
From: Mary Deaville [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 March 2021 15:29
To: VE.RT
Cc: 'Lindy Wildsmith'; Gary deaville
Subject: Objection to Appeal for planning Application 193478
Attachments: PLANNING Appeal OBJ 193478F HORSE FIELD Mr and Mrs Deaville March 21.docx; PLANNING OBJ 193478F HORSE FIELD Mr and Mrs Deaville FURTHER OBJ.docx; OBJECTIONS TO 193478 (1) Dai Harris.docx; RepsObj 9 M Deaville.pdf

Dear Ms Lauren Matthews (Planning inspectorate),

Please find attached my letters of objection to the planning application 193478. I have included today's objection letter **Planning Appeal obj** word doc.

My original objection letter **RespObj 9 M Deaville** .pdf

My further objection letter for a revised application from 46 houses to 44 **planning obj 193478F** word doc.

And the Objection letter from the Hawthorne Field Action Group, of which I am a member. **Objections to 193478** word doc.

[REDACTED]

I trust you will give all objections your valued attention when coming to your decision.

Mary Deaville

Mr and Mrs Deaville
Tresco
Chase View Road
Ross-on-Wye
Herefordshire
HR9 5BQ

Ms Lauren Matthews,
The Planning Inspectorate,
Temple Quay House,
2 The Square,
Bristol, BS1 6PN

31st March 2021

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 193478.

Demolition of stable out-buildings and proposed residential development of 44 no single and two storey dwellings with associated hard and soft landscaping.

Land off Middleton Avenue, known as Hawthorne Field, Ross on Wye, Herefordshire.

Dear Lauren Matthews,

With regard to the Appeal against the Refusal decision we continue to object to this planning application 193478 for buildings on this land. There have been little amendments to the application that make a difference to our original reasons for objecting to this proposal.

- 1) Building the revised 44 houses on this land still goes against the 15 houses and allotments recommended by the Ross NDP, (and this is if and only when Ashfield School is relocated).

The RNDP still has significant weight and was shortlisted for the West Midlands for Planning Excellence 2020 Award. The judges said "The Ross-on-Wye NDP has benefitted from a truly collaborative, creative, innovative and inclusive approach to community engagement, supported by Place Studio. This is to be applauded". Now it also has been shortlisted for a National award.

- 2) The appeal said there was nothing from the Principle Conservation Officer, which directly ignores the fact they would be endangering rare bat, dormice, great crested newts habitat, who are already on the protective list. It also does not consider the hedgehogs and other animal species that would be greatly affected by this building intention. Not to mention the horses that graze on this field. Planting new hedgerows will not be established enough to encourage endangered species to move home and this may actually cause their death.
- 3) Welsh Water state their "Lower Cleeve Waste Water Treatment Works does not have the required capacity to accommodate any new growth", including this amount of buildings and they had planned to update the treatment site. Has this happened? We are 1 year on and with lockdown a lot of things have been put on hold.

- 4) With the Covid health issues the “minimum 2 m width” of footpaths will not be enough to allow safe passage to/from school and people walking dogs.
- 5) They have not addressed the fact they plan to put large 2 storey buildings backing on to 2 bungalows, allowing windows to overlook our privacy.
- 6) This planning was assessed using the census of 2011. There is now a current census of 2021 and this should be reviewed against the recent census.
- 7) The builders still feel that people will walk to school because of the locality. This does not allow for the families that have children also attending high school/other schools across town, and have to arrive at a similar time so walking is not an option.
- 8) Major traffic issues are being ignored.
- 9) No plans for future technology and eco saving have been included, e.g. electric car chargers, solar panels etc.
- 10) They will be removing the green space used for animals and recreation of dog walkers and ordinary people that are currently using this land and replacing it a miniscule space for the new residents.
- 11) There is already a parking issue with current residents about cars parking to deliver children to the school. This will only bring more arguments for new tenants because they will park within the new build area too.
- 12) Members of the Ross Town Council also strongly object to this application
- 13) There are 3 pages of summary of the main bullet points from the Decision letter that object to this proposed planning application. Appealing against this decision without addressing the many objections cannot be ignored.

Please take all this into consideration along with the other numerous objections and deny this planning application again.

Yours sincerely

Gary and Mary Deaville

Mr and Mrs Deaville
Tresco
Chase View Road
Ross-on-Wye
Herefordshire
HR9 5BQ

For the attention of Heather Carlisle
Herefordshire Council Planning services
PO Box 4,
Hereford,
HR4 0XH

20th March 2020

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 193478.

Demolition of stable out-buildings and proposed residential development of 44 no single and two storey dwellings with associated hard and soft landscaping.

Land off Middleton Avenue, known as Hawthorne Field, Ross on Wye, Herefordshire.

Dear Heather Carlisle,

We write again to firmly object to the revised planning application 193478 for buildings on this land.

There have been little amendments to the application that make a difference to our original reasons for objecting to this proposal.

The Governments 'National Design guide' for good planning states to look at:

- 1) **the scale of the buildings.** 'Scale is the height, width and length of each building proposed within a development in relation to its surroundings. This relates both to the overall size and massing of individual buildings and spaces in relation to their surroundings, and to the scale of their parts.'

We live in a bungalow and this planning puts 3 and 4 bedroom, 2 story buildings with windows overlooking our garden, (plots 22 and 23).

- 2) **Landscape** 'Landscape is the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site, the area in which it is situated and the natural environment. Landscape includes landform and drainage, hard landscape such as surfacing, boundary treatments, street furniture and play equipment. It also includes soft landscape – trees, shrubs and other planting.'

The amount of hard surfacing planned will have a **negative effect** on drainage since water finds the lowest level and this is a sloped field, with the lowest being the western boundary, It is not just the ditch that is a medium risk but also the 3 houses directly on that border in Chase View Road. There is also no play equipment in the tiny green space they have squeezed in. This is not acceptable.

- 3) **Future needs.** 'well-designed private places, such as homes and gardens, are designed to be flexible to adapt to the changing needs of their users over time. This includes changes in the health and mobility of the user, as well as potential changes in lifestyle due to developing technologies, such as use of electric vehicles, remote working and general changes to the way in which people live'.

There has been no effort put in the planning to include electric car charging, solar panels, electric storage in line with the government's plan to reduce diesel cars and for the houses to be self-sustainable. Surely as these are

to be social housing, they are most in need of this technology to counteract their lack of economic independence. Might I add that we are in a chemical health crisis at the moment and the need to self-isolate along with the risk of economic recession is already on our doorstep. All the more reason to think ahead.

With regard to, and with all due respect to the **transport statement**, the speed of cars in Middleton Avenue is low due to the invoked single file traffic caused by residents parking. The photo of the school bus parked at Ashfield School does not take into consideration the amount of times the school bus is delayed by not being able to travel cleanly in Middleton avenue, due to parked cars dropping off and picking up school children. Nor does it take into consideration the additional plant vehicles needed to arrive to deliver and build the said planning of 44 houses. This survey is not accurate to the daily issues that residents and school visitors face and is also not acceptable. This survey does not show the impaired visibility on Redhill Rd and Middleton Avenue looking out onto Archenfield road. This cannot be ignored since the main Archenfield road is also predominantly single file due to residents parking. Archenfield road has severe pothole issues that are reappearing very shortly after being filled. 98 Extra cars will not help this situation at all. The transport statement is blindly avoiding assessing Archenfield Rd to make it look favourable on paper.

Nature; No regard to the rare bats, dormice, hedgehogs and great crested Newts is being given. They state there are low numbers and therefore not at risk, yet the mere fact that they are rare means there ARE low numbers and we need to protect them. We cannot just build a new hedgerow and expect these creatures to move to it before they bulldoze their home and risk their lives and extinction.

Lastly, There is a total disregard for the RNDP with states this land is only suitable for up to 15 houses and allotments – WHEN THE SCHOOL MOVES. The water utilities report states this land can only support 15 houses, why are we allowing 44?

Please take all this into consideration along with the other numerous objections and deny this planning application.

Yours sincerely

Gary and Mary Deaville

OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION P193478/F

1) Traffic Congestion and Access

The outflow of traffic from the proposed development onto Middleton Avenue would cause an unacceptable increase in the risk of injury or accidents to children and parents arriving at and leaving Ashfield Park School. This concern is totally dismissed by the applicant's Transport Report which states in Section 4.13 that ***'there are no existing highway issues on the local road network'***. Residents of Middleton Avenue and Redhill Road strongly contest this claim. The junction of these two roads is only 100 yards (not 150 yards as mentioned in the Traffic Report) from the entrance to the planned development. The school bus parks on this junction and severely restricts the visibility of parents and children attempting to cross from the school to their cars in Middleton Avenue. Short term double parking by parents on Middleton Avenue frequently occurs as most kerbside parking is taken up by residents, many of whom have no off-road parking. Also the necessary splay / visibility requirements at the entrance to the development will inevitably lead to a loss of 8 – 10 parking spaces, although cars will inevitably park there

The photographs of the junction of Middleton Avenue in the applicant's Traffic Report show the bus but no sign of any parents, children or extra traffic whatsoever, which are therefore totally misleading, having been taken outside the peak times, as has the photograph in Figure 4.2 which only indicates resident parking and no traffic or pedestrian movement at all. Staff from the school regularly have to come out in the afternoon to assist with the movement of traffic. Residents in these two roads adjacent to the school regularly witness near-misses involving children and cars and it is only a matter of time before a child is injured or killed. We also question the figure stated in the report that 64% of children walk to school; this claim is based on the 2011 census and has no credence today

We also wish to contest the claim in the Traffic Report Section 4.12 which states that ***'it is not considered that the development will generate a significant amount of vehicle trips'*** and that residents would walk to shops and services which are within 2 kms. There will certainly be an increase in the morning when residents from the proposed development are leaving for work by car at the same time as children are arriving for school (a cautious estimate of 30 + vehicles exiting the development is not unrealistic).

The applicant's Transport Report focuses solely on traffic flow in Middleton Avenue and Redhill Road and makes no mention of Archenfield Road and the horrendous congestion that residents to the west of the town have to endure. Archenfield Road is in effect a single lane during the day exacerbated by Ashfield Park School parents parking there at school start and finish times (as illustrated in the photographs submitted by John Gregory), lasting for the best part of an hour on each occasion. In addition to a high traffic density in terms of cars, we are also faced with two bus routes and large articulated trucks and agricultural machinery servicing the two large and expanding farms beyond Archenfield Road and also vehicles going to and from Rehau and Beyond Storage. We also have a regular flow of migrant workers who walk and cycle this route into town. Furthermore, the recent decision by residents of Ashfield Park Road to impose their own parking restrictions has forced those who normally park in this road (residents, members of the tennis club and motorists who work in the town centre and have used Ashfield Park Road for free parking) to park on Archenfield Road near to its junction with Walford Road, thus causing further congestion and making this stretch effectively a single lane

In the 2010 Ross Town Plan it was recognised that traffic congestion is experienced on routes coming in to Ross from the Walford side and in particular at the various ‘pinch points’ such as in Copse Cross Street and Alton Street which lead to traffic backing up beyond The Prince of Wales and down Archenfield Road at peak times. Nothing has been done in nearly ten years to alleviate this and the proposed new development in Hawthorne Field (also known as Stoney Stile) would severely exacerbate the situation.

It should be noted that on Page 82 section 5.1.3 of the Ross Neighbourhood Development Plan (RNDP) it states *‘Development to the south west (of Ross) is currently resisted by Herefordshire Council (which Ross Town Council supports) because of the problems of vehicular access from this direction both into and through the town centre and for landscape sensitivity reasons’*

According to the National Planning Policy Framework (Para 109) *‘A development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks would be severe’*

It should be noted that our objection to this Planning Application is supported by the Transport Department of Herefordshire Council

2) Ecology & Environment

The Ecological Impact Assessment submitted in the planning application is wholly inadequate. It admits that there are 7 species of bats present and concedes that some of these are rare and that the NE corner of the field is classed as a site of high value for bats. Currently the light pollution in this area is minimal and any development with its associated lighting would severely impact on the bat population. The survey to identify if great crested newts are present is also misleading. It states that only 11 ponds out of 20 in the vicinity were inspected and great crested newts were found in one of these ponds. The report concedes that as there is evidence in one pond then there is a possibility of their existence in other ponds. However the Reptile Trust states that farmland forms the most common habitat for great crested newts, in particular pastoral and arable farmland and grassland. In recent years there have been significant and verifiable sightings of great crested newts within metres of Hawthorne Field. Furthermore, there is not a single reference to hedgehogs in the Ecological Impact Assessment. Ross has had an association with hedgehogs for over 1500 years when the area was called Ergyng (which was known as The Land of the Hedgehog). The name Archenfield can be traced back well over a thousand years; in the 9th century the area was known as Urchenesfeld and later Arcenefelde before it eventually became Archenfield. A survey of hedgehogs carried out in Ross three years ago on behalf of Herefordshire Council showed a concentration in the Archenfield area. To reinforce the town’s association with hedgehogs there are 14 depictions of hedgehogs in St Mary’s Church and the hedgehog features on the mayor’s regalia and also on the family crest of John Kyrle (The Man of Ross)

3) Housing Development (Build v Target)

The Herefordshire Local Plan and Core Strategy (Policy RW1) requires delivery of 900 new homes in Ross on Wye by 2031 plus a contingency – a 10% contingency would take this figure up to 990 and a 15% contingency would make it 1035. The latest figures from Herefordshire Council in April 2019 indicate that completions and permissions total 943. According to figures contained in the Ross Neighbourhood Development Plan (RNDP) papers the latest figure for the town is 1071 homes built, committed or planned (this is 119% of the base target) and is marginally below the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recommendation of 120% - which level is stated *‘as enabling councillors*

to resist unwanted or predatory developments.’ Included in the RNDP figures are the 1st Phase of St Mary’s Garden Village (Planning Applications 140684 & 180163) for 290 homes currently under construction (but not the proposed 2nd Phase for 175 homes – Planning Application 194403/O) and the 212 homes at Hildersley Farm Fields (Outline Planning Permission 150930). Also not included in the HCC figures (but included in the RNDP figures) are the proposed developments at Cawdor Arch Road (34 units), Merrivale (20 – 25), Cleeve Lane (16 – 18), Ryefield Site (10 – 12), Ferndale Road (5), Stoney Stile, also known as Hawthorne Field (16), the old Laundry Site on Ledbury Road (32) and the Broadmeadows / Tanyard development (c. 300). The anticipated development of The Chase Hotel site, with 140 units proposed, is also not included at the present time. The above developments, which do not yet have a developer or planning permission total over 700 units and are all anticipated or supported by the RNDP

In total, identified housing provision is demonstrably able to meet local requirements, and could provide in the order of 150% of the town’s requirements from the current HCC Core Strategy

In terms of housing density the planning application calls for 10.6 houses per acre. Houses backing on to Hawthorne Field currently have 2.8 houses per acre in Chase View Road, 3 per acre in Hawthorne Lane and 4 per acre in the area adjacent to Archenfield Road. Based on the 2011 Census the housing density for Ross is 2.1 houses per acre so to maintain this figure for the town the site is suitable for a maximum of 9 houses ! The RNDP requires reference to the character area analysis undertaken as part of the NDP work, which is demonstrably not applied in this instance

4) Infrastructure & Services

In terms of local services the Primary Care Contracting submission on behalf of the Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group states *‘The existing two GP practices do not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the above-mentioned development which could generate an additional 110 residents and increase demand upon existing constrained services’* (the accompanying table shows a current negative capacity).

On the education front John Kyrle High School is currently over capacity in Years 7, 8, 10 and 11 (an average of +17% across 4 year groups)

The above strain on current resources in both the medical support and education is before we take into account the building of 290 houses at St Mary’s Garden Village (Planning Applications 140684 & 180163) and the Hildersley Farm Fields development of 212 houses (Outline Planning Permission 150930), as well as several other proposed residential developments in Ross, including the 2nd Phase of St Mary’s Garden Village which is designed for 175 houses (Planning Application 194403/O) or the proposed development of the Chase Hotel site to accommodate 140 apartments

5) Climate Change

The effects of climate change are already evident in this field. During the period 14th November through to 6th December 2019 there was standing water across a substantial part of this site and the surrounding area was severely water-logged. Since that period there have been frequent occasions when standing water has again been observed. There is nothing in the planning application to explain how this situation will be alleviated.

Given Herefordshire Council’s recent declaration of a Climate Emergency one would also expect to see measures to reduce carbon dioxide as a priority in all future residential developments.

Furthermore, the developer makes no reference to the installation of solar panels, ground source heating, electric car charging points, etc in their application

6) Loss of Green Space

Green spaces are vital for the wellbeing and mental health of the local population. This site is highly-valued by local residents and those from the large housing estate at Roman Way. During the preliminary stages of the RNDP a limited number of households were surveyed and all 20 who responded supported the maintenance of this field as a green space, as did over 80 signatories of the Hawthorne Field Action Group. The spacious, tranquil, characterful nature of the area will be severely diminished if there is no longer the opportunity to use it for exercise, dog walking or walking for relaxation

To Summarise –

- 1) As evidenced in Section (1) above there are major concerns relating to traffic congestion and access in the vicinity of the school. This is reinforced by Herefordshire Council stating that ***‘any development to the south west of Ross should be resisted due to the problems of vehicular access from this direction into and through the town and also for landscape sensitivity reasons.’*** This view is strongly supported by Ross Town Council which has voted unanimously to oppose this application.
- 2) As already indicated the build targets for delivery of new homes through to 2031 in the Herefordshire Local Plan and Core Strategy (Policy RW1) have already been met – and we are still only in 2020 – and there are further substantial housing developments planned to go ahead in the next few years. The Inspector’s report on the Ross Neighbourhood Development Plan confirms (Section 193) that the build target for the town has already been exceeded
- 3) As indicated earlier in this presentation the provision of services is already woefully inadequate with the Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group stating that the GP practices in the town are already overstretched and the secondary school numbers are approximately 17% over their current capacity
- 4) At the time of the deadline for Representations to Herefordshire Council (7th November 2019) there has not been a single submission in support of this Planning Application – every individual submission, plus the signatures of those who signed various petitions and subscribed to the Hawthorne Field Action Group, has objected to this ill-conceived and predatory application. Amongst the respondents there is considerable support for the Ross Neighbourhood Development Plan which lists the substantial benefits associated with Hawthorne Field and recommends a ***‘proposal to allocate the site for a small amount of housing, plus allotments and an open space’***.

Furthermore, Para 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that :

‘Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions’. In every respect this development fails to meet these criteria



On behalf of the Hawthorne Field Action Group

From: Web <web@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 October 2019 22:10
To: Planning Enquiries <planning_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application comment was submitted

The following is a comment on application '**P193478/F**' by '**Mary Deaville**'

Nature of feedback: Objecting to the application

Comment:

Mr And Mrs Deaville
Tresco
Chase View Road
Ross-on-Wye
Herefordshire
HR9 5BQ

Planning Services
Herefordshire Council
PO Box 4
HR4 0XH

21st October 2019

For the attention of Principle Planning Officer, Heather Carlisle, Case officer

Dear Sir/Madam,

Reference: PLANNING APPLICATION NO P193478/F
PLANNING PORTAL REF PP-08047841

Proposed demolition of stable, out buildings and proposed residential development of 46 single and two storey dwellings with associated hard and soft landscaping in the land off Middleton Avenue, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire , (also known to residents as Hawthorne Field, Planners also quote Stoney Stile), by the applicant Mr Mat Vye, EG Carter & Co Ltd Bybrook House Lower Tuffley Lane Gloucester GL2 5EE, (Agent: Miss Beth Hamblett, Quatro Design Architects Ltd)

We have lived bordering this land since [REDACTED] and, having examined the proposed plans, we have a strong objection to the above planning application.

Traffic Issues: I have issues with the Traffic surveys done ..

CrashMap 2.5 and 2.6 Fig 2.3 Local Highway Safety, Cotswold Transport Planning Ltd. This reports" no personal injury collisions were recorded in the vicinity of the application site during the study period of 5 years"

1. They only seem to have assessed Middleton Avenue, and not Redhill Rd and the main Archenfield Rd that they have a junction at. This is not taking into account the extra parking down Archenfield Road during busy periods. Archenfield Road serves many heavy duty tractors visiting and delivering produce from and to the farms at Hom Green, along with the Ross-on-Wye – Monmouth bus and other bus routes. These Large vehicles aside, the amount of traffic that uses this road is evident in the constant pot holes and other repairs required for Archenfield Road. Whether the traffic is busy or not, you drive up and down the road with blind areas, not knowing if something is coming the other way or not and, if you have a space to pull in out of the way, if there is. Not assessing these other roads is a serious mistake and one that may well cause further incidents.

2. Due to residents and visitors parking on the road, Middleton Avenue, Redhill Road and the Main Archenfield Road are basically single file traffic.. With Ashfield Park Primary School /Nursery, which is the largest primary school in Ross-on-Wye, also being situated on Redhill Road, this poses a significant traffic problem. School mornings and finish times are horrendous, and cars and school bus/coaches are regularly held up and causing a blockage. Although the school day starts at 08:55 and ends at 15:15, due to the above traffic issues, parents start to arrive much earlier than required up to the time the children need to arrive, sometimes up to 1 hr. There is a Nursery in this school that operates on morning and afternoon shifts, so lunchtime swap over of children also causes a problem. The school already has traffic cones and big signs asking people not to park along outside the school, which is at a junction of Middleton Avenue, and also asks parents to use an unofficial one way system to help, which suggests the current traffic issues are already a problem.

3. Emergency vehicles already struggle to gain access and park to attend to their purpose. When they do stop they cause further delay and blockage due to the single file traffic and parking on the bend in Middleton Ave, (where the proposed access will exacerbate the issue.

4. The planners seem to explain this away by suggesting the government wants people to use public transport and walk more. This is extremely hard when you have young children with no road sense attending nursery and lower primary. Not to mention the parents who have to get children to the Primary and Secondary schools at the same time at opposite ends of town.

5. The driving access from and to Archenfield Rd via Redhill Rd and Middleton Avenue are already stressed with limited access and visibility issues, and drivers on the Archenfield Rd, do not tend to drive sensitively with a school in close proximity. This makes it already dangerous to drive and walk to and from the school.

Archenfield Road also has parents parking for St Josephs School at the Walford Road end.

6. There are currently 26 houses in Middleton Avenue, 17 houses in Redhill Rd and 4 houses in Castle Meadow, near the school, giving a total of 47 houses and 96 possible parking spaces, including driveways and there already is a problem. How do you think adding another 46 houses and a probable 98 residents cars is going to help the problem?

Habitat and Green Space issues –

From above the satellite view seems to show more green areas than is actually usable by the residents and public visiting the area, due to neighboring fields being used for farming & agricultural use. Therefore this field is very valuable to us as a usable green space to visit the horses, watch the night sky uninterrupted by light pollution, being blessed by the volume of wildlife inhabiting the field. The following Government green space link quotes:

<https://publichealthmatters.blog.gov.uk/2016/11/09/green-space-mental-wellbeing-and-sustainable-communities/> “We’ve known for some time that good quality natural landscape in urban areas can affect how people feel. It reduces stress and sadness, lifts the mood and makes us feel better.”

I have been investigating the supporting documents provided by the planning application and, specifically the Ecological Impact Assessment (where I have found my information). This proposal suggests it is OK to destroy valuable habitat for bats, great crested newts and dormice.... Just because they state there are low numbers of some rare bat species and Great crested newts, does not mean they have any less value, in fact it supports the need to protect their habitat because of their low numbers.

BATS: The Ecological Impact Assessment has identified 7 bat species: Pipistrellus pipistrellus; pipistrellus pygmaeus; Noctalus noctule (flight path issues as it flies in a straight line very fast); Myotis sp – (possible rare/extinct); plecotus sp - results of 172 passes in a 3hr survey.

Also 2 species listed on Conservation of Habitats and species regulations 2010: - Rhinolophus hipposideros & Rhinolophus ferrumequinum – results 7 passes in all three survey locations NE/SE/SW.

The assessment noted that it was difficult to identify individual myotis species with the methods used on this assessment, and therefore, the myotis calls identified were not included in their analysis data table. Their opinion was that NE corner or site was classed as high value for bats and that SE and SW was regarded as moderate value. They give a verdict of a ‘High negative impact at a local level’, as their opinion regarding this site. Baring in mind that the Lesser and Greater horsehoe bat has been sited and a positive report for the Myotis species, (Myotis myotis was considered extinct in 1990, but a solitary individual has been hibernating in southern England since 2002 as quoted from online UK Bat species

<https://www.bats.org.uk/about-bats/what-are-bats/uk-bats>), Would it not be prudent to protect the habitat for these beautiful creatures. If a bat species is in decline, it takes a long time for it to make a significant recovery since a female only bears one young each birth. Since they have not tried to ascertain which species of Myotis bat is present on this site, could it be possible we have a myotis myotis in Ross-on-Wye?

GREAT CRESTED NEWTS: Since only 1 out of the available 20 ponds have been surveyed , I suggest there is insufficient accurate evidence to complete a study for this site with regard to the Great Crested Newt. Just quoting that, since there are a low number of endangered newts been present is not enough reason to destroy their habitat in the hope they will move to a new planting of immature hedgerow etc. Why

“risk the possible killing and destroying of habitat of these species” (point 4.4.7 Ecological Impact Assessment, without mitigation) . Have we not learnt from our recycling issues endangering the species on land and in the sea, that we are visitors on the land and have no right to destroy creatures lives and homes for our own greed.

DOORMICE:- EIA 4.7.2 and 4.7.3; Citing that local cats prey on dormice may reduce the likelihood that dormice will be present on site is not a viable reason for destroying their habitat.

HEDGEHOGS: - Archenfield Road was given its name because it means Hedgehog Field, deriving from the Latin name for Hedgehog, of which it is Ross-on-Wyres most recognized symbol, as seen on numerous coats of arms. It is no accident that there are field nearby that are homes to hedgehogs. In fact, hedgehog houses have been built on site to provide shelter. This proposed building will destroy their habitat and homes.

Proposed buildings –

Replacement Habitat Hedgerow: We object to the Cyprus 3m width hedgerow running along the northern boundary, on the basis that Leland cyprys hedging can reach a height of up to 35m without proper maintenance, (which you are forbidding pruning by farmers and residents), this will obstruct the beautiful view of the farmers field, of which it is full of colour when crops are in bloom. This is in direct opposition of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2011-2031) as quoted in (point 3.5.9 Landscape and Visual Appraisal) Policy SS6 and in the National Planning Policy Framework June 2019 (point 3.5.2 Landscape and Visual Appraisal).

Access through to neighboring fields: We also object to the small kissing gate entrance at the North of the site to the farmers field being replaced with a large gate, allowing vehicular access, not previously been allowed. See Drawing no 5385-P-800 (between Plot 40-41 and plot 42), Indicative Street Scene.

Utilities: In the RNDP letter from Ryan Norman of Welsh Water states “5A.3 Stoney Stile (Hawthorne Field) there would be no issues providing a supply of water to the site” referring to less than 15 units” This does not mean 46 units!

We are not convinced that there are sufficient plans in place to cover drainage of the excess run off from the non porous roads being built and avoid flooding to our property and neighboring gardens.

Windows on the rear elevations of the two storey, 4 bedroom house plot #27 and the 3 bedroom houses plots #25 & #26,(of which there are 3 of on each building), are overlooking our garden and neighbors gardens removing our privacy. Our House, (Tresco, Chase View Road), is a bungalow with a manageable boundary hedge height for us of 1.4m (width .5m), allowing us to view and interact with the horses and fields, and it also gives light to our garden and house in the mornings. Any higher hedge would be hard to maintain and severely impede the light we receive. Not wanting to be a NIMBY but one of the reasons we bought the house, ■■■ years ago, was for the quietness and the view that we were blessed with.

Personal opinion: It is with great distress that we hear that the land between Hawthorn Lane up to Ashfield Park Primary School has been selected for planning. It is known locally by residents as the Horse field / Hawthorne Field because horses reside, graze and interact with people visiting the field. Out of my window I regularly see the horses in the field, rabbits running free, birds of prey (Owls, buzzards and sparrow hawks), looking for food and sitting on the posts, a numerous variety of birds flying around, swallows also nest in the stables area, I have seen foxes, hedgehogs, bats, butterflies, bees, ducks, not to mention the dogs that people walk and have the freedom to run free off the lead. We have also had the opportunity to have sheep graze on the fields. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] this view is amazingly beneficial to us. When we are in the garden, the horses put their head over the hedge, rabbits and hedgehogs visit and bats fly overhead at night. My daughter has a telescope and due to the fact our area is not greatly lit from lamp posts, the area above the field can be quite a dark place allowing us to see numerous stars in the sky, again we find this uplifting. We sit in the garden and see the occasional comet and then a bat or too fly over us. We often visit the horses, walk our dog [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Have you considered the noise pollution, (and extra visiting construction vehicles), for residents of this peaceful area while building is taking place? Have you considered the effects of disturbing harmful chemicals found in the ground on site? Will removal of these substances cause any further health issues by being airborne?

Finally, please note that our submission is in respect of the proposed development. While we have taken every effort to present accurate information for your consideration, as we are not the decision maker or statutory consul tee, we cannot be held accountable for unintentional errors or omissions and you should satisfy yourselves on any facts before reaching your decision.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Mary Deaville Mr Gary Deaville

Mr Michael Deaville Kimberly Deaville

Attachment:


House_and_car_survey_data_Middleton_Ave_and_Redhill_Rd.xlsx

Their contact details are as follows:

First name: Mary

Last name: Deaville

Telephone: [Response - Telephone]

Email: 

Postcode: HR9 5BQ

Address: Tresco, Chase View Road

Ross-on-Wye

Herefordshire

Link Id:

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=193478

House and car survey by Mary Deaville

Middleton Ave

Redhill Road

House No	Drive Car space	Road Car space	comment	House No	Drive Car space	Road Car space	comment
3 Duxmere Villas	4			38	0		Opposite schl no rd parking
25	1			39	0		Opposite schl no rd parking
26	1	5		40	1		
27	1			41			
28	3			Lane End	2		
29	2			No name	1		
30	2		On access bend	Sunview	1		
31	1	2		Langdrew	2		
32	1	2		8	0		
33	0			6	2		
34	1	2		7	2		
35	2	2		Elmcroft	1		
36	1			5	1	6	
9a	0	1		Tara	3		
10	1			4	2		
11	1			3	1	2	
12	1	3		2	0	2	but at end of Jnct of Redhill/Archenfield
13	0						
14	0	1					
15	1	2					
16	1	1					
17	1	2					
18	0						
19	1						
20	0	5					
2 Duxmere Villa	4						
	<u>31</u>	<u>28</u>			<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	
New access entrance		-4	spaces				

Number of Middleton Ave Houses	Number of Redhill Rd/Castle Meadow	96	Total possible parking
26	17 + 4	-4	
		92	if planning goes ahead
		47	Total Number of houses