

Planning application comment was submitted on the **12 May 2025 19:17 PM**

The following is a comment on application **P240422/F** by **Pamela Gundy**

### **Nature of feedback: Objecting to the application**

---

**Comment:** The interim proposals submitted in April 2025 still fail to address many of the concerns raised in previous objections.

Welsh Water initially expressed concerns about the impact of this development on existing mains water pressure, stating they could not provide adequate supply without negatively affecting nearby homes. Why should current residents bear the consequences? The revised proposals offer no solution to this issue.

While the proposer acknowledges potential drainage problems, new measures are still under investigation. Previous objections highlighted that the Lugg Flats sit on a gravel bed, allowing water to continuously drain back into the watercourse. However, the hardstanding and foundations required for these houses will disrupt this natural balance, leading to increased runoff from roads, gardens, and parking areas—heightening flood risks and carrying contaminants into the water system.

The drainage ponds will require ongoing, costly maintenance to ensure they remain safe and functional.

The originally proposed school, located in flood risk zone 3, has been deemed unnecessary and removed from the revised plans. Instead, an area has been designated for dog walking, a hay meadow, and general recreation, purportedly to alleviate pressure on the SSSI Wildlife Trust land across the road. However, the precise location of this area remains unclear, and it appears that part of it could still fall within flood risk zone 3—meaning it will be prone to flooding and persistently muddy for extended periods, limiting its usability.

Realistically, can residents of the proposed development be expected to restrict their exercise to this designated area and not venture across to the much larger SSSI Wildlife Trust land—especially when a pedestrian crossing has been included in the plans? The Wildlife Trust is already struggling with the existing influx of people and dogs. In fact, the new development may further increase visitor numbers from outside areas, as additional parking will become available.

The revised plans offer no viable alternatives for cat-proof fencing, raising serious concerns about the protection of nesting curlews and other wildlife.

The Lugg Flats are home to a diverse range of species, including badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, deer, geese, swans, owls, bats, kestrels, kites, curlews, and great crested newts etc—many of which have protected status. Why are the protected species facing threats to their survival? Where will all this wildlife go if their habitat is disrupted by this development?

An update from the Highways Department is awaited regarding the anticipated rise in traffic caused by this development.

Previously, concerns were raised about highway congestion and safety on the A465 Ledbury Road when the farm track was originally planned for strictly monitored traffic access to anaerobic digesters under a Traffic Management Plan (TMP). However, this track is now also used by large HGVs servicing Court Farm's canning and soft drinks plants. These HGVs have been banned from entering via Hampton Bishop due to their size-related disruptions and are now instructed to use the Ledbury Road farm track exclusively, adding to the already

heavy traffic, increasing the danger and safety of road users.

The addition of 300-400 vehicles from the proposed development will exacerbate traffic congestion and safety concerns, particularly with the increased interaction between residential traffic and large HGVs. This will significantly impact Tupsley, Hampton Dene, Lugwardine, and surrounding areas—especially during school hours, when long traffic queues are already a persistent issue.

The proposed access from Holywell Gutter Lane should be removed, as it remains unacceptable. Despite the removal of direct references to Mantella Drive in the latest plans, the access point remains in virtually the same location. Given that Bishopfields is privately maintained by residents through annual fees to a property management company, allowing pedestrian and cycle access at this point would create undue pressure on a private space not intended for public use.

The proposer has submitted a letter from their solicitor granting access to a lane at the side of the Cock of Tupsley for pedestrians and cyclists. However, this additional foot and cycle traffic—particularly during school hours—will significantly increase congestion and safety risks along Hampton Dene Road and near the school entrances, an area already experiencing severe traffic and parking problems.

The number of houses has been reduced following the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), due to their visibility from Ledbury Road. Additionally, the council recommended removing the farm shop, this has been replaced with additional homes adjacent to the A465. These houses, highly visible, will also affect the character of the landscape and will require LVIA approval. They will also be positioned near the Lugg Rhea and drainage ponds, increasing their flood risk.

There is a clear lack of essential infrastructure—including hospitals, roads, schools, nurseries, doctors, dentists, and veterinary services—to support this development.

The Environment Agency recently warned that by 2050, one in four homes will be at risk of flooding. Additionally, the Association of British Insurers has cautioned that tens of thousands of properties built on floodplains across the UK may become uninsurable. Why should more homes be exposed to such a devastating fate, especially when they may be unprotected by insurance?

Emergency services are already stretched, frequently responding to flood-related incidents. Additional development in high-risk flood zones will only increase demands on these resources, potentially compromising response times and effectiveness.

Furthermore, most insurers already require homeowners to disclose whether their property is within 400 metres of a watercourse—these proposed homes would fall well within that range. With the increasing risk of flooding, securing affordable home insurance may become increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for future residents.

These proposals fail to meet the policies and requirements outlined in the Herefordshire Core Strategy, including SS1, SS6, SS7, LD1, LD2, LD3, LD4, SD1, SD3, SD4, and MT1, as well as Hampton Bishop NDP HB10.

While there is a recognised government requirement for additional housing in Herefordshire, the Lugg Flats is simply not a suitable location.

**Attachment:**

---

Their contact details are as follows:

**First name:** Pamela

**Last name:** Gundy

**Address:** 13 Great Crested Crescent, Hereford, HR1 1FG

---

**Infrastructure from section 106 to consider:** Contribution to youth services and after school activities

Contribution to day centres for disabled and elderly

Local health services - GP surgeries, clinics etc

Public transport

---

Link ID: [https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning\\_services/planning\\_application\\_search/details?id=240422](https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=240422)

Form reference: FS-Case-714032986