

Planning application comment was submitted on the **14 April 2024 14:09 PM**

The following is a comment on application **P240422/F** by **Natasha Lane**

Nature of feedback: Objecting to the application

Comment: I am objecting to the proposed development on the Lugg Meadows due to the following reasons:
The natural, historic and scenic beauty of the landscape will be compromised and will be in breach of policy LD1 – which is to ensure the features are conserved and enhanced, which will not be the case. The site selection and design would contravene this policy, in that it would negatively influence the landscape.
The area is a site of Special Scientific Interest and would be breaching policy LD2, which is in place to ensure any developments conserve bio and geodiversity in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality, which could not be the case in respect of this proposal. It contravenes the requirement to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services. Additionally, development on land within or outside a site of Special Scientific interest, which is likely to have an adverse effect on it should not normally be permitted and I do not believe any of the proposals put forward to be sufficient mitigation. Policy SS6 would be breached due to the distinctive features of the landscape as it would endanger rare curlews, skylarks and plants through the increased footfall, traffic and noise. This area, the access road to the farm and the surrounding areas of the Lugg flats have been flooded to some extent since October 2023. Additional housing will not improve this. Policy SD3 and SD4 detail that water management and wastewater from any developments reduce flood risk and do not adversely impact water quality targets for rivers. There is no doubt, even with the proposals from the developers to mitigate this risk by the installation of bio diversity ponds, that these will not suffice as it is unsure how effective they would be on already waterlogged land. A question that needs to be answered is as to whether this development would cause further flooding downstream if it were to proceed.
Whilst the application details a plan to build a school, the planned location of the school looks to be on the edge of flood zone 3, thus indicating that it would be prone to flooding.
Hampton Bishop NDP details Hollywell Gutter Lane as an important landscape feature, which contributes to the rural character and sense of place. It is an historic route, which marks the city boundary.
There will be a breach of MT1 – traffic management, highway safety and promoting active travel. The development could see an additional 500 cars in and around the area on an already congested area of road. There is already congestion at school drop off and collection times. Not everyone can, as the developers suggest, change the times that they leave for work or return from work.
Whilst Herefordshire council may have to build more houses I do not believe this is the right place as the area has never been suggested for more housing or formed part of any strategy that I am aware of.

Attachment:

Their contact details are as follows:

First name: Natasha

Last name: Lane

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: HR1 1FB

Address: 33 Mantella Drive, Hereford, HR1 1FB

Infrastructure from section 106 to consider: I strongly object to the application but should it be approved then the developer must fund the protection and maintenance of the SSI, and completely and properly maintain all roads in the surrounding areas (Tupsley, Bartestree, Lugwardine, Hampton Dene and Hampton Bishop) which will be necessary to mitigate the increased stress and pressure on them as a result of the development

Link ID: https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=240422

Form reference: FS-Case-605627545