on nevertheless.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>	
258	07/24/21	email	<p>As regards your above response: Are you stating, then, that the calculations and suggestions outlined by you, as to adjustments for windfall allowance - as set out in your document "Meeting Housing Need and Site Assessment" - will not be conveyed to the Parish Councillors for their guidance? - or, if your suggested figures were conveyed to them as guidance, you would not expect the WPC to be so guided? If you did not expect your guidance to influence matters, what would be the point in issuing any?</p>	<p>The Meeting Housing Needs and Site Assessment Report is part of the evidence base that the council will of course consider in finalising the NDP draft. The windfall allowance is fully explained in this report so that Councillors can make their own assessment of what they consider appropriate.</p> <p>The NDP Steering Group will not be telling the parish council which housing option to choose.</p>	
259	07/28/21	email	<p>Dear sir, WHY are you and the NDP committees bothering with this ill-conceived plan. Ross has an NDP plan and have exceeded their quota but still planning applications are going in and Hereford planners are passing them. You think you have some say in the planning process but HEREFORD planning officers are not going to give up their powers and so the whole process is an expensive waste of time and money. Yours totally disillusioned (name redacted)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which are noted.</p>	

#	Date	Source	Question or Comment	Response	NDP Action
260	07/31/21	email	<p>Thank you for your reply received yesterday.</p> <p>Your first paragraph speaks of the draft NPD and supporting reports being a fair and balanced reflection of the information gathered, though as I have pointed out, it is demonstrably selective. It neglects to address the requirement for proportionality, as referred to in my original email dated 14 July - points (c), (d) and (e). There are two distinct settlements in Walford / Coughton and the one to the north comprises around 112 residences, if one includes those houses running south along the B4234 from a point opposite the school. Fourteen percent of that is some 16 houses. Yet all of the defined options which you set out seem to provide for that one particular settlement to bear the bulk of all further development necessary to meet the target figure for the whole Parish. You have played down this very relevant social issue, focussing only on the special provisions applicable to small settlements, whilst failing to mention those provisions that apply to all settlements. That is also an important technical matter which must fall within the remit of the NDP provisions - but you did not address it.</p> <p>If there are problems in allocating proportional development in other settlements, due to flood risks, lack of mains sewerage, access, etc., then that is a further technical issue to be addressed and brought to the attention of the Parish Council, with a suggested option of making relevant representations to Herefordshire Council and pointing out the impracticalities. That is the duty of Parish Councils - not simply keeping quiet and piling the whole problem on to one semi-rural settlement in an AONB. If public opinion is not an important factor for the consideration of the Parish Council and there is little interest in observing the requirements of proportionality, quality developments appropriate to their setting and reflecting local demand (which your report seems to ignore), then that is a serious social problem to be tackled.</p> <p>Another serious social problem is that we have a system whereby agricultural land that has been acquired relatively cheaply can be directly converted into development land, at a huge profit, by a process initiated at parish council level - and it is, as you say, perfectly legal for agricultural landowners to gain admission to the very councils which can influence their own fortunes. The respective rules and regulations that you refer to have little practical effect, (redacted) That's what is totally unfair; not the recognition of it!</p>	<p>We note your comments, observations and opinions. Consideration of the social issues to which you refer are beyond the current remit of the Steering Group and would perhaps be better addressed to either the Parish or Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>The NDP process only enables the consultant and Steering Group to report on sites which have been put forward for consideration, their size and location is beyond anyone's control so it is not possible to ensure suitable sites are proportionately spread around the parish. Please note the Steering Group will not be telling the Parish Council which option to enter into the NDP. Walford Parish Council have yet to reach the point of debate / decision making.</p>	
261	08/07/21	Email	<p>The proceedings during Tuesday's Zoom meeting on Tuesday of this week seemed very much a contradiction of any suggestion that the Steering Group is unable to explore possibilities and make recommendations to the Parish Council. Besides, who was it, if not the Steering Group, that decided, or recommended, which sites should go forward for further consideration and which should be excluded? Who negotiated the option of a reduced extent of Site 11R? Just how much could the average, uninformed parish councillor be expected to know about such matters?</p> <p>Also, it should be noted that proportionality of development is an obligatory factor for consideration in respect of all settlements, as laid down in the Core Strategy - not just something that can be side-stepped as an expedient. If there are serious problems with finding usable sites in other settlements, as with the southern Walford settlement, then the obvious solution should be to seek exclusion of those settlements from the figure of existing properties on which the additional allocation for the Parish is based.</p> <p>Finally, could you please advise what impracticality there might be in seeking submission of a strictly reduced area of development at Site 11R, with no further option for extending the development area within the terms of the NDP.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, which are noted.</p> <p>WPC employed an independent consultant to carry out the site submission evaluations and the report on these and associated addendums were written by the consultant. These reports do not recommend any specific sites, they merely qualify all sites in terms of relative suitability against current planning criteria, as required by the NDP process, and tabulates them in order of that suitability.</p> <p>The further reduction of site 11(R) to 11(R1) was put forward by the site owners following the publication of the questionnaire results. There was no contact by the Steering Group or the Consultant pre-empting this submission.</p> <p>To seek a submission of a strictly reduced area of development with no further option for extending the development at any site would be entering into negotiations. This is not within the remit of the Steering Group or the consultant. Whilst an NDP can identify sites where development would be considered to be appropriate it is not possible to explicitly restrict development elsewhere within the Parish. It is broadly possible to define which areas should be considered under Core Strategy Policy RA2 through defining settlement boundaries and these would also indicate (outside of the boundaries) where the exceptional requirements under Core Strategy policy RA3 must be met. This may have the effect of limiting areas for most new housing development. An NDP can indicate the approximate number of dwellings that are considered to be optimum for offered sites but this is only a recommendation which would form part of the planning application decision process. A NDP is unlikely to be able to stipulate a maximum number of dwellings on a site, these could vary greatly in size, for instance more 2 bedroom dwellings than 4/5 bedroom dwellings could be sited within the same area. Local Planning Authorities and MCHLG appointed Inspectors can take a different view on the acceptable size of any development, based on the submitted plans and supporting documentation. Should the NDP settlement boundary for the Coughton area include site 11(R1) but exclude the remainder of what would be site 11(R) then there would be a presumption that the latter would not be developed so long as the NDP remained up to date, it did not comprise a proposal under policy RA3, and there were no other material considerations that indicate development should be permitted.</p>	
262	08/11/21	Website	<p>In response to conversation that can be viewed here: Q & A Correspondence Log Updated – Walford Neighbourhood Development Plan (walford-ndp.co.uk)</p> <p>"Dear (Name redacted), I base my question upon the many recent, and some not so recent planning applications made to Herefordshire Council. They all indicate that Church Lane is being classified the centre of the settlement. Thanks."</p>	<p>The content of any planning application is not a matter for the NDP Steering Group. It is entirely down to applicants and their agents. Members of the public can challenge any part of a planning application by making representation to the nominated Planning Officer. The NDP Steering Group has no role in that part of the planning process and can not comment on any planning application.</p>	
263	08/11/21	Website	<p>"How do I, as a Parishioner, instigate a vote of NO CONFIDENCE in the Walford Parish Councillors with regard to the NDP???"</p>	<p>This is not a question for the NDP Steering Group. We suggest you send your question to the Clerk of the parish council (clerk@walford-pc.org.uk).</p>	