

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

1. Summary

At the March PC meeting it was agreed that a consultation flyer would be distributed to all households to seek the public view on the option of Site A or B as proposed by our consultant. This proposal followed discussion with both landowners and, in one case, the owner's agent.

The consultant produced the flyer offering residents a choice between the two sites or an option to include both in the NDP. Residents were also asked to confirm if they agreed with the proposed Settlement Boundaries around Crow Hill and Upton Crews.

This document summarises the process followed, who was involved and the outcome with a summary of comments extracted from the flyers.

It should be noted that this exercise was to gather information about the preference in the Parish for the two sites proposed. It is appreciated that we did not assign one voting paper per person, but only one per household. Whilst some may feel that this was unfair, it would have been equally unfair to post four flyers through some doors with no control over who was completing them. Also, identifying people on voting papers is not considered acceptable so any method we adopted would be subject to some minor criticism.

Further along the process Parishioners will get other opportunities to express their individual comments and preferences and in the final reckoning, there will be a formal referendum when the NDP Report is presented to Herefordshire Council.

This intermediate stage was simply to allow us to gauge the mood of the parish in relation to the two sites that our Consultant deemed as acceptable under planning rules as detailed in the Call for Sites Report available on the website or on request from the Clerk.

There are several comments about the lack of information but the flyer states that everything is available on the Parish Website and the clerk's email was clearly displayed. While it would have been ideal to hold a public meeting, this was just not possible in the circumstances and I believe the approach taken was the best we could achieve.

2. Process

It was agreed at the PC meeting in March that flyers would be distributed one per household. Whilst this should have been with the Chimes delivery, a slight hold up resulting from a challenge to the NDP document meant that this deadline was missed. The following shows the actual timeline of events.

2nd March – PC agreed to distribute flyers to every household

21st March – Following several email exchanges, it was agreed that the flyer was suitable for distribution

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

22nd March – 280 A5 double sided copies of the flyer were printed by Brian Spencer

24th March – Flyer distribution delayed whilst consultant addressed a concern with the NDP report

26th March – NDP report re-issued. Chimes distribution had already started so alternative arrangements were made to distribute flyers. Andy Parr confirmed the 'post box' would be placed in the Crow Hill telephone kiosk

27th March – Flyers were distributed as follows:

- Phocle Green – Paul Newman and Claire Austin (52)
- Upton Crews – Chloe Rusby – confirmed no spares
- Crow Hill – Hazel and Steven Strange – confirmed no spares
- Tanhouse and Upton Bishop – Jan Stevenson (20)
- All other areas – Alison Feist and Brian Spencer – delivery checked against the Electoral Register

16th April – Voting closed, and the results added to this report

It is believed that every household in the Parish received a flyer and it was confirmed that there were no spares. Parish notices stated that anyone who had not received one could apply to the clerk. Brian Spencer had a few copies left that were destroyed. An email was also sent to everyone on the NDP email list confirming that the delivery had taken place and confirmation was also placed on social media that flyers had been delivered.

3. Returns

To ensure that an acceptable level of verification was in place the returned flyers were collected regularly and held by Andy Parr who extracted the comments. 7 were returned directly to the Clerk by email. Brian Spencer added the comments to this document and the returns were all verified by Claire Austin to give an independent authentication to the process who also numbered and cross-referenced the responses for scrutiny. This document was finally amended to incorporate the comments and cross-references contained in Appendix A.

4. Total Responses

Total number of returns(a) – 105 to post box; 7 by email to Clerk

Total disregarded as incorrectly filled in (b) - 3

Total considered (a) – (b) = 109 (c)

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

Question 1 – Site preference

	No. of responses	% of returns
Site A	28	25
Site B	55	48
Both Sites	26	24
Void	3	3

Question 2 – Crow Hill Settlement Boundary

	No. of responses	% of returns
Support	86	77
Not support	25	22
No vote	1	1

Question 3 – Upton Crews Settlement Boundary

	No. of responses	% of returns
Support	93	82
Not support	16	15
No vote	3	3

5. Free Text Comments

Parishioners were given the chance to make any other comments. These are listed in Appendix A and cross-referenced to the flyers which were numbered on receipt. These have been scanned and are available on request to the Clerk.

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

Appendix A

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

Question 1: Of the following options, which do you prefer? *Please tick one box only*

Site A	28
Site B	55
Both	26
Spoilt	3
Total	112

Comments made by those supporting Site A

001	A. Higher ground, better drainage. A. is on the bus route (B is on a fast road)
002	We need balanced housing in the area so need up market property to be built.
003	Site A is within the village framework. It is on a bus route and has paths to service pedestrians.
004	Site B would cause a problem with drainage as there are already 9 houses being built nearby.
008	Site A has pavement access to the bus stop and other village facilities.
022	Let's hope this is the last of it.
023	Ref P191187 nine houses too many for land drainage and traffic etc.
025	Neither attractive options due to flooding / traffic / drains but A. if had to choose.
026	None would be best. Traffic and drains problems.
028	I definitely prefer Option A. The reasons are that it is on a bus route between Ross and Gloucester, and the houses opposite this site have no direct view but look onto the road and a hedge the other side of it. Whereas those houses opposite and to the side of Option B look across from house and gardens to the pond at Felhampton, Felhampton Farm and beyond to May Hill. Erecting houses on this site would completely destroy this idyllic view.

Comments made by those supporting Site B

029	Site B is centrally placed within the settlement, and does not increase the ribbon development taking place. The presumption should be to increase the central mass of the village near to existing focal points of the Millennium Hall and the Moody Cow.
031	Is site A. a vineyard - it would be very sad to get rid of that.
039	Wherever houses must go please ensure we keep dark skies - Upton Bishop is rural!
043	Site B is in fill and rounds off the village.
049	Too much traffic already on B4221. Less visible, less houses affected.
053	Crow Hill is best for housing in the parish.
056	The housing growth needs to be at the centre of UB.
058	Site A too large and should not be included in NDP.

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

059	It is downright ridiculous you would even consider destroying a successful cherry orchard and business for housing.
060	Why destroy an established cherry orchard business for housing. This is an ecological crime.
064	Why put more houses on the sky line, perhaps more local input!
065	Crow Hill is best for housing growth.
067	Upton Bishop should grow from the centre, not at the edges.
072	The survey says that Parish Council only needs one of these sites to fulfil need for nine houses - so not sure both need to be in NDP.
073	We already have 4 affordable housing developments in the village WHY more? Kempley has 2. Site A - destroying land used successfully for a productive crop employing people all year round. Site A - access to the B4221 would be an added danger where accidents already happen. Site A - My view of the Black Mts would go and light pollution would be annoying (I believe villages do not need street lights)
074	Site A is of concern as it leads to the progressive expansion of the settlement towards Phocle Green. Site B is in effect an 'in-fill' site and is supported. Whilst a matter for planning and highways I stress that Site B will need adequate pedestrian provision (pavement) if it is not to be subject to objection should planning permission be sought.
075	There is required an improved transport system / infrastructure - speed and size of vehicles using the roads is dangerous!!

Comments made by those supporting both sites

078	<p>Both sites A & B are what I would consider to be suitable options for housing developments. However, I do have the following reservations regarding land management and behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sites, indeed the entire village and surrounds, should be subject to vehicle speed enforcements in order to attain safety of residents and promote walking, cycling and riding as sustainable means of transport. • Site A is situated within an intensive orchard with large quantities of plastic crop protection; this creates large amounts of noise as it is exposed to wind that will no doubt cause disturbance, particularly at night, and may therefore require dismantling or a change of crop. • Site B is situated in close proximity to a pond within Felhampton Farm, where wildfowl are lured with bait and shot most weekends throughout the winter, with noise and safety implications for villagers. • Site A is served by a fragmented pavement, Site B has no current pavement, there are no pedestrian crossings and the only provision for cyclists in Upton Bishop are signs at the lower end of Powells Croft prohibiting it.
096	There should have been 1 sheet per adult - not all members of one household agree that is why I have put both sites. I had not realised that Both Sites meant both would be developed. It is not clear I thought it would mean either. How do we know all landowners have been contacted to vote if they do not live in the parish.
101	Both sites because if any other site fails to deliver there is a risk of otherwise inappropriate development.

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

Comments made when no preference for site A or B was indicated or when more than one box was ticked

103	Did not know there were 12 sites. Would have been helpful if all 12 were on map so to make more informed decision. Both sites A & B look very large, were there no smaller sites entered.
104	We don't feel that Upton Bishop has the infrastructure to accommodate more housing.
105	We need starter homes for families.

Void papers

Three papers had void answers for question 1. But their comments for all three questions and votes for question two and three have been included.

- Ticked twice in Site A and Both Sites - vote not included as couldn't determine intention.
- Marked N/A – vote not included as couldn't determine intention
- No box ticked - vote not included as couldn't determine intention.

Question 2: Do you support the draft settlement boundary for Crow Hill? *Please tick one box only*

Yes	86
No	25
No vote recorded	1
Total	112

Comments made by those in agreement with the settlement boundary for Crow Hill

047	It is a natural edge of settlements line
078	Although I broadly agree with the settlement boundaries in protecting the integrity, community and amenity of village life, there is a question over the long-term validity of maintaining the land-ownership models handed down through the past few centuries of enclosure. In the aftermath of the phenomena such as the 2008 economic collapse (caused by globalisation and exacerbated by overcrowded conditions, and EU-exit disruptions to trade, I believe greater resilience can be achieved through increased access to land. Gardens, allotments, footpaths, bridleways, village greens and commons are of fundamental importance and should be prioritised.
111	This appears to be more of an infill site and thus sensible for the development of the village

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

Comments made by those against the settlement boundary for Crow Hill

006	No services in village
008	Lack of safe pedestrian access to site B on a relatively busy cut through road to A40
017	Because it's not big enough to support future development for village.
023	Crow Hill is the name of the hill only.
039	Site A is effectively ribbon development - also field opposite site B.
048	I think the boundary should stop short of site A.
049	Does it mean more houses can now be built there? It will no longer be a village.
059	It is downright ridiculous you would even consider destroying a successful cherry orchard and business for housing.
060	The road is very narrow at Site A so we should not encourage more cars to add to the already busy traffic.
064	Why keep to strict boundary perfectly good sites have been refused.
075	If the four settlement will the boundary be redrawn to include the Millennium Hall?
076	Looks like it's been reduced from the Old Gore direction.
077	I think there are enough new houses being built and Upton Bishop has already had new ones.
090	Needs to include both Site A / B.
096	Why has there been no public meeting to discuss the options - to only vote on 2 is wrong they should all be discussed.
101	Hatched should be removed, cross hatched should be added. <i>(marked on original map)</i>
103	Did not know there were 12 sites. Would have been helpful if all 12 were on map so to make more informed decision. Both sites A & B look very large, were there no smaller sites entered. Need to see all 12 sites on map.
104	We don't understand why the centre of Upton Bishop isn't included in any of the boundaries.
109	<p>Site A is totally inappropriate for housing as it contains a thriving local agricultural business. This has had considerable investment in order to establish the trees, therefore enabling it to become a very successful commercial cherry orchard which provides valuable income to our local farming family. A rural enterprise such as this should therefore be actively encouraged and not given up for yet more (unwanted) development. We are also concerned that there is a possible conflict of interest in the project too, as we note that the land agent is actually a close relative of the farmer.</p> <p>The B4221 is exceptionally narrow near site A, such that cars are unable to pass by each other, let alone the tractors, lorries and buses that also use the road in both directions many times per day. Hence any extra traffic at this narrow 'pinch point' would just worsen the current problem. The local traffic is bad enough already without adding further to it and we believe that this significant road narrowing is documented as a known problem in the parish 'traffic calming plan'.</p> <p>There are also considerable ongoing issues with sewage provision at Crow Hill and any further housing would merely exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>We also question many of the statements within the NDP about the 'local amenities' in the village, as we have none, other than a Hall, and a Michelin star restaurant which is only open part-time. We have no school, shop or post office and the bus service is hopeless as it is expensive, infrequent and totally unable to provide any direct transport to or from</p>

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

	our county town of Hereford - hence the villagers have no option but to use their cars to get out and about for work, education, shopping or access to the Town Hall or County Hospital. All our roads are narrow and largely without pavements, hence any thought of sustainable travel by bike or foot can be downright dangerous or nigh on impossible. Hence any mention of the 'facilities and services' in the village should be more accurately reflected in the wording of the NDP.
111	Comment made about the settlement boundary being wrong as it cuts through a domestic curtilage. This is an error on the NDP's part and will be corrected. The comment has therefore not been included in this report.

Question 3: Do you support the draft settlement boundary for Upton Crews? *Please tick one box only*

Yes	93
No	16
No vote recorded	3
Total	112

Comments made by those in agreement with the settlement boundary for Upton Crews

047	It is a natural edge of settlements line
078	Although I broadly agree with the settlement boundaries in protecting the integrity, community and amenity of village life, there is a question over the long-term validity of maintaining the land-ownership models handed down through the past few centuries of enclosure. In the aftermath of the phenomena such as the 2008 economic collapse (caused by globalisation and exacerbated by overcrowded conditions, and EU-exit disruptions to trade, I believe greater resilience can be achieved through increased access to land. Gardens, allotments, footpaths, bridleways, village greens and commons are of fundamental importance and should be prioritised.
108	What about Area 'C' side of footpath opposite Stoggle Oak (<i>marked on original map</i>)
112	Appears to be logical and includes the full extent of all properties in the area.

Comments made by those against the settlement boundary for Upton Crews

002	Can't accept as we need to know the proposed buildings.
017	Because it's not big enough to support future development for village.
020	We think it is strange that the natural parish boundary line is not being followed in this development plan. We believe that it should be marked to include <u>all</u> homes within the parish. Thank you. If there has to be a split, our preference is for the Crews Orchard House, orchard & field to be in the Crow Hill settlement. (<i>marks made on original map</i>)
027	We think it is strange that the natural parish boundary line is not being followed in this development plan. We believe that it should be marked to include <u>all</u> homes within the parish. Thank you for your consideration. If there has to be a split, our preference is for

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

	the Crews Orchard House, orchard & field to be in the Crow Hill settlement boundary. <i>(marks made on original map)</i>
029	The boundary should join Crow Hill to Upton Crews so that in time they can become one settlement.
050	Upton Crews is a very small settlement effectively in open countryside. The lanes meeting at the crossroads are all very narrow and unsuited to anything but the occasional local vehicle. Its rural character would be destroyed by any further building.
059	The boundary is so tight it offers no opportunity for any development at all however small.
060	There is no scope for any development at all here, thus forcing Crow Hill to be the one to sacrifice their green space.
064	Why keep to strict boundary perfectly good sites have been refused. Put houses where land is no use for agriculture. Tanhouse area!
073	I didn't receive a voting form and just by chance heard about it. Site A was a complete shock to me. I didn't know it was contemplated. HOW DO YOU KNOW PEOPLE CAN'T VOTE 2 or more times? You are not asking for signatures and this form can be copied. <i>Signature.</i>
077	Upton Bishop is a small village and does not require any more houses. This will increase traffic which is already dangerous with cars speeding through the village.
096	What does pre-developed land mean and surely this is better than green fields. Why has Site A been cut and put parallel to the road and not perpendicular? What is being done about footpaths along the road? How long is this valid for? I was concerned at the lack of audit etc. / information governance to ensure all residents were informed and can read to fill in form.
103	Did not know there were 12 sites. Would have been helpful if all 12 were on map so to make more informed decision. Both sites A & B look very large, were there no smaller sites entered. Need to see all 12 sites on map. Map is of poor quality. Not been kept informed enough. Don't have internet access so can't see website.
104	We don't understand why the centre of Upton Bishop isn't included in any of the boundaries.
105	Upton Crews east side boundary should end in the hill at Crews Cottage
109	This appears to be extremely restricted with no scope for any small opportunistic housing development along the roads in that vicinity. Similarly, the village envelope includes the road up to the Old Gore crossroads and also down to and including Phocle Green, which seem to have escaped the threat of development there too. Crow Hill does seem to be the 'easy target' here. Finally we would like to state that as residents of a house directly opposite Site A, we would also object to the added light, noise and traffic pollution that we would have to suffer from a development of such close proximity to our home and garden.

Comments made by people who did not mark either the yes or no box

023	Upton Crews is on the Google map for Upton Bishop anyway.
-----	---

General comments not relating to the questions:

Upton Bishop Parish Council (UBPC)

Public Consultation on Sites A and B

078	<p>An amendment to Cameron's 2016 Housing & Planning Act was proposed in the wake of the Grenfell disaster to ensure that homes are of a standard suitable for human habitation. Jesse Norman MP voted against it, stating that local authorities have plenty of powers in this area; central government funding to councils ended in 2020.</p> <p>The Right to Buy Council and Housing Association social housing properties reduces affordable housing.</p> <p>Section 106 obligations are at risk of being phased out, meaning that developments won't bring benefits to us.</p> <p>The end of the Green Homes Grant jeopardises the sustainability of our housing stock and our future in general.</p> <p>Local authorities' powers, such as the planning process and creation of NDPs, are undermined by binding targets due to the influence of the Housing Secretary Robert Jenrick MP, amongst others. To give some idea of his personal taste, one of Mr Jenrick's three homes is £1.1m Eye Manor in Herefordshire originally built for a slave trader, another is tax-payer funded at £2,000 a month in his Newark constituency.</p> <p>How many new homes are really needed and who are they for?</p>
-----	--