

16. APPENDICES

16.1 APPENDIX A - CYCLE PARKING STANDARDS

Objections

W323/2856 CTC Right to Ride
RW1272/500120 Mr A Pucill

Summary of Objections / Issues

- Appendix A should be modified to provide standards for long-stay and short-stay cycle parking, with more emphasis in the text on security. (323)
- Objection is raised to the removal of cycle parking standards from the Plan. (1272)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

All objections

16.1.1 Appendix A was deleted at revised deposit stage. It is now the Council's intention to include standards for cycle and vehicle parking in a new supplementary planning document on transport infrastructure provision and design. I consider that this would be the appropriate policy forum to consider the issues raised by the objectors.

16.1.2 Paragraph 8.7.5 of the Revised Deposit Draft retains a reference to Appendix A. I recommend that this is deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

16.1/1 Modify Paragraph 8.7.5 by deleting the words "which are set out in Appendix A."

16.1/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objections.

16.2 APPENDIX B - VEHICLE PARKING STANDARDS

Objections

P12/16 Hereford Hospitals NHS Trust
P12/10332 Hereford Hospitals NHS Trust
P830/2390 Herefordshire Friends of the Earth (Conditionally Withdrawn)
P890/2524 Government Office for the West Midlands
P956/2761 Mercia Healthcare Limited
P977/2924 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Conditionally Withdrawn)
P1185/3758 Tesco Stores Ltd (Conditionally Withdrawn)

Summary of Objections / Issues

- The basis of calculation for hospital provision should be clarified. (12)
- Necessary healthcare developments may be restricted by the car parking standards. The removal of Appendix B leaves developers without clear guidance. (12, 956)
- The UDP standards should be revised to reflect current guidance. (830, 890, 977, 1185)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Parking provision at Hereford Hospital – 12

16.2.1 It is not appropriate to include calculations of parking requirements for specific developments.

Other objections – 12, 956, 830, 890, 977, 1185

16.2.2 In response to a number of objections, Appendix B was deleted at revised deposit stage, allowing some objections to be conditionally withdrawn. It is now the Council's intention to include standards for cycle and vehicle parking in a new supplementary planning document on transport infrastructure provision and design, to accord with the advice in PPG 13 and PPG 3. I consider that this would be the appropriate policy forum to consider the issues raised by the objectors.

RECOMMENDATION

16.2/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

16.3 APPENDIX D - NATURE CONSERVATION AND GEOLOGICAL SITES

Objections

P355/672	Titley and District Group Parish Council
P603/1361	Mr R J Verdin
P411/846	Mr H Jones
W306/857	E P Davies & Son
W306/856	E P Davies & Son
P953/2757	Royal National College for the Blind
P249/519	Mr and Mrs R Capewell
W306/855	E P Davies & Son
P258/540	Welsh Water
P1102/3532	H P Bulmer Ltd
P691/1701	Mr M P Lloyd
P1102/3531	H P Bulmer Ltd
P1107/3538	H P Bulmer Ltd & Jennings Estates Ltd
P603/1362	Mr R J Verdin
P603/1340	Mr R J Verdin
W287/646	Mr A Greene
P971/2792	Monkland and Stretford Parish Council

Summary of Objections / Issues

- Some procedure of notification should be adopted for sites of local importance. (306, 355, 691)
- The road to Cedar House Farm should be omitted from the Kington to Presteigne railway line SINC. (411)
- The SINC designation should be removed from the whole or part of the land to the rear of 56-62 Venns Lane. (953)
- Whether the designation of land behind Oak Willows is appropriate. (249)
- The designation of Knill Garraway should be justified. (306)
- The designation of Knill Wood, Hazel Point and Nash Wood should be justified. (306)
- The pond at Knill should not be listed as a SINC. (306)
- Designation of part of Broomy Hill Treatment Works as a special wildlife site should be withdrawn. (258)
- There is no justification for Yazor Brook being identified as an SWS. (1102)
- There is no justification for land adjacent to Sherrington Drive being identified as an SWS. (1102, 1107)
- Surveys of Butthouse Knapp, Stretford Brook and Tippet's Brook should be carried out. (603)
- There is no justification for the Leominster railway line being identified as an SWS. (306)
- The nature conservation interest of the Arrow Valley should be recognised. (287)
- The nature conservation interest of Monkland millstream should be recognised. (971)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Notification procedure – 306, 355, 691

16.3.1 The way in which owners are consulted and notified about the designation of sites of nature conservation value is an administrative matter that is outside the remit of the Plan. No related modification is necessary.

Kington to Presteigne railway line - omission of road to Cedar House Farm - 411

16.3.2 The Council is suggesting that the Plan should be modified to show the correct extent of the special wildlife site along the Kington to Leominster / Presteigne railway line. Such a modification would meet the objection and is recommended.

Knill Garraway - justification for SWS designation - 306

16.3.3 The objector requests an explanation for the inclusion of the site as a Special Wildlife Site. The site was identified in the Herefordshire Inventory of Ancient Woodlands in 1986. Whilst some of the site may contain modern planting, the

designation is on the basis that the site has been continuously wooded since 1600. Replanted areas have the potential to be restored.

16.3.4 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Knill Wood, Hazel Point and Nash Wood - justification for SWS designation - 306

16.3.5 The objector requests an explanation for the inclusion of the site as a SINC. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977". The wood is described as an ancient woodland which, although inter-planted with conifers, includes an area of ancient coppice. There are several species of smaller trees present and the ground flora is good. Species include field maple, wild angelica and meadowsweet and the site provides habitat for the uncommon purple hairstreak butterfly. Some of the site may contain modern planting but replanted areas have the potential to be restored.

16.3.6 I appreciate that an up-to-date survey would be useful. However, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Lane rear of Venns Lane - removal of SINC designation - 953

16.3.7 On a preliminary point, I note that the objector's consultant ecologist has recommended retention of the plantation woodland, certain specimen trees and small areas of semi-improved grassland within a reduced SINC boundary. In such terms, I see no justification for removing the whole of the existing SINC designation.

16.3.8 In my opinion, the smaller SINC area suggested by the objector would still contain important habitats. The habitats referred to above would be retained. In addition, the hedge along the eastern boundary of the site could also be kept and protected. To this extent, the outstanding issue is whether removal of the orchard would have a significant detrimental effect on protected species.

16.3.9 I note that there is substantial bat interest in the orchard area with the more open areas being used by soprano pipistrelle in particular. The grassed areas below the trees are also important foraging areas for birds. In addition, orchards in the county are a Herefordshire BAP habitat, soon to be designated a UK BAP habitat. As to the importance of retaining the area, I find that the survey work has been relatively limited and does not support a firm conclusion either way.

16.3.10 I have considerable sympathy for the objector. There is an urgent need to provide new and additional residential facilities, funded in part by private residential development, for which there is considerable public support. In addition, it is clear that the college takes the management and enhancement of its estate very seriously. However, these are matters to be weighed in the balance in the context of a planning application.

16.3.11 In the absence of any clear evidence to the contrary, I believe that the correct approach is to recognise the on-going nature conservation value of the site that undoubtedly exists and carry forward the SINC designation from the adopted Local Plan. However, this is in the knowledge that designation as a SINC and the provisions of Policy NC4 are not an absolute bar on development.

Designation of land behind Oak Willows, Hereford - 249

16.3.12 I appreciate that there is no public access to the objection site. However, to my mind, that does not affect its inherent nature conservation value. Similarly, in my opinion, lack of interest from the Herefordshire Nature Trust in acquiring or maintaining the site does not demonstrate that designation as a SINC is inappropriate nor does the lack of any maintenance grants.

16.3.13 With regard to the site's condition, I acknowledge that this may well change over time particularly with lack of management. However, in the absence of any up-to-date survey information, I am unable to conclude that designation as a SINC is not appropriate. In reaching this conclusion, I have also had regard to the appeal decision made in November 2003. This concluded that the site remains a significant nature conservation feature notwithstanding poor maintenance and declining diversity.

Listing of pond at Knill as a SINC - 306

16.3.14 I appreciate that the cooperation and maintenance that have contributed in the past to the nature conservation value of Knill Pond will not necessarily continue into the future. Be that as it may, there is no substantiated evidence such as survey data which suggests to me that designation as a SINC at this point in time is not justified. No modification of the Plan is necessary.

Designation of land at Broomy Hill Treatment Works - 258

16.3.15 The designated areas within the treatment works have been affected by operational development. As a result, the Council accepts that the SINC designation is no longer appropriate. I recommend accordingly.

16.3.16 The Council states that certain earth banks, mature trees and shrubs have ecological value. The preparation and implementation of an ecological enhancement scheme is suggested. Given that any such approach would be voluntary, I consider that it would be inappropriate to seek provision under the terms of the UDP.

Yazor Brook, Plough Lane, Hereford - justification for SWS designation - 1102

16.3.17 The objector considers that there is inadequate justification for the inclusion of the site as an SWS. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977". The objector states that this section of Yazor Brook has been culverted over, in line with authorised works. In view of this, I recommend that the Proposals Map is updated and the stretch of Yazor Brook which has been culverted should have the designation removed.

Disused railway line, Leominster - justification for SWS designation - 306

16.3.18 The objector considers that there is inadequate justification for the inclusion of the site as an SWS. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990, primarily for its scrub habitat for nesting birds. It also functions as a

wildlife corridor. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977".

16.3.19 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey of the site's value would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Designation of land at Sherrington Drive – 1102, 1107

16.3.20 I have considered a related objection in Section 5 of my report, seeking the allocation of this land for housing. I conclude that the site should not be allocated for housing. The objector considers that there is inadequate justification for the inclusion of the site as an SWS. In this regard, identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977".

16.3.21 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey of the site's value would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Butthouse Knapp - 603

16.3.22 The objector requests that a survey is carried out to justify the inclusion of the site as an SWS. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977". Butthouse Knapp is described as an ancient woodland of mixed species of standards and coppice, including yew, oak and ash.

16.3.23 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Stretford Brook - 603

16.3.24 The objector requests that a survey is carried out to justify the inclusion of the site as an SWS. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977". Stretford Brook is described as supporting a rich wetland flora, including yellow water-lily, water avens and marsh speedwell; also black poplar which is recognised as a priority species for biodiversity in Herefordshire's Biodiversity Action Plan. In addition, it functions as a wildlife corridor.

16.3.25 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey would be useful, the objector does not forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent

manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Tippet's Brook - 603

16.3.26 The objector requests that a survey is carried out to justify the inclusion of the site as an SWS. The site was identified as a "Special Wildlife Site" in 1990. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977". Tippet's Brook is described as a lowland stream with a rich wetland flora. In addition, it functions as a wildlife corridor.

16.3.27 Whilst I appreciate that an up-to-date survey would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and pending this I consider the designation should remain.

Nature conservation interest of the Arrow Valley - 287

16.3.28 It is asserted that the Arrow Valley floodplain has local nature conservation interest including rare black poplar plantations. However, there are no details or appropriate survey information. In the circumstances, there is inadequate justification for designation of the Arrow Valley as a site protected by local designation.

Nature conservation interest of Monkland millstream – 971

16.3.29 The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole county to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP. Monkland millstream could be assessed as part of this process. At present there is insufficient justification for its identification as an SWS.

RECOMMENDATIONS

16.3/1 Modify the Proposals Map in accordance with Appendix 1 to the Council's Statement AD/3d (Kington to Presteigne railway line).

16.3/2 In Appendix D of the Plan, and on the Proposals Map, delete reference to Broomy Hill waterworks as a special wildlife site.

16.3/3 Delete the culverted stretch of Yazor Brook from the Proposals Map.

16.3/4 Do not make any other modification in response to the objections.

16.4 APPENDIX E - CONSERVATION AREAS AND SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS

Objection

W287/854

Mr A Greene

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The Arrow Valley area should be a designated conservation area. (287)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Arrow Valley as a conservation area - 287

16.4.1 Conservation areas cannot be designated through the development plan process. No modification of the Plan is therefore appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

16.4/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.