

**CORPORATE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES**

Director: Mrs. J.E. Jones

**TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

Your Ref:

Our Ref: AMcL/CD

Please ask for: Mrs. C. Dyer

Direct Line/Extension: (01432) 260222

Fax: (01432) 260249

E-mail: [cdyer@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:cdyer@herefordshire.gov.uk)

1st February, 2007

Dear Councillor,

**YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED** to attend the meeting of the County of Herefordshire District Council to be held on **FRIDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 2007** at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford. at **10.30 a.m.** at which the business set out in the attached agenda is proposed to be transacted.

Yours sincerely,



**A. McLAUGHLIN**  
**HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**





# A G E N D A

## COUNCIL

Date: **Friday, 9th February, 2007**

---

Time: **10.30 a.m.**

---

Place: **The Council Chamber,  
Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,  
Hereford.**

---

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

*For any further information please contact:*

*Christine Dyer, Democratic Services  
Manager*

**Tel: 01432 260222, e-mail:  
[cdyer@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:cdyer@herefordshire.gov.uk)**

---



# AGENDA

## for the Meeting of the COUNCIL

To: All Members of the Council

|  | Pages     |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. PRAYERS</b>  |           |
| <b>2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b><br>To receive apologies for absence.   |           |
| <b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b><br>To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on this Agenda.   |           |
| <b>4. MINUTES</b><br>To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd November, 2006.  | 1 - 14    |
| <b>5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</b><br>To receive the Chairman's announcements and petitions from members of the public.  |           |
| <b>6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b><br>To receive questions from members of the public.   | 15 - 20   |
| <b>7. QUESTIONS TO THE CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b><br>To receive any written questions.   |           |
| <b>8. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b><br>To consider any Notices of Motion.  |           |
| <b>9. CABINET</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meetings held on 16th November, 14th and 21st December, 2006 and 18th January, 2007.          | 21 - 82   |
| <b>10. PLANNING COMMITTEE</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meetings held on 30th October and 24th November, 2006 and 19th January, 2007.     | 83 - 88   |
| <b>11. REGULATORY COMMITTEE</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meetings held on 31st October and 28th November, 2006 and 30th January, 2007.   | 89 - 92   |
| <b>12. AUDIT AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meetings held on 8th December, 2006 and 19th January, 2007. | 93 - 96   |
| <b>13. STRATEGIC MONITORING COMMITTEE</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meetings held on 22nd December, 2006 and 15th January, 2007.          | 97 - 106  |
| <b>14. STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b><br>To receive the report and to consider any recommendations to Council arising from the meeting held on 12th January, 2007.  | 107 - 110 |

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>15. COUNCILLOR P.G. TURPIN - VALLETTS WARD: LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 85</b>   | <b>111 - 112</b> |
| To consider granting Councillor P.G. Turpin leave of absence until May 2007 because of ill health.  |                  |
| <b>16. WEST MERCIA POLICE AUTHORITY</b>   | <b>113 - 120</b> |
| To receive the report of the meeting of the West Mercia Police Authority held on 19th December, 2006. Councillor B. Hunt has been nominated for the purpose of answering questions on the discharge of the functions of the Police Authority. |                  |
| <b>17. HEREFORD &amp; WORCESTER FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY</b>   | <b>121 - 126</b> |
| To receive the report of the meetings of the Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority held on 14th December, 2006.  |                  |

# **The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings**

## **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -**

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

## **Please Note:**

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The meeting venue is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

## **Public Transport Links**

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service runs approximately every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning the officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.



Where possible this agenda is printed on paper made from 100% Post-Consumer waste. De-inked without bleaching and free from optical brightening agents (OBA). Awarded the Nordic Swan for low emissions during production and the Blue Angel environmental label.



## **COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.**

### **FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point J which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.



**MINUTES of the meeting of COUNCIL held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford. on Friday, 3rd November, 2006 at 10.30 a.m.**

**Present:** Councillor J.W. Edwards (Chairman)  
Councillor J. Stone (Vice Chairman)

**Councillors:** Mrs. P.A. Andrews, B.F. Ashton, Mrs. W.U. Attfield, Mrs. L.O. Barnett, W.L.S. Bowen, R.B.A. Burke, A.C.R. Chappell, Mrs. S.P.A. Daniels, P.J. Dauncey, Mrs. C.J. Davis, G.W. Davis, P.J. Edwards, D.J. Fleet, Mrs. J.P. French, J.H.R. Goodwin, Mrs. A.E. Gray, K.G. Grumbley, P.E. Harling, J.W. Hope MBE, B. Hunt, T.W. Hunt, Mrs. J.A. Hyde, T.M. James, J.G. Jarvis, Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, G. Lucas, R.M. Manning, R.I. Matthews, J.C. Mayson, R. Mills, J.W. Newman, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, R.J. Phillips, Ms. G.A. Powell, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, D.W. Rule MBE, Miss F. Short, R.V. Stockton, Mrs E.A. Taylor, J.P. Thomas, W.J.S. Thomas, Ms. A.M. Toon, W.J. Walling, D.B. Wilcox, A.L. Williams, J.B. Williams and R.M. Wilson

**40. PRAYERS**

In the absence of the Dean of Hereford, the Very Reverend Peter Haynes led the Council in prayer.

**41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs. E.M. Bew, H. Bramer, M.R. Cunningham, N.J.J. Davies, J.G.S. Guthrie, Brig. P. Jones, CBE, R Preece, D.C. Taylor and P. Turpin.

**42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor W.L.S. Bowen declared a personal interest in the report on the Public Service Trust at Agenda Item 9(b), paragraph 1.1(iii) as a non-executive member of the National Health Service.

**43. MINUTES**

Before signing the minutes of the meeting held on 28th July, 2006, the Chairman proposed that Minute 28, Page 8, final paragraph be amended to read: "...Councillor Mrs. French expressed sadness at Councillor Hunt's response and again encouraged Members to use the service and report any failings to her."

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 28th July, 2006 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**44. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman announced that the Council had received an ISO 14001 certificate in recognition of its environmental performance. He presented the certificate to Councillor P.J. Edwards, Cabinet Member (Environment) who praised the Council, its employees and the officers in the sustainability team who had all played their part in gaining the certificate.

The Chairman asked Council to note that the next Civic Service was to be held on 11th March, 2007. He said that the arrangements were being finalised and further details and invitations would be sent out well in advance of the date.

He drew Council's attention to the new leaflet "Thinking of becoming a Herefordshire Councillor?" aimed at prospective candidates in the May 2007 elections and advised that further copies were available from the Members Support Office.

The Council joined the Chairman in congratulating Councillor Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes on being granted the Freedom of the City of London.

#### 45. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Under the Constitution a member of the public can ask a Cabinet Member or Chairman of a Committee any question relevant to a matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties, or which affects the County, as long as a copy of the question is deposited with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services more than six clear working days before the meeting. One question had been received and included in the agenda. The question and response is set out below:

Question from Mr. C.J. Grover, Bromyard

##### **BROMYARD HOUSEHOLD WASTE SITE**

*As the members of the Council are aware several million pounds of the long term Waste Disposal Contract were spent between, I believe, 1999 and 2002 upgrading sites throughout the county. The Bromyard one in particular provides an excellent service to the local community. It has however one major drawback which is the deteriorating condition of the approach road which is in an extremely bad state of repair and a disgrace for any self respecting organisation. Nobody has made any attempt to carry out maintenance in the last six years although one or two potholes on probably the best part were filled in with concrete a couple of weeks ago.*

*The official response from the Chairman of Planning and local Ward Councillor is that the road is owned by different people and it is therefore too difficult to do anything until the UDP is finally approved and the site will be improved. I would say from the date of this question it would be very optimistic to quote two years for this improvement even to start. This site road is pounded at least three times a week by the heavy skip trucks and will continue to deteriorate. It is amazing that none of the three owners of the road have ever been approached by the Council concerning maintenance since the site was built.*

*Clearly there is a difficulty over ownership and the degree of responsibility the Waste Disposal firm has but the question is how much longer are the Council prepared to ignore the situation since they chose the site and are, as we ratepayers see it, ultimately responsible."*

Councillor P.J. Edwards, Cabinet Member (Environment) accepted that the site access road was not ideal. He explained that the access to the site did not belong to the Council. He advised that the Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards and the Head of Property Services in conjunction with the Council's Waste Management Contractors would be approaching the owners of the road to discuss the best way to secure improvements both in the short-term and in the longer-term.

**46. QUESTIONS TO THE CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Councillors may ask questions of Cabinet Members and Chairmen of Committees so long as a copy of the question is deposited with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. A list of questions, set out in the order in which they had been received, was circulated at the beginning of the meeting. Councillors may also, at the discretion of the Chairman, ask one additional question on the same topic.

**Question asked by Councillor D.C. Taylor - for the Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation)**

*"I understand that the Madley Parish Council have been consulted about the removal of two 100 metre lengths of hedge and provision of post and rail fencing. Also two 30 metre lengths of tarmac on the Madley to Bridge Sollars Road. Could he advise me when this work is to start as traffic when two large vehicles meet is horrendous?"*

**Councillor D.B. Wilcox, Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation)**

confirmed that discussions had taken place with Madley Parish Council regarding the need to improve the C1098 Madley to Bridge Sollars road by the introduction of two additional passing places. The proposed scheme would provide two passing places, one each side of the carriageway, at different locations in the vicinity of Bage Farm. He advised that, in order to facilitate this work and improve visibility, it would be necessary to remove a total of approximately 200 metres of hedgerow (100 metres on either side of the road) and either, erect post and rail fencing or re-plant the hedge, set back from the road.

Subject to all the necessary permissions being granted and agreement being reached with the landowner, it was hoped to be able to commence the works during the current financial year with a start date anticipated in March 2007.

**Question asked by Councillor Mrs. E.A. Taylor**

*"When checking on-line it's clear from the May agenda, that the November meeting takes place on the 10th November and there is nothing on the Agenda of 28th July to indicate a change of date. As there is so much criticism of the council of late, it is even more important to engage with the public and not exclude them. I note from the Agenda there is only one question from members of the public and that is from an ex-cabinet member.*

*My question to council is, "How have the Council informed the 170,000 people who live in Herefordshire of the change of date of the next Council meeting?"*

Councillor R.J. Phillips, the Leader of the Council said that the change of date had been approved by Council at its meeting on 28th July and the date had been changed on the Council's website within a week of the decision. He advised that the normal method of giving members of the public advance notice of meetings of the council is through a notice of public meetings which is issued fortnightly. The revised date had been included in these notices (which are issued to all Info Shops, Area Offices, Libraries and media) since the beginning of September, this being the first notice to cover November meetings. He also advised that Council was required by statute to give at least five clear working days' notice of any meetings open to the public.

**Question asked by Councillor Mrs. S. Robertson**

*"I note that the Grafton Works and the Burcott Depot have been vacant for a considerable time with a loss of income to the Council as these sites could have been let.*

*(a) Why has this occurred and*

*(b) What is being done to rectify the position."*

Councillor M. Wilson, Cabinet Member (Resources) replied that neither depot was actually vacant.

The **Grafton Depot** was being used by FOCSA, the Council's waste collection contractor who has offices at the rear of the garage and mess facilities in the original Depot as well as using the depot for overnight parking of its fleet. He advised that negotiations have been underway for some time about proposals to relocate FOCSA to Rotherwas in the New Year and dispose of the Grafton Depot site.

The **Burcott Depot** is at present being used by Wrekin Construction, as their equipment and bulk material storage site, whilst they carry out the works in High Town. The site is being disposed of and Solicitors are nearing completion of the conveyance. In addition the prospective purchaser has submitted a planning application for a new office block. Exchange of contracts should take place early in December with completion by the end of the year.

He advised that the sale of both sites would produce capital income for the Council and end ongoing liabilities.

**Questions asked by Councillor Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes**

*"What consultation was carried out with the public prior to the decision being made on the Rotherwas Relief Road?"*

Councillor D.B. Wilcox, Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation) replied that the public, including employees and businesses on the Rotherwas Industrial Estate, had been consulted on the proposed Rotherwas Access Road at several stages during the development of the scheme prior to the recent decision to proceed with implementation. This had included consultation carried out during the preparation of the Council's first Local Transport Plan 2001/2 to 2005/6 (published in July 2000) and the second Local Transport Plan 2006/7 to 2010/11 (published in March 2006), both of which had identified the scheme as the Council's top priority major highway scheme.

He said that a variety of methods had been used to provide opportunities for as many people as possible to respond. During the development of both Local Transport Plans, all households had received an informative leaflet explaining the process, key aspects and including a questionnaire allowing residents to make comments on their priorities. Presentations had also been given to all Local Area Forums (known now as Community Forums) and feedback had also been encouraged through the Council's website. Consultation and involvement had also been carried out with stakeholders through the Herefordshire Partnership and other stakeholder groups. Direct consultation had been carried out with employers and employees on the Rotherwas Industrial Estate, through questionnaire surveys and meetings on the estate, which had consistently shown support for the provision of an access road.

Formal consultation, by means of public notices, had been undertaken as part of the planning process, prior to Planning Permission being granted in February 2003 and also in relation to the Side Roads Order and Compulsory Purchase Orders for the scheme that had been published in March 2005 and the subject of a public inquiry in January 2006.

In response to a further question about consultation with the residents in the area, Councillor Wilcox said that leaflets had been sent to all households, with visits to over 4,000 homes. Petitions had been raised in High Town and other areas of the city. Consultation had taken place over a period of six years with very little response from the residents. There had been a full Public Inquiry and consultation through Herefordshire Matters. He failed to see how the Council had fallen short in terms of consultation.

### **Question from Councillor Mrs. Lloyd-Hayes**

*"How does the Council intend to improve its engagement with the public?"*

Councillor Mrs. J.P. French Cabinet Member (Corporate and Customer Services and Human Resources) said that the Council had done much to improve the way it engaged with residents, to understand their views and needs, so that they may influence policy and services. The Council's community involvement strategy sets out, for now and the future, stringent quality standards for engaging a range of groups. She cited the Disability Equality Forum and the Youth Council as examples.

She advised that regular customer satisfaction surveys informed changes to service delivery in areas such as waste management, local bus provision and libraries and Info Shops.

There was also extensive consultation on the Local Transport Plan and the views of those working in communities are gathered through the Voluntary Sector Assembly. Consultation on the new Herefordshire Community Strategy included talking to people face to face. The Herefordshire Conversation involved several group sessions, and the Council has a citizens' panel of 1,254 residents, which it intend to consult more often face to face. Planning applications are consulted upon using statutory processes and the recently published Statement of Community Involvement includes an increasing emphasis on face-to-face consultations. New Community Forums, together with West Mercia Police, will engage people on issues of local concern.

She advised that the Council is working across statutory and voluntary sector partners, to share information, to jointly consult and share best practice in consultation and there is full co-operation between social care and the Primary Care Trust to improve our consultations and the use of information about vulnerable residents.

She said that there is a vast range of information on how the council engages and consults the public on the council's website and stated that staff have recently received training on the use of plain English; summary leaflets such as the latest one on Council finances have been appreciated; and the Council is currently working on improving information for Members to help them brief residents in their Wards.

She also said that e-mail was an important tool in the age of 24/7 media.

Councillor Mrs. Lloyd-Hayes said she was pleased that young people were part of the consultation process and asked if the money raised through the closure of youth

centres in the north of the city could be used to fund a skatepark.

Councillor French said she noted the points made but it was not for her to comment on matters outside her area of responsibility.

**Question asked by Councillor W.L.S. Bowen**

*"Is the Cabinet Member for Housing aware of South Shropshire District Council's affordable Housing Policies?"*

*"Is it possible that some of these policies can be used to advantage in Herefordshire? If so, how soon could these policies for the improvement and greater provision of affordable housing in Herefordshire be instituted?"*

Councillor Mrs. L.O. Barnett, Cabinet Member (Social Care Adults and Housing) said that she was aware of the provisions of the interim planning guidance on affordable housing for South Shropshire. She said that the guidance was non-statutory at this stage and did not form part of adopted statutory planning policy.

She also said that the Council would continue to closely monitor new approaches by other local authorities to affordable housing, and when these new approaches demonstrated their worth and were aligned with national and regional policy, their suitability for this County would be assessed and policies brought forward as part of the Council's Local Development Framework.

**47. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There were no Notices of Motion.

**48. CABINET**

The Chairman indicated that he intended to take any discussion on the Rotherwas Relief Road and Rotherwas Futures at Item 9.1 on page 31 of the agenda. This included any questions on the call-in of the decision as set out in the report of the Strategic Monitoring Committee on page 39 of the agenda.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor R.J. Phillips, presented the report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 7th and 28th September and 12th October, 2006.

**In relation to Item 5.1 Building Schools for the Future** - A local Member expressed his pleasure about the grant to the Minster College, Leominster and urged the Council to take note of the public consultation exercise particularly people's views on Westfield School.

**In relation to Item 7.1(i) Integrated Performance Report** - In response to a comment on partner organisations' performance, Councillor Mrs. J.P. French, Cabinet Member (Corporate and Customer Services and Human Resources) replied that performance management and interrogation of reports was very important. The Council and partners were jointly responsible for delivering on certain targets and both needed to be held to account. She said she would be happy to assist any Councillors to understand the figures.

The Cabinet Member (Social Care Adult and Housing) agreed to speak to a Member after the meeting about a particular instance in which it was alleged that homeless people were being actively discouraged from registering as homeless. She agreed that homelessness was a very serious issue. The Leader stated the Council could not abdicate its responsibility for homelessness but the issue was a national problem



that required primary legislation from central government.

**In relation to Item 9.1 Rotherwas Futures and Rotherwas Access Road** - In response to a query about alternative funding options for the Rotherwas Access Road (other than housing developments) the Leader said that the development of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and the building of the access road was vital to the future economic viability of the County. Various other options for funding the projects had been considered. These included:

- **Selling the Industrial Estate or other assets of the Council.** This had been rejected because of the implications of the loss of revenue. The sale of the Industrial Estate alone would mean a loss of £1 million a year. The only way to recoup this would be by raising Council Tax, something the Council was keen to avoid as it would put an unacceptable financial strain on the people of Herefordshire.
- **Increasing the Council Tax** - the Council is aware that it needs to limit the amount of Council Tax increases in order to reduce the tax burden on the people of Herefordshire.

The only viable option was to negotiate with the housing developers on their contribution towards the development of much needed infrastructure.

Councillor T.M. James, Leader of the Liberal Democrats, said that this matter had been fully debated at the previous meeting of Council on 28th July, 2006. He did not think there were any alternatives. The majority of the Council had been in favour of the principle of the scheme. He said that none of the alternative options: raising Council Tax, cutting services or selling revenue producing assets was viable.

The Local Ward Member, Councillor W.J.S. Thomas said he had contested two elections and on both occasions there had been major discussions about the building of an access road at Rotherwas. He said businesses in the area deserved a vote of thanks for their patience and that the economic viability of the county depended on the road and the Rotherwas Futures scheme. He spoke in favour of housing development as a means of funding the access road.

Councillor D.W. Rule, the Cabinet Member (Children and Young People) said that young people in Herefordshire were doing well educationally and in vocational training and needed good jobs to encourage them to remain in the County.

The Leader concluded the discussion by saying that the County needed to take advantage of the funding provided by Advantage West Midlands and that those who frustrated the project would be held to account.

**In relation to Item 11 - Rural Regeneration and Strategy** - in response to a query the Cabinet Member assured Council that he was continuing to press Government very hard on the issue of rural post offices.

The Leader then presented the Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 26th October, 2006.

**It relation to item 1.1(iii) - Public Service Trust, Herefordshire** - Councillor James, the Leader of the Liberal Democrats, supported the proposals in the report. Councillor A.C.R. Chappell, Leader of the Labour Group - also lent his support to the proposals saying it would be an opportunity for more democracy in health and social care. He said that the Council would face many criticisms from the public and it would be necessary to persuade them that this was the best thing for them and for

the County, but that it would take time to get it right. He regretted that Mental Health was not included in the plans.

Councillor Mrs. Barnet, Cabinet Member (Social Care Adults and Health) endorsed Councillor Chappell's views.

Councillor Mrs. French, Cabinet Member (Corporate and Customer Services and Human Resources) advised that it would be necessary to consult with staff in the Council and the PCT and keep them fully informed of progress. She warned that although there was a tight timeframe, any slippage should be avoided. She said that the formation of a Public Service Trust would mean a better service for residents.

Councillor W.J.S. Thomas, Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee also lent his support to the proposals and encouraged Members to attend any seminars on the subject. He said this would be the most important decision to be taken by the Council over the next 12 months and said it was a great opportunity for the Council and the PCT to work together for the good of all the residents in Herefordshire.

Councillor J.G. Jarvis sounded a note of caution as he had been involved in a similar proposal in another Council and that scheme had been sabotaged and had eventually collapsed.

The Leader stated that the proposals would lead to genuine savings and improved services. He warned that if the scheme did not go ahead that the Government, in the light of proposals in the new Local Government White Paper, might look again at the viability of Herefordshire continuing as a unitary authority. He also spoke of the need to integrate the Council's Herefordshire Connects programme into the proposals for the Public Service Trust.

**RESOLVED: That the reports from the meetings of Cabinet held on 7th and 28th September and 12th and 26th October, 2006 be received.**

#### **49. REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

Councillor R.I. Mathews presented the report of the meetings of the Regulatory Committee held on 9th August and 26th September, 2006.

He drew the Council's attention to the progress made in relation to Public Path Diversion Orders.

In response to a query about taxis registered in neighbouring counties operating in Herefordshire, he confirmed that these taxis were not allowed to tout for business or use taxi ranks, but acknowledged that it was difficult to monitor and enforce. He urged any Members who knew of such activity to report it to him for further investigation.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meetings of the Regulatory Committee held on 9th August and 26th September, 2006 be received.**

#### **50. PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Councillor T.W. Hunt presented the report of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 25th August and 29th September, 2006.

Councillor Hunt reminded Council of a seminar on Planning Obligations to be held on Monday, 13th November at 2.00 p.m.

He responded to a number of comments and queries as follows:

Retrospective applications - He confirmed that officers were involved in discussions and working towards solutions, particularly in relation to large developers.

Estech - He confirmed that he felt the Estech application should have been dealt with by the main Planning Committee because it involved a strategic element which involved the whole county.

When a question was posed about the future of Area Planning Sub-Committees, the Chief Executive intervened and advised that any discussion which involved an amendment to the Constitution would have to follow the proper procedure and could not be debated at Council without proper notice.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 25th August and 29th September, 2006 be received.**

#### **51. STRATEGIC MONITORING COMMITTEE**

Councillor T.M. James presented the report of the meetings of the Strategic Monitoring Committee held on 15th September and 16th October, 2006.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meetings of the Strategic Monitoring Committee held on 15th September and 16th October, 2006 be received.**

#### **52. AUDIT AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

Councillor A.C.R. Chappell presented the report of the meeting of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee held on 22nd September, 2006.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meeting of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee held on 22nd September, 2006 be received.**

#### **53. INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

The Chief Executive presented the report of the Panel which had met to review the current Members' Allowance Scheme and to make recommendations which would take effect from the elections in May 2007. He explained that the report was being presented at this time, rather than after the Elections, as it would be clear that those voting would not automatically benefit from the decision. He explained that the Panel did not revisit the basic principles of the scheme but confined their discussion to the suitability of the allowances compared to other authorities of a similar nature and with neighbouring authorities and to those Committees where the workload has increased, or was expected to increase, significantly.

In response to a request that Vice-Chairmen be given an allowance, he explained that government guidance placed a restriction of the number of Special Responsibility Allowances that could be granted and if Vice-Chairmen were to be included this number would be exceeded. He said the Panel had considered this point and was of the view that if the Vice-Chairman was undertaking a substantial workload there should be an informal arrangement between Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen to recompense this. One Committee Chairman said he would be prepared to do this.

One Councillor suggested that Cabinet Members should be paid a higher allowance with adjustments made elsewhere to stay within the proposed budget. The Leader advised that the allowance paid to Cabinet Members and the Leader had been voluntarily frozen over the last three years.

One Councillor felt that the basic allowance was still too low to attract younger people and that the workload was such that it was difficult for anyone who was employed to take on the role.

The Chief Executive confirmed that the Panel had discussed many of these issues, but that government guidelines did not allow them to make recommendations on higher figures. He confirmed that the Council could approve allowances below the level of the recommendations of the Panel but it would be unwise to go much above the recommendations because of public perception if the Council was to ignore the advice of an Independent Panel.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel held on 19th October, 2006 be received and**

**THAT (a) the Basic Allowance be amended to £7,000 (current £6,165);**

**(b) Special Responsibility Allowances be amended as follows:**

|               |                                  |
|---------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>£27,000 (current £26,586)</b> |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>£11,000 (current £10,635)</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>£8,500 (current £8,212)</b>   |
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>£1,500 (current £1,368)</b>   |

**(c) Special Responsibility Allowances be attached to the following at the Band Indicated:**

- (i) Chairman of Audit and Corporate Governance Committee – Band 3 (pro rata 50 %);**
- (ii) Chairman of Regulatory Committee – Band 3;**
- (iii) Chairman of Standards Committee – Band 3 (pro rata 50%);**

**(d) the Childcare and Dependent Carers' Allowance be set at the current market hourly rates;**

**(e) no change be made to the Members' Travel and Subsistence allowances which is currently set within the scale of rates used by the Inland Revenue;**

**(f) Members' Allowances should not be subject to performance related measurement;**

**(g) new and existing Members be given every encouragement to adopt the use of ICT in their work as Councillors.**

The revised scheme of allowances which will take effect after the May 2007 elections is attached at Appendix 1 for ease of reference.

#### **54. STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Robert Rogers, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. David Stevens presented the report of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 20th October, 2006.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 20th October, 2006 be received.**

**55. WEST MERCIA POLICE AUTHORITY**

Councillor B. Hunt presented the report of the West Mercia Police Authority held on 26th September, 2006.

Councillor Hunt responded to a number of queries and comments as follows:

Stop Search - He reported that, generally, West Mercia Police Officers conducting stop searches were polite and helpful but often stop searches were carried out in contentious circumstances and whereas some of those being stopped and searched co-operated with the police officers, others did not. Police officers had discretion to respond to these situations accordingly.

Neighbourhood Watch Officers - He said the response was often down to who was contacted. There did not appear to be an agreed standard of response. He would take this up.

Removal of speed camera on Aylestone Hill, Hereford - He said that he understood the location of speed cameras was being investigated but could not comment on individual cameras. He said that, in future, it may fall to local authorities to decide on locations for speed cameras.

Community Support Officers - He confirmed that these posts were part funded by the Home Office and would only attract continued funding if they demonstrated value for money.

Leominster and Hereford Police Stations - He advised that the new police station on the Industrial Estate, Leominster was due to open during 2007 and that the refurbishment of Hereford Police Station was being undertaken in stages and was due for completion in 2008.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meeting of the West Mercia Police Authority held on 26th September, 2006 be received.**

**56. HEREFORD & WORCESTER FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

Councillor G.W. Davies presented the report of the meeting of the Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority which was held on 28th September, 2006.

In response to a concern that the Regional Fire Control Room In Wolverhampton would be too remote from Herefordshire, Councillor Davies said that he had been assured that distance was immaterial as all operations would be computerised. He also advised that the Fire Control Room was expected to be operational by 2010.

**RESOLVED: That the report of the meeting of the Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority which were held on 28th September, 2006 be received.**

The meeting ended at 12.15 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN**



## COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME - wef MAY 2007

The Councillor's Allowances Scheme has been agreed following consideration of the recommendations of an Independent Remuneration Panel.

**Note:** The Independent Remuneration Panel was established in November 2001. It consists of six members who collectively have a wide range of experience, comprising two members from local businesses (Sun Valley Foods Ltd and Special Metals Wiggin Ltd); the Editors of the Hereford Times and the Hereford Journal and representatives from Herefordshire Unison and Herefordshire Voluntary Action. The Council has agreed that the membership of the Panel be continued until November 2008 and the relevant individuals or their nominees or successors be invited to serve at the appropriate time to ensure continuity and to reflect statutory requirements.

The main features of the Scheme are:

- A Basic Allowance for all 58 members of £7,000.
- A scheme of Special Responsibility Allowances with four bands with the post of Leader of the Council in Band 1 with a Special Responsibility Allowance of £27,000 per annum, and other offices assigned to Bands and remunerated at set proportions of the Leader's rate, as shown below:

|        |   |         |
|--------|---|---------|
| Band 2 | Cabinet Members<br>Chairman of Strategic Monitoring Committee   | £11,000 |
| Band 3 | Chairman of Council,<br>Deputy Leader ( <i>if not a Member of the Cabinet</i> )<br>Chairmen of: Planning Committee, Regulatory Committee and Scrutiny Committees<br>Independent Chairman of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee (pro rata 50%)<br>Independent Chairman of the Standards Committee (pro rata 50%) | £8,500  |
| Band 4 | Vice-Chairman of Council<br>Chairmen of Planning Sub-Committees<br>Group Leaders  | £1,500  |

- In addition to the flat rate Group Leaders' Allowance of £1,500, a payment of £124.00 per member of the Group to reflect the different level of responsibility dependent on the size of the Group.
- Special Responsibility Allowance to be in addition to Basic Allowance. Excluding Group Leaders' Allowance, only one Special Responsibility Allowance is payable per **Elected** Member.
- A Childcare and Dependant Carers' Scheme: allowances payable for eligible duties where costs are incurred in the care of children aged 16 or under, and in respect of other dependants where there is medical or social work evidence that care is required, and where the work claimed for has been undertaken by persons other than family members resident in the household; all claims must be evidenced by receipts and will be paid at the current market hourly rates.
- All allowances to be updated annually in line with the N.J.C. for Local Government Services pay award.

In addition attendance whether as an appointed member or at the invitation of a Director, Cabinet Member or Chairman of the relevant body at any of the following will entitle a Councillor to claim for travel and subsistence:

- Council meeting
- Council committee and sub-committee meeting
- Any of the other bodies described in these Standing Orders including Cabinet and Community Forums;
- A Working Group established by any one of the above bodies (including attendance as a member of a Best Value Review team at a team meeting or related activity);
- Official briefing session called by the Chairman of Council, Leader, Cabinet Member, Chairman of a Committee, Sub-Committee or Panel, Community Forum or Working Group, or by a Group Leader or his/her substitute - such attendance being limited to one Councillor from each group per session;
- Meeting of any other approved body.

The undertaking by any of those listed below of any duty associated with the Council or its committees and other bodies approved for such purposes by the Chief Executive or Head of Legal and Democratic Services in consultation with the Leader:

- The Chairman/Vice-Chairman of Council
- A Cabinet Member
- The Chairman/Vice-Chairman of any Committee, Sub-Committee or Working Group, or Chairman of a Community Forum.
- The leaders of the political groups

Attendance on site visits approved by the relevant Committee or body.

Attendance at Cabinet by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Strategic Monitoring Committee;

Attendance at a meeting of any Scrutiny Committee by the Chairman of the Strategic Monitoring Committee or in the absence of the Chairman and with his/her permission the Vice-Chairman.

Attendance at Cabinet by the Chairman or in the absence of the Chairman and with his/her permission the Vice-Chairman of a Scrutiny Committee where Cabinet is addressing matters within that Committee's terms of reference.

Attendance at any conference by any Councillor authorised by the relevant Director.

Any other attendance for which prior approval has been given by the Chief Executive or Head of Legal and Democratic Services after consultation with the Leader.

In general allowances will not be payable for meetings of outside bodies. A list of appointments to outside bodies, which shall be approved by the Chief Executive or Head of Legal and Democratic Services following consultation with Group Leaders, will be maintained by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services. This list will also identify those appointments to outside bodies where allowances are payable.

**Note:** The single rate at which travel may be claimed shall be within the scale determined by the Council within the scale of rates used by the Inland Revenue

A subsistence allowance for Councillors is paid on the basis of actual reasonable expenditure and where overnight accommodation is necessary, this will be for three star accommodation or equivalent, evidenced by receipts.

Co-opted and other non-elected Members are entitled to claim Travel, Subsistence and Dependant Carer's Allowances on the same basis as Members of the Council.



**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC****Report By: Head of Legal and Democratic Services****Wards Affected****Purpose**

1. To receive any questions from members of the public deposited more than six clear working days before the meeting of Council.

**Background**

2. Standing Order 4.24 of the Constitution states that: A member of the public may ask a Cabinet Member or Chairman of a Committee any question relevant to a matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the County as long as a copy of that question is deposited more than six clear working days before the meeting i.e. by close of business on a Wednesday in the week preceding a Friday meeting. No supplementary questions may be asked.
3. A total of 25 minutes shall be set aside for the answering of questions from members of the public save that the Chairman, or Vice-Chairman, if presiding, shall have absolute discretion to vary the period of time by making it shorter or longer as he/she considers appropriate. Any questions unanswered at the expiry of the time limit shall be dealt with by way of written reply to the questioner.
4. Any question which contains defamatory material or the publication of which is likely to be detrimental to the Council's interests, may be rejected.

**Questions**

5. The questions received by the deadline are attached at Appendix 1.



**Question from Mrs. M. Cocks, Lower Bullingham**

"The latest information is that consideration is being given in the latest UDP for 300 houses to be built on the eastern side of the Bullinghope land owned by Bloor Homes. This will put about one thousand more cars per day on to Hoarwithy Road. This will compound the traffic from the north that will still prefer to use Holme Lacy Road to access the Rotherwas estate.

What plans does the council have to ensure that every vehicle travelling from or to the north, of all types wishing to access or egress the Rotherwas Industrial Estate uses the proposed new road?"

**Question from Mr. P.J. Cocks, Lower Bullingham:**

"The council's purpose for putting housing development at Bullinghope into the UDP is to part fund the ROTHERWAS road, in the sum of £8,000,000 from Bloor Homes.

As the council will have to, initially, borrow the £8,000,000 for up to three years until Bloor Homes tender their contribution, what services do the council propose cutting to service the debt? At 6% £480,000 per year. £1,440,000 over three years or if compounded over three years a total of £1,521,128."

**Questions from Mr. I. Jardin, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Herefordshire Branch**

"With regard to the Rotherwas Access Road:

- (a) what is the latest cash flow forecast, by financial year, of expenditure on procuring the Road, including any interest payments?
- (b) what are the intended sources of funding for that cash flow, including loans, by financial year?
- (c) what is the earliest expected date for the signing of a Section 106 agreement with Bloor Homes to secure their contribution to the funding of the Road?
- (d) if Bloor Homes' contribution does not eventualize, how do you propose to fund the equivalent element of the cost of the Road?
- (e) do you still share the conclusion, set out in the letter of 20 January 2004 from Bloor Homes' agent to the Forward Planning Manager, that "the direction of future growth of Hereford should be to the south of the City"?
- (f) do you expect the number of heavy goods vehicles travelling north on the A49 through Hereford, including the Belmont roundabout, to increase after completion of the Road?"

**Question from Mr. B Caldicutt, Hereford**

The Initial UDP up to 2011 included for 300 houses at Holmer, which after the consultation period was moved to Bullinghope in the Draft UDP. After a Public Enquiry the inspector recommended that the houses should be reinstated back to Holmer as proposed in the Initial UDP. This was quite rightly done through the democratic procedure. Planning Permission has been granted for the houses at Holmer so it appears to me that this is now an over provision of houses based on the Initial & Draft UDP especially when the Stirling Lines development is to increase by a further 250-300 houses

I generally have the feeling that the majority of members do not know where the site is, and even more so just how much land Bloor Homes, the prospective developer owns, which could lead to some 2000 houses.

If it were not for the financing of the Rotherwas Access road, these houses would not have been included in this Modified UDP.

I personally collected 220 signatures on a petition against this proposal, and standing on residents' doorsteps the feeling was, enough is enough. It is a pity that they are not here to voice their opinions!

Before the Committee approves this Modified UDP, I request that, another Public Enquiry is held on this matter, and all members should visit the site to acquaint themselves with the landscape and the drastic consequences this proposal would have.

**Question from Ms J. Shuttlewood, Bullinghope**

Based on the recent history at the Stirling Lines development, where one of the developers sold amenity land to another developer who subsequently obtained planning permission to build on it, I am concerned that leisure and amenity land be protected. If planning consent for the Bullinghope development includes leisure and amenity land will the Council insist that the developer gift any such land to the people of Herefordshire for leisure purposes in perpetuity?

**Question from Mrs. S. Shuttlewood, Bullinghope**

What is the hidden agenda that persuades this council to go against the results of its own surveys and the decision of the inspector from the Government department with regard to the development at Bullinghope?

I would be grateful to receive a transcript of the meetings recorded minutes.

**Question from Mr. H. Shuttlewood, Bullinghope**

Population Estimates for Hereford - As an interested party in what Herefordshire Council is proposing for Bullinghope I have tried to research the reasons, but some figures are a little out of date.

Surfing the internet has produced the Council's papers on population figures, age distribution and housing needs and I see that population growth is expected to slow during 2003-11 and be in line with the general growth of England and Wales of 3.4%. Do you have later figures from the Population Estimates Unit of ONS for growth in Hereford City and rural areas that support planned housing growth here?, and can you tell me what the housing needs figure was for Hereford in the last unitary development plan? There is obviously a shortage of cheap homes, but the plan to piggy back development here just to get a builder to pay for a spur road of limited use, will not achieve that aim given the cost to the builder.

Just how many homes are you expecting to be justified?

**Question from Mr. T. Ford by e-mail**

Question from Cycle Hereford concerning the current scheme for the St Owen's Street cycle contraflow:

The Council convenes the Pedestrian, Access and Cycle Forum to get advice on improving the environment for vulnerable road users in the County. The PAC Forum has agreed a set of movement principles to ensure that traffic management schemes benefit road users in line with the Council's road user hierarchy and enhance the area where they are introduced. It is clear from the scheme currently being progressed for the St Owen's Street cycle contraflow that the Council ignored the movement principles and the road user hierarchy when instructing its consultants.

If the Council will ignore these principles for a scheme on St Owen's Street, one of the most attractive and sensitive streets in Hereford, where and when will it apply the principles?

**Question from Mr. P. Cocks by e-mail**

Is the council aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, announced on 6th December, 2006: that the government intends to introduce legislation that will take away clause 106 money from local authorities and pass it to Regional Government?

How would this legislation affect the councils financing proposals for the Rotherwas Relief Road and thus the need for the Bloor Homes houses at Bullinghope?

**Question from Revd Peter Hackett, Lower Bullingham**

How many houses would need to be built to meet the shortfall in the cost of the Rotherwas Access Road, and how many houses would be affordable?



## REPORT OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

HELD ON 16TH NOVEMBER, 14TH AND 21ST DECEMBER, 2006  
AND 18TH JANUARY, 2007

---

**Cabinet Members:** R.J. Phillips (Leader of the Council),  
D.W. Rule, MBE (Deputy Leader),  
Mrs. L.O. Barnett, P.J. Edwards, Mrs. J.P. French, J.C. Mayson,  
R.V. Stockton, D.B. Wilcox, R.M. Wilson.

This report covers proceedings of the meetings listed above.

### 1. DECISIONS RESERVED TO COUNCIL UNDER PART 4 OF THE CONSTITUTION

- 1.1 **Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP)** - Cabinet has considered representations to the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions and Reasons. The statutory plan making process requires that all objections to Modifications or to a Council decision not to accept an Inspector's recommendation must be considered by the Council, and that the outcome of this process be set out in a Statement of Decisions and Reasons. The Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions and Reasons were published and made available for inspection between 7th September and 19th October, 2006. During this period 255 comments were received with 84% (214) objections and 16% (41) representations of support. Model Farm in Ross-on-Wye generated the largest number of responses with 43% (94) objections and 2 representations of support. A further 3 objections were for the rejections of the Inspector's recommendation to amend the Ross-on-Wye settlement boundary to exclude the Model Farm site. The rejection of the Inspector's recommendation regarding land at Bullinghope generated some 37 objections and 2 representations of support with one objection submitted being a petition with 218 names calling for the deletion of the allocation. The modification to allocate land at Holmer for housing generated 21 objections and 6 representations of support. Many of the objectors requested detailed amendments to the proposal with regards to traffic issues rather than to the principle of the development of the site. Set out at the Appendices are responses and recommendations regarding representations to the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions and Reasons. Cabinet was advised that representations in the Schedules by WO and OE Price should refer to Holmer House Farm rather than the site attributed, with no further modification being proposed in response.
- 1.2 Cabinet has noted that there have been a number of consequential changes made as a result of modifications to the UDP, which do not materially affect the content of the Plan and can be made without the need to publish the modifications, as they are minor amendments such as updates or corrections. Those identified are:
- Paragraph 5.4.22 provides the reasoned justification for the Tanyard Lane housing site in Ross-on-Wye. There remains reference to the pedestrian and cyclist links to the new business park. However, in his report the Inspector recommended (6.10/2) that other references in the paragraphs which refer to both sites should be deleted. The recommendation has been accepted and, therefore, to provide consistency, the words "and new business park (policy E4)"

should be deleted from the third sentence of paragraph 5.4.22 as a consequential change.

- Two typographical errors in proposed modifications 189 need to be corrected. In paragraph 11.3.4 there is reference to a landbank of 43,969,000 tonnes. This figure should read 3,969,000. In paragraph 11.3.5 there is reference to reserves of crushed rock at 2001, however, this should refer to reserves of crushed rock at 2004.

Cabinet thanked the officers for the hard work that had gone into producing the UDP.

**Cabinet recommends to Council that:**

- (a) **the responses and recommendations set out in the attached Schedules regarding duly made representations to the UDP Proposed Modifications and the Statement of Decisions and Reasons be approved;**
- (b) **no further Modifications materially affecting the content of the Plan need to be made, and a further Inquiry is not required;**
- (c) **the minor changes set out above be included within the Plan without the need for further modifications;**
- (d) **a Statement of Decisions and Reasons be published in respect of the Council's consideration of the representations;**
- (e) **the UDP be adopted and that the requisite statutory procedures be undertaken to give notice of intention to adopt the Plan;**
- (f) **the UDP be adopted on the day after the expiry of the period given by the Council in the notice of intention to adopt, provided that no direction to modify or call in the Plan has been made by the Secretary of State; and**
- (g) **notice of adoption be given in accordance with the statutory procedures.**

**2. NOTICES OF MOTION**

2.1 No motions to Council were considered by Cabinet during the reporting period.

**3. KEY DECISIONS BY INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBERS WHICH WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE FORWARD PLAN**

3.1 There were no such decisions made during the reporting period.

**4. CORPORATE STRATEGY AND FINANCE  
(Chairman of Cabinet – Councillor R.J. Phillips)**

**4.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Managing Performance Management** - Cabinet has noted the results of the recently completed audit of performance management. In 2005 performance



management had been identified as a weak area for the Council. The Audit Commission has now re-assessed progress over the last twelve months to test the performance management culture. It looked at three key services: adult social care, children's social area and benefits.

Cabinet has noted the steady progress the Council is making in strengthening its performance management arrangements and culture, but recognises that it still has to embed into the Council a culture of continuous improvement shared by Members and officers. Cabinet accepts the recommendations of the Audit Commission and has recommended the report to the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee.

- (ii) **Edgar Street Grid** – Cabinet has received a report on the potential need to make Compulsory Purchase Orders for the acquisition of interests and rights on the Edgar Street Grid (ESG), which is required to facilitate the regeneration of this 100 acre site in Hereford. A plan of the site will be on display at the Council meeting. There are three areas in particular that are a priority, these are the Retail Quarter – concentrated in the city block between Edgar Street, Widemarsh Street, Blackfriars Street and New Market Street including the Livestock Market and Garrick House Car Park; the Civic Quarter – the area between Blueschool Street and Coningsby Street; finally the Link Road/Canal Basin – a stretch of land reaching from the A49 north of the football ground through to Commercial Road with its junction to Station Approach. In order to enable the Council to be in a position to drive forward the implementation of the Edgar Street Grid proposals, the implementation of a CPO, or a number of CPOs is likely to be necessary if all the interests and rights in the ESG cannot be acquired by agreement. It is anticipated that there will be a CPO for each of the priority areas.

Cabinet has authorised the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to take forward further preparatory work for the potential Edgar Street Grid CPO/CPOs in respect of the land and rights in the identified area (and any further land that may be identified) and to take all necessary related action to facilitate the implementation of the Edgar Street Grid proposals.

Cabinet has also received a confidential report regarding the marketing for redevelopment, of the Council assets within the Retail Quarter of the Edgar Street Grid site and approved the proposals.

#### 4.2 **Report on Items of Interest**

- (i) **Financial Strategy Update** – The Council's Medium Term Financial Management Strategy (MTFMS) had been approved in October 2006 after widescale consultation. The MTFMS places emphasis on affordability and sustainability in the budget process. The Financial Strategy updates the position from October 2006, with particular reference to emerging areas of pressure for the 2007/08 budget and takes into account the comments from the Strategic Monitoring Committee. Cabinet has noted that, under the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review, the previous pessimistic forecasts continue to look accurate with nil growth forecast for local government along with tight control on Council tax increases. Government expectation is that growth in priority services will be secured through greater efficiency and closer joint working and service provision with other public bodies.

- (ii) **Strong and Prosperous Communities: The Local Government White Paper October 2006** - Cabinet has noted the contents of the White Paper, which sets out a wide ranging programme to give local people and communities more influence and power to improve their lives. The White Paper proposes to achieve improvement through strengthening the role and powers of local authorities through "...a new approach to local partnership to give local authorities more opportunity to lead their area, work with other services and better meet the public's needs." Cabinet has noted that the White Paper encourages greater co-operation between local authorities and Primary Care Trusts and other partner organisations, which fits in with the Council's and the Herefordshire Primary Care Trust's proposals for a Public Service Trust. An Executive Summary of the White Paper has been sent to all Members of the Council and a seminar for all Members will be organised in due course.
- (iii) **Community Forums** – Cabinet has received the report on the October 2006 round of Forum meetings and noted the statistics presented. Once again Members expressed their thanks and satisfaction to the Community Forum Co-ordinator over the style of the meetings and how well managed they are.

## 5. **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE** (Cabinet Member: Councillor D.W. Rule, MBE)

### 5.1 **Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Performance Update Following the Joint Area Review and the Annual Performance Assessment of the Council's Children's Services** – Cabinet has noted the progress to date on performance. The Annual Performance Assessment states that significant improvement has been made and provides a sound platform for further improvement. Nationally the Council has received a score of two, which puts the Council at the middle level (1-4). Overall performance in the Safeguarding and Assessment Service has been rated as good, which means the Council is now in a position where there are no inadequate assessments on "Stay Safe" or Service Management" issues.
- (ii) **School Transport** – Cabinet has received a report assessing the impact of the introduction of charges for those pupils admitted to year 7 in St Mary's RC High School and The Bishop of Hereford's Bluecoat High School in September 2006. Cabinet was pleased to note there was no discernable impact on the popularity or the mix of students attending the two aided high schools. In fact there had been an overall increase in students attending the schools. Cabinet noted that the Education and Inspections Act 2006 would not make any difference to the transport arrangements for pupils in Herefordshire.
- (iii) **Care Matters: Transforming the Lives of Children and Young People in Care** – Cabinet has received a report on the Government Green Paper Care Matters: Transforming the Lives of Children and Young People in Care and noted that although outcomes for looked after children had improved in recent years, there was still a significant gap when compared with all children. A comprehensive consultation exercise was undertaken with 65 looked after children and young people, aged 10+ were sent copies of the young people's version of Care Matters with their own questionnaire. In addition views were sought from a further eight young people and care leavers and were

interviewed by professional staff. As well as the young people, over 200 key stakeholders in Herefordshire were contacted by email and asked to complete an electronic questionnaire. Cabinet has noted that although there had been an encouraging response to the consultation, there had been no formal response from the Secondary Schools or the voluntary and independent sector. It also noted that further attempts would be made to engage with the Secondary Heads Association and the Voluntary Sector Alliance.

## **6. COMMUNITY SERVICES (Cabinet Member - Councillor R.V. Stockton)**

### **6.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Bromyard Downs (Common)** – Cabinet has considered the proposed action for the future management and governance of Bromyard Downs. The Common is currently managed through the Bromyard Common Management Committee. The Council has received a request to determine whether the management committee is fulfilling its functions towards the Downs. Under the Scheme of Delegation the Council is required to determine any grievances. Cabinet has endorsed the proposed plan of action, as set out by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to review the governance and maintenance of the Common and will receive a further report in due course.

## **7. CORPORATE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Cabinet Member - Councillor Mrs. J.P. French)**

### **7.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Draft Annual Operating Plan 2007-08** – Cabinet has agreed that, as part of the Performance Improvement Cycle the Council should have an Annual Operating Plan (AOP) to give effect to the first year of its latest Corporate Plan and to serve as the basis for in-year integrated performance reports. Cabinet approved a draft of the Corporate Plan 2007-10 in October 2006, and gave in principle approval to the associated three-year investment proposals. The draft AOP sets out what the Council intends to do and achieve in year one of the new Corporate Plan. It takes into consideration the views of the Strategic Monitoring Committee. The AOP has been developed in line with the changes to the Medium Term Financial Management Strategy. It will be finalised in conjunction with the Budget for 2007-08 and along with the final version of the Corporate Plan and the proposed budget be recommended to Council for formal approval.
- (ii) **Corporate ICT Strategy** – Cabinet has approved the draft Corporate ICT Strategy subject to further consultation. This is the first time a detailed strategy document has been prepared setting out a strategic road map for ICT services; how the service will be developed and adapted to meet the business needs of the Council and its partner organisations; and be a key building block for the delivery of the Herefordshire Connects Programme. The strategy will allow for more flexible working solutions giving a standardised desktop computing environment so that hot-desking and home working can be introduced. It will also manage the corporate risk and inspections and audit recommendations.

## 7.2 Report on Items of Interest

- (i) **Integrated Performance Report** – Cabinet has received a report outlining performance to the end of September 2006 and the actions being considered to address areas of under-performance and a further report in November measuring performance against the Annual Operating Plan 2006-07. The September report outlines 89 indicators of which 19 were marked red indicating issues that have not been addressed. Cabinet has noted that issues around sustaining vibrant and prosperous communities were mostly about public perception rather than access to services. They were pleased to note that staff sickness absence was now below target. There has also been a significant reduction in overspends in the Adult and Community Services Directorate. The November report measured performance against revenue and capital budgets and corporate risks, and remedial action to address areas of under-performance, along with progress against the Council's Overall Improvement Programme.

Cabinet has agreed to monitor most 'in year' performance indicators that measure the public's perceptions of quality of life or services in a different manner. Progress towards improving them will be judged against three year targets. Performance will be reported annually along with in-year performance reporting of the things that are happening that should change, for the better, how people perceive their quality of life and services.

- (ii) **Pay and Workforce Development Strategy 2005-08** – Cabinet has noted the progress made against the Strategy and the key actions to be taken for the forthcoming year. Cabinet first agreed the Pay and Workforce Development Strategy 2005-08 in June 2005. Cabinet noted the areas for priority action were pay and rewards, developing leadership capacity, resourcing, developing the skills and capacity of the workforce, and developing the organisation. Activities within each key theme act in support of each other and are designed to help support delivery of the Corporate Plan.

## 8. ENVIRONMENT (Cabinet Member: Councillor P.J. Edwards)

### 8.1 Report on Decisions Taken

- (i) **Annual Monitoring Report 2005/06** – Cabinet has approved the second Annual Monitoring Report and its formal submission to the Secretary of State. Cabinet has noted that the Report had been produced in line with the guidance provided by Government, which is for an objectives-policies-targets-indicators approach to the monitoring of development plans. Improvements have already been made in line with government requests and best practice has been implemented where appropriate.
- (ii) **Local Development Scheme** – Cabinet has approved the revised Local Development Scheme. The scheme is a requirement placed on local planning authorities to publish a statement of how the forward planning work is to be organised over a three year period and revised as necessary. The current scheme was published in January 2006 and has now been reviewed in response to a number of considerations and allows a more flexible approach in the future, with links to the Community Strategy.

- (iii) **Sustainability Strategy** – Cabinet has endorsed the Sustainability Strategy for 2006-09 and the accompanying action plan. The Sustainability Strategy contributes to the Community Strategy for Herefordshire in which the Herefordshire Partnership sets out its vision for Herefordshire. One of the five guiding principles is that we “integrate sustainability into all our actions”. As a key member of the Herefordshire Partnership the Council is committed to and promotes sustainable development. The Strategy sets out a programme of activities that will enable the Council to co-ordinate across all its plans and strategies.

## **9. HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION** **Cabinet Member - Councillor D.B. Wilcox)**

### **9.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Policy Statement for the Use of the Rivers Wye and Lugg** – Cabinet has approved the draft Policy Statement for the use of the Rivers Wye and Lugg as the basis for public consultation. It recognises the importance of the rivers to the County’s future. In particular, the River Wye is nationally renowned and, together with the River Lugg, is defined as navigable within the confines of the County. Cabinet agrees on the need to make more use of the rivers for diverse leisure and economic interests. Cabinet recognises the main responsibility for the rivers lies with the Environment Agency but a policy statement for the use of the two rivers has been produced to indicate how the Council could work with partners on matters of mutual interest and concern.

## **10. RESOURCES** **(Cabinet Member - Councillor R.M. Wilson)**

### **10.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **The Council’s Investment in the Maylords Shopping Centre** – Cabinet has received a confidential report and approved the commencement of negotiations to restructure the headlease with Prudential Property Investment Managers (PruPim) in order to revitalise Maylords as a shopping centre and as good financial return in the long term.

### **10.2 Report on Items of Interest**

- (i) **Asset Management Plan** - A report on this item was deferred and will be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 8th February, 2007. It will be reported to the Council meeting on 9th March, 2007.

## **11. RURAL REGENERATION AND STRATEGY** **(Cabinet Member - Councillor J.C. Mayson)**

### **11.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Hereford Livestock Market** - After a long period of consultation with the public and interested parties Cabinet has approved a new site for the relocation of the Livestock Market. The agreed site is on the Roman Road identified as Site 5. Cabinet noted the effect of the relocation on the future of the Edgar Street Grid proposals. In considering the options the main considerations were: the effect on residents, traffic implications and long term

value. Cabinet felt that no site would be perfect, but the aim was to secure a suitable long term site and to negotiate with the market operators' both a capital contribution and lease terms. Cabinet felt that this would prove to be the best site to relocate the market with the least disruption to residents and provide long term value and therefore gave authority for officers to proceed to negotiate the purchase.

The decision was called in by the Community Services Scrutiny Committee who wished to ensure that all the sites had been investigated thoroughly.

Following the call-in, Cabinet considered the matter again, including the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee, in an urgent report on 18th January, 2007. This was the last opportunity for Cabinet to consider the issue before the meeting of Council on 9th February, 2007. It has accepted the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee, subject to the normal processes being followed in respect of any planning applications, and confirmed that the market will re-locate to Site 5 on the Roman Road.

Cabinet has also expressed their thanks to the Cabinet Member (Rural Regeneration and Strategy) for the work he had carried out so far to bring the project forward and to the officers involved. In particular thanks were expressed for the work of the late Councillor George Hyde and that of Councillor Terry James who had initiated the project by agreeing to seek a change to the Hereford Market Act to enable the relocation to go ahead.

## **12. SOCIAL CARE ADULTS AND HEALTH (Cabinet Member Councillor Mrs. L.O. Barnett)**

### **12.1 Report on Decisions Taken**

- (i) **Future Social Care Needs for Older People and Adults with Learning Disabilities in Herefordshire** – Cabinet has considered the findings and recommendations of the review of future social care needs of older people and people with learning disabilities. It has agreed the proposals to move to a more effective and efficient prevention based service model and to establish the additional capacity needed to deliver the improvements. A similar needs analysis on the future needs of the service has been undertaken in respect of 18 to 65 year olds with mental health problems and/or physical disabilities. Cabinet recognises that the proposals would lead to significant improvement in the services for vulnerable client groups. It has noted that the implementation of the Herefordshire Connects programme would be important to the improvements in services.
- (ii) **Integrated Community Equipment Services** – Cabinet has noted the proposed changes by Central Government to the delivery of community equipment services nationally and the impact and pressure this will have on the pooled revenue budget and the need for capital investment. Cabinet has requested a further report on the role of the Third Sector in equipment service once the full Government guidance is available. A pilot project on the new method of delivery and fitting of community equipment has demonstrated that efficiencies can be made, but in order to progress this model additional capital and revenue investment is required. A further report on savings and cost benefits and how they will be progressed will be submitted to a future meeting.

- (iii) **Homelessness Update** – Cabinet has received a report on homelessness prevention in Herefordshire. It had approved a number of ‘spend to save’ initiatives in July 2005, which addressed the financial pressures created by the demand for homelessness services in Herefordshire. Additionally the provision of housing for the homeless and housing advice services have returned to the Council from Herefordshire Housing and this has led to an improving position for homelessness prevention in Herefordshire, with less than two new families a month going into bed and breakfast accommodation. The spend to save fund has enabled nearly 300 successful homelessness prevention payments to be made since it became available in October 2005, with the total value of payment since the fund was created being in the region of £130k. This has helped considerably in the use of temporary accommodation. Since April 2006 over 70 families have been helped in accessing the private rented sector before being re-homed. Previously families would have had to stay in bed and breakfast accommodation until it had been determined whether the Council had a duty to re-house.

**COUNCILLOR R.J. PHILLIPS  
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**





## Responses to Council rejection of Inspector recommendations

| NAME                       | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Inspector's Ref No: 5.14/1 | Policy/Paragraph Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.13 - Hereford - Allocated sites - Land at Bullinghope   |   | 40 comment(s)  |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |  |   |  |
| Ms Anne Adams              | Housing should remain at Holmer. Affordable housing is badly needed. Development will spoil landscape and Dinedor Hill and create more traffic problems. The railway should remain the boundary of the city. | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. No affordable housing is to be provided in recognition of the financial contribution the scheme will make to the Access Road. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and the settlement boundary has been drawn accordingly. The Inspector indicates that assessments show that the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                    | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| <i>Objection from</i>   |   |   |   |
| Mr. A C Anthony-Edwards | Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites, and building up to 2000 dwellings at Bullinghope would be inappropriate. Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road are erroneous. The proposals do not represent well planned and managed development. | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. It is accepted that references in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are inappropriate, and should be removed. This is a minor change which will not materially affect the content of the Plan. Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. | <p>Amend the second and part third sentences of paragraph 5.4.13 by replacing "This land, which lies between Bullingham Lane and Hoarwithy Road and is crossed by the Withy Brook to the east, would form the first phase of a much larger residential development to take place at Bullinghope beyond this Plan period. Access to this initial development of 300 dwellings..." with the following: "This land lies between Bullingham Lane and Hoarwithy Road and is crossed by the Withy Brook to the east. Access to this development of 300 dwellings..."</p> <p>Amend the final sentence of paragraph 5.4.13 by replacing "Initially a development brief will be required which will form part of an overall master plan for the area to establish the community facilities and development concepts required for this emerging new district of Hereford" with the following: "A development brief will be required".</p> <p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p> |

| NAME                       | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. Ursula Attfield | The development of 300 houses initially, rising to 2000, will put an unacceptable strain on transport infrastructure. Development will cause irreversible harm to the rural character and appearance of the area.   | The Inspector indicates that assessments show that traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and does not fall within any designated landscape.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Mr E G Bevan               | Proposed Modifications seek to increase housing requirement to 12458, through rejection of Inspector recommendation 5.14/1. Inspector indicates that future housing allocation should be determined on a comprehensive basis. This would include examination of distribution between Hereford, market towns, larger villages and rural areas. Council have increased requirement from 11700 to 12458 without strategic allocation. In allocating a further 300 dwellings to Hereford the Council has failed to examine all alternatives. In Bodenham Moor there is a need for affordable and open market housing, the argument regarding land coming forward at a sufficient rate could also be made in respect of sites in this village. Council should accept Inspector's recommendation in respect of land at Bullinghope or defer adoption of the UDP until a further public inquiry has been held. | The Inspector recommends increasing the housing requirement from 11,700 to 12,200 to accord with the RSS. The Council have accepted this position and the Proposed Modification 042 and rejection of the Inspector's Recommendation 5.14/1 seek to achieve this. In respect of the distribution to rural areas the Inspector supported the levels of housing development proposed in the Deposit Draft, and suggested in paragraph 3.18.59 that, where appropriate, the opportunity could be taken to reduce rural provision. There is therefore no case at present to reconsider the allocation of sites in main villages.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Ms M Burns                 | The site at Holmer is preferable. Additional housing should be found from existing sites. Final number of dwellings could be in the order of 2,000. Railway line is natural boundary. Demand for further employment land is unproven. Inappropriate use of planning gain to fund the Access Road.   | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                   | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |   |  |
| Mr and Mrs B Caldicutt | It is wrong that the Access Road should dictate the development part financing the road. The houses being proposed will only be the start of a larger development in the area which could not be sustained. The area cannot accommodate traffic increase. The area is protected for its mineral reserves and is of landscape value. | The Inspector has accepted that seeking funding for the Access Road is legitimate and that the Road would be a necessary accompaniment of housing development at Bullinghope. Sustainability issues have been taken into account in developing the proposal. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The Inspector indicates that assessments show that the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The Inspector has recommended that land at Lower Bullingham be removed from the safeguarded mineral reserves, and this has been accepted by the Council (Modification 192). The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and does not fall within any designated landscape. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.  |  |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |   |  |
| Mr. B. Caldicutt       | Petition with 218 signatures submitted objecting to the inclusion of 300 proposed houses at Bullinghope in the UDP.   | The petition does not indicate any grounds for objection and on this basis is to be noted as an expression of public concern on this issue.  | No further modification be proposed in response to the petition.  |  |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |   |  |
| 34                     | Cllr. Chris Chappell  | There are other locations for the development. No affordable housing is to be provided. Bullingham Lane is too narrow and the Ross Road/Walnut Tree Road/Holme Lacy Road junction cannot take any more vehicles.   | The Plan process has included a full assessment of alternative locations to accommodate development, including in the urban areas of Hereford and elsewhere. No affordable housing is to be provided in recognition of the financial contribution the scheme will make to the Access Road, and the Inspector considers this as reasonable. The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |   |  |
| Mr Derek Davies        | The infrastructure of the area needs further investigation. The Access Road should be funded in other ways.   | Issues relating to traffic infrastructure were fully considered at the Public Inquiry in 2005. The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The site is otherwise capable of being developed as proposed. The Inspector also concludes that it is legitimate to seek to fund the Road from the housing development.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.  |  |

| NAME                      | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>     |  |   |  |
| Mr. Gerald Dawe           | Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. Council should show how development will reduce climate change. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites, and building up to 2000 dwellings at Bullinghope would be inappropriate. Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road are erroneous, and are not reasons for supporting development at Bullinghope.  | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. The implications for climate change are appraised through the relevant sustainability appraisal.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |  |   |  |
| Mr G Hankins              | Most sites were recommended for rejection by the Inspector on the basis that land sufficient for strategic requirement had been identified and there was no need to search further. Council now indicate that 12152 housing sites will not come forward, contrary to the position at the Inquiry and the evidence provided by the Council and supported by the Inspector. If a shortfall exists other land should be re-examined, including land at Church Way, Holmer, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and mod 042 figure (12458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Church Way and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid. | The housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the site's themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matter not considered at the Inquiry. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |  |   |  |
| Alan & Marjorie Hardwicke | Bullingham Lane is too narrow and there will be extra strain on the local road network. There are no plans for community facilities. Bullinghope area is one of scenic and wildlife quality, new development should go to the north of the City. The development should not be used to fund the Access Road.   | The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The site is within convenient reach of existing community facilities. The impacts on wildlife have been taken into account in developing the proposal, which does not fall within any designated landscape. The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer to the north of Hereford provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The Inspector concludes that it is legitimate to seek to fund the Road from the housing development.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                      | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>     |   |  |  |
| Mr. Mark Hubbard          | It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites. Building up to 2000 dwellings in the future at Bullinghope appals me. Continued promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road ignores advice of the Inspector. | The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |   |  |  |
| Mrs V M Hughes            | Area cannot cope with any more traffic. Development will not provide affordable housing. Access Road can be funded in other ways.   | The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The Plan does not require affordable housing to be provided. The Council has fully investigated options for funding the Access Road. The Inspector concludes that it is legitimate to fund the road from the housing development.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |   |  |  |
| Mr and Mrs DB and M Jones | Objection to building of 300 houses to pay for Access Road when roads cannot accommodate present traffic.   | The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |   |  |  |
| Ms S Kitchener            | Alternative ways of funding the Access Road should be sought. No affordable housing will be provided. Scale of financial contribution to infrastructure should be confirmed. There will be increased pressure on infrastructure, including roads and junctions, and the site access is unsuitable. Other opportunities in Hereford and elsewhere should be sought for the development.  | The Council has fully investigated options for funding the Access Road. The Inspector concludes that it is legitimate to fund the road from the housing development. The scale of contribution is not yet confirmed. The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The Plan process has included a full assessment of alternative locations to accommodate development, including in the urban areas of Hereford and elsewhere.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>     |   |  |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. M Lloyd-Hayes  | To proceed would allow developers to increase housing in an already saturated area. The allocation of the site is a route to obtaining the Rotherwas Access Road.   | Housing development will be regulated by the framework of planning policy set out in the UDP. The Inspector has accepted that the seeking of funding for the Access Road is a legitimate requirement and that the Road would be a necessary accompaniment of housing development at Bullinghope, taking into account infrastructure requirements and enabling further development of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mrs L D Moore         | Inadequate transport infrastructure, improvements to the existing road network required. Lack of existing and proposed facilities in the area (eg schools, doctors surgeries) will increase the need to travel. Proposal will cause chaotic and dangerous situation on the roads.   | The issues related to traffic were fully considered at the Public Inquiry in 2005. Although the Council have rejected the Inspector's Recommendation in respect of Land at Bullinghope he indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mr and Mrs G Morse    | Local roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic which will become dangerous for pedestrians. No affordable housing will be provided. Alternative ways of funding the Access Road should be sought. Other locations in Hereford should be sought for the development. No infrastructure is proposed. The site is greenfield and of ecological value. Local flooding at railway bridge.   | The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. No affordable housing is to be provided in recognition of the financial contribution the scheme will make to the Access Road, and the Inspector considers this to be reasonable. The Council has fully investigated options for funding the Access Road. The Plan process has included a full assessment of alternative locations to accommodate development, including in the urban areas of Hereford. The site is within convenient reach of existing community facilities. The impacts on agricultural land and wildlife have been taken into account in developing the proposal. Local flooding will be addressed as the proposal is developed further.                   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Ms Susana Piohtee     | Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites, and building up to 2000 dwellings at Bullinghope would be inappropriate. Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road are erroneous, and are not reasons for supporting development at Bullinghope. | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mrs M Pritchard       | Development will add to congestion. The Rotherwas Access Road will not be enough to alleviate the additional traffic and should be paid for in another way.   | The issues related to traffic were fully considered at the Public Inquiry in 2005. The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The Inspector also concludes that it is legitimate to seek to fund the Road from the housing development.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Ms Rebecca Roseff     | Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites, and building up to 2000 dwellings at Bullinghope would be inappropriate. Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road are erroneous, and are not reasons for supporting development at Bullinghope.                       | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Ms Janet Shott        | Development would encroach on open countryside and breach the railway line; Holmer is a better location. It is not acceptable to put houses at Bullinghope to secure planning gain for the Access Road. The increase in the housing requirement should be met from existing and already found sites, and building up to 2000 dwellings at Bullinghope would be inappropriate. Promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate and of the Access Road are erroneous. Council should promote the road openly and honestly as part of the planning process. | The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. The Plan's housing provisions include known sites. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. The Access Road is a Plan proposal which is supported by the Inspector. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. E Taylor   | Needs to be further study and commitment to related transport measures. Not convinced Bullinghope is the appropriate location for future strategic growth of the order of 1,000 dwellings.  | The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above).  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Cllr. W J Walling     | Inspector's reasons for recommending rejection of the proposal at Bullinghope were logical and cogent. The decision to proceed with the development is a ploy to facilitate building of the Rotherwas Access Road. Decision takes no account of the need for the development or overloading of infrastructure.  | The Bullinghope allocation will contribute to the housing requirements for Hereford and the County overall. The Inspector has accepted that the seeking of funding for the Access Road is a legitimate requirement and that the Road would be a necessary accompaniment of housing development at Bullinghope, taking into account infrastructure requirements.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |



| NAME                             | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |   |  |
| Mr KJ Woods                      | Inadequate transport infrastructure, improvements to the existing road network required. Lack of existing and proposed facilities in the area (eg schools, doctors surgeries) will increase the need to travel. Proposal will cause chaotic and dangerous situation on the roads.  | The issues related to traffic were fully considered at the Public Inquiry in 2005. Although the Council have rejected the Inspector's Recommendation in respect of land at Bullinghope he indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |   |  |
| Church Commissioners for England | There is no justifiable need for the 300 dwelling allocation at Bullinghope. The site is unsuitable for reasons of traffic congestion, landscape impact and lack of affordable housing. The scheme will prejudice decisions on the future growth of Hereford beyond 2011.  | The allocation is required to ensure that the Regional Spatial Strategy housing requirement will be delivered given the proximity of the end of the Plan period and the fact that several allocated sites have yet to commence. The Regional Assembly have confirmed that the UDP, as proposed to be modified, is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Inspector indicates that the impact of traffic is not an overriding issue. The site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and does not fall within any designated landscape. No affordable housing is to be provided in recognition of the financial contribution the scheme will make to the Access Road. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |   |  |
| Crest Strategic Projects LTD     | Crest object to continued allocation of the Bullinghope site. Council's reasons for retention of the site are flawed. Retention will prejudice the LDF process; there is no need for the site; further promotion of Rotherwas is not a key priority; the Access Road scheme does not provide value for money; allocation will not provide affordable housing or a full package of benefits to the residents of Hereford.                             | The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The allocation is required to ensure that the Regional Spatial Strategy housing requirement will be delivered given the proximity of the end of the Plan period and the fact that several allocated sites have yet to commence. Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. No affordable housing is to be provided in recognition of the financial contribution the scheme will make to the Access Road, and the Inspector considers this as reasonable.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |   |  |
| Dinedor Hill Action Group        | Inspector's decision should be upheld, to do otherwise is perverse. Existing development under construction will meet housing requirement and add to congestion. The Bullinghope development of 300 initially will exacerbate traffic congestion. Funding of the Access Road will mean an excessive premium on price of each house. Role of Rotherwas will be less important in the future and the case for the Access Road is weakened accordingly. | The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The Bullinghope scheme will make a financial contribution to the Access Road. In recognition, no affordable housing is to be sought and the Inspector considers this as reasonable. Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                   | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |   |  |
| GOWM                   | The site should not be allocated in the UDP. Its allocation prejudices the broader consideration of the future direction of growth of Hereford through the Local Development Framework. This would enable the site to be considered alongside others and be the subject of sustainability appraisal and community engagement.  | The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above).   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |   |  |
| Hereford City Council  | City Council deplores the decision to reinstate the Bullinghope development. The site is in open countryside involving the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The railway should remain a physical barrier. The development would be damaging to tourism and recreation. Site of 2,000 dwellings would lead to over-provision within the life of the Plan.   | The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The use of agricultural land has been taken into account in developing the proposal. Inspector concludes that the development will not have a major impact on tourism and recreation. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above).   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |   |  |
| Hereford Civic Society | Development should be sited on brownfield sites. Loss of agricultural land and attractive landscape, breaching defined boundary of the railway line. Premature to commit to a larger development of 2000 dwellings. Inappropriate use of planning gain. Traffic problems have not been addressed. Inspector has ignored evidence on sustainability.  | There has been a full assessment of available previously developed land in preparing the Plan. The impact on agricultural land has been taken into account. The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and does not fall within any designated landscape. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The Inspector concludes that it is legitimate to seek to fund the Road from the housing development. The Inspector concludes that assessments show that traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. All submitted evidence will have been considered by the Inspector.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire CPRE     | The Council have not countered the Inspector's conclusions. The site is not necessary to meet the UDP housing requirement and the over-allocation contravenes the Regional Strategy. Other objection sites should have been re-considered, if the need was accepted. Relationship between the site and employment at Rotherwas is irrelevant. It is not appropriate to retain the Bullinghope allocation in order to secure funding for the Access Road. | Given the proximity of the end of the Plan period and the fact that development of several allocated sites is yet to commence, the Bullinghope site is needed to ensure UDP housing requirements will be delivered. The Regional Assembly have confirmed that the Proposed Modifications are in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, having regard to the role of Hereford as a sub-regional foci and likely increases in regional housing requirements. The site is well related to Rotherwas Industrial Estate, the further promotion of which (including access improvements) is a key priority of the Council. The Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim, and on this basis it is not considered necessary to re-examine other sites considered at the Inquiry. Given the direct relationship between the site and the Access Road, the Inspector considers that the funding of the Road would be an acceptable form of planning gain. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                               | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire Friends of the Earth | Housing at Bullinghope would severely damage the landscape of the area and distort established boundaries. There is no need for the allocation. Holmer is a better alternative. The rationale for the development, to secure planning gain to build a road, is perverse. Need for the road is exaggerated. There is ample land in Hereford to accommodate the required housing.  | The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location and does not fall within any designated landscape. The Bullinghope site in addition to that at Holmer provides the opportunity to help meet the Plan's housing requirement, taking into account known sites within the urban areas. The Inspector concludes that the funding of the road through the housing development would be an acceptable form of planning gain. Further promotion of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate including access improvements is a key priority of the Council and the Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire Green Party          | Green Party evidence to the Inquiry on the site remains valid. Object most strongly to the reinstatement of the site. Neither the proposed low housing density nor the precedent set for the future development of the area beyond the Plan period has been properly appraised. Council has failed to address issues of intrusion into countryside and breaching of the railway. Next stage of planning for Hereford should not be driven by search for ways to finance the Access Road. | The site area (13 hectares) includes an allowance for structural landscaping. Taking this into account, net site densities are expected to be in accord with Plan policy. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above). The allocation site is that which best relates to the existing built form of the City in this location. The Inspector concludes that it is legitimate to seek to fund the Road from the housing development.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Lower Bullingham Parish Council    | There is no detail as to necessary infrastructure to be provided, which should include road and bridge provision, sewerage, open space, shops, medical and other facilities. It is clear that many more houses have to be built here than stated if infrastructure is to be provided.  | Issues relating to traffic infrastructure were fully considered at the Public Inquiry in 2005. The Inspector indicates that assessments show the traffic from the development will work within tolerable limits and that the impact of traffic and links with the city are not overriding issues. The site is within convenient reach of existing community facilities. The allocation at Bullinghope is limited to 300 dwellings. References in the Plan to further residential development post-2011 at this location are to be removed (see response and recommendation to Mr. A.C. Anthony-Edwards, above).   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD    | Inspector indicates that there is no need to allocate additional housing sites, therefore, it is premature to allocate housing at Bullinghope. The Council's decision to allocate land at Bullinghope is based not on land use planning merits but upon financial (planning gain) merits of an allocation.   | The Bullinghope allocation will contribute to the housing requirements for Hereford and the County overall and help to ensure that the target of 12,200 dwellings is achieved by 2011. The Inspector has accepted that the seeking of funding for the Access Road is a legitimate requirement and that the Road would be a necessary accompaniment of housing development at Bullinghope, taking into account infrastructure requirements.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                                     | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION  |              |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| <b>Objection from</b>                    |   |   |   |              |
| WO & OE Price                            | Most sites were recommended for rejection by the Inspector on the basis that land sufficient for strategic requirement had been identified and there was no need to search further. Council now indicate that 12152 housing sites will not come forward, contrary to the position at the Inquiry and the evidence provided by the Council and supported by the Inspector. If a shortfall exists other land should be re-examined, including land at Church Way, Holmer, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and mod 042 figure (12,458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Church Way and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid. | he housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the site's themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry. |   |              |
| <b>Support from</b>                      |   |   |   |              |
| Bloor Homes                              | Circumstances relating to Bullinghope have progressed since the Inquiry, principally in relation to the Rotherwas Access Road. The continued allocation of the site is necessary and appropriate for reasons of housing delivery, Plan strategy, and in order to secure implementation of the Rotherwas Access Road.  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.   |              |
| <b>Support from</b>                      |   |   |   |              |
| The Association of Rotherwas Enterprises | Association of Rotherwas Enterprises wishes to register its complete support. Rotherwas is the largest employment site in the County but for many years its development has been constrained by lack of good quality road access. Investment has been lost. Rotherwas must be able to provide more and better paid levels of employment if Hereford is to fulfil its sub-regional foci role. The Bullinghope proposal is the most appropriate and legitimate method for securing the funding for the Road.  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.   |              |
| Inspector's Ref No:                      | 5.19/3  | Policy/Paragraph  | Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp | 3 comment(s) |
| <b>Objection from</b>                    |   |   |   |              |
| Mr Aubrey Greene                         | If the zone of interest is included within the UDP it should be shown on the Proposals Map and consulted upon before adoption.  | The rejection of the Inspector's recommendation in respect of paragraph 8.8.21 means that it is also appropriate to retain a cross reference to the zone of interest in paragraph 5.4.17. The zone of interest is an acknowledgement of the constraints upon development in Leominster in the interests of future planning beyond the Plan period. Addressing these issues through definition of a specific route will be undertaken at a future date. It is not appropriate to show proposals that will be brought forward post-2011 on the proposals map.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.                          |              |

| NAME  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |                           |   |  |               |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |                           |   |  |               |
| Herefordshire CPRE  | If the zone of interest to the south west of Leominster is deleted, the final sentence of UDP paragraph 5.4.17 should also be deleted.  | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning. The cross reference to the zone of interest is therefore appropriate and should be retained.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |                           |   |  |               |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |                           |   |  |               |
| Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD   | The grant of planning permission for 425 dwellings at Barons Cross Camp without additional infrastructure within the Leominster Zone of Interest demonstrate that traffic measures arising from the development are acceptable and appropriate. It is inappropriate to refer to the Leominster Zone of Interest in the context of development at Barons Cross Camp. It would be unsound to adopt the UDP with reference to a Leominster Zone of Interest.   | It is accepted that the grant of planning permission for Barons Cross Camp will mean that development can proceed without major improvements to the highway network within the Leominster Zone of Interest. However, it is considered reasonable and necessary to retain reference to constraints and requirements beyond the Plan period in the interests of future planning. The cross reference in paragraph 5.4.17 should therefore be retained as a consequence of the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 8.35/1.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |                           |   |  |               |
| <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="94 587 302 635">Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/2</td> <td data-bbox="302 587 1108 635">Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues)</td> <td data-bbox="1108 587 1825 635"></td> <td data-bbox="1825 587 2148 635">2 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>          |   |   |  | Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/2 | Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues) |  | 2 comment(s)  |
| Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/2   | Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues)   |   | 2 comment(s)   |                           |   |  |               |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |                           |   |  |               |
| Messrs MJ, AB & RG Griffiths  | In rejecting Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 (Land at Bullinghope) the Council has failed to consider alternative locations to meet the additional requirement. The Inspector indicates that a review of the settlement boundary at Kings Acre Road should be undertaken. Had the Inquiry a need to seek sites for 12,500 dwellings the additional sites would have been given greater consideration. The Council has acknowledged this position in their reasons for rejecting the Inspector's recommendation. Undertake the review and defer adoption of the UDP. The housing requirement should not be arbitrarily increased without a further public inquiry. Alternatively remove land at Bullinghope and undertake an early review to meet any increased housing requirement. | The Proposed Modifications and rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 are not intended to raise the housing requirement. Rather these will ensure certainty that that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry. Deferring the adoption of the UDP will only add greater uncertainty to achieving housing requirements for the period up to 2011.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |                           |   |  |               |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |                           |   |  |               |
| DJ and IR Powell  | The Inspector is not recommending a review to result in significant new housing site allocations but so that Kings Acre Road is no longer considered as countryside. Kings Acre Road cannot be considered to be "remote", it has a good bus service, is within walking distance of a full range of employment, retail, educational and other services. The decision to commit to a review would in no way change the fact that the Inspector's Report could be a material consideration and would not compromise effective planning control. Not committing to a review will lead to opportunistic planning applications in the area. If there was a commitment to a review such applications could be resisted as premature.   | The appropriate means of reviewing the settlement boundary for Kings Acre Road should be within the context of a city-wide appraisal rather than a piecemeal basis. The review of the Regional Spatial Strategy and preparation of a Core Strategy as part of the Local Development Framework will determine the future level of development to be accommodated at Hereford, and will provide the context for a City-wide settlement boundary review. It is not accepted that there is a "full range" of services available within a short distance. The Inspector's Report will remain as a material consideration whether or not a review of this part of the settlement boundary is undertaken. However, an indication of a forthcoming review is considered more likely to result in speculative proposals. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |                           |   |  |               |
| <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="94 1409 302 1457">Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/3</td> <td data-bbox="302 1409 1108 1457">Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues)</td> <td data-bbox="1108 1409 1825 1457"></td> <td data-bbox="1825 1409 2148 1457">14 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table> |   |   |  | Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/3 | Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues) |  | 14 comment(s) |
| Inspector's Ref No: 5.3/3   | Policy/Paragraph Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues)   |   | 14 comment(s)  |                           |   |  |               |

| <i>NAME</i>              | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. A C Anthony-Edwards  | Objection. See reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Ms M Burns               | Objection. See reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. Gerald Dawe          | Objection. See reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. M Lloyd-Hayes | The site at Bullinghope should not be allocated in the UDP, for the reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1. The settlement boundary should be amended accordingly. | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Ms Susana Piohtee        | Objection. See reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Ms Rebecca Roseff        | Objection. See reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Ms Janet Shott           | The site at Bullinghope should not be allocated in the UDP and the settlement boundary amended accordingly.  | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                        | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. E Taylor                | The site at Bullinghope should not be allocated in the UDP, for the reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1. The settlement boundary should be amended accordingly.   | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Crest Strategic Projects LTD       | Object to retention of site within the defined limits of Hereford. Site should not be included within the defined settlement limit.  | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| GOWM                               | The site at Bullinghope should not be allocated in the UDP and the settlement boundary amended accordingly.  | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire CPRE                 | If Bullinghope allocation is deleted, the settlement boundary should not be extended.  | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire Friends of the Earth | Inspector's recommendation should be accepted for the reasons given in objection to the rejection of Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1.  | The Council considers that land at Bullinghope should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Support from</b>                |  |   |  |
| Bloor Homes                        | Circumstances relating to Bullinghope have progressed since the Inquiry, principally in relation to the Rotherwas Access Road. The continued allocation of the site is necessary and appropriate for reasons of housing delivery, Plan strategy, and in order to secure implementation of the Rotherwas Access Road. | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |

| NAME                                     | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION  |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Support from</b>                      |  |  |   |
| Hereford & Worcester Chamber of Commerce | The Inspector states the Road will benefit access into the Estate, identified in the UDP as the principal location to meet future needs for employment land. Improvement of access to the Estate will assist realisation of the sub-regional focus role for Hereford. There is consistent support from the Chamber's member companies for the Road with over 100 companies supporting the scheme in a petition (July 2006). The Road will bring benefits to the economic growth of the County by overcoming current constraints on the Estate's development and releasing additional land for development. | Support is noted.  | The support for the rejection of the Inspector's Recommendation be noted.                                   |
| Inspector's Ref No:                      | 5.5/1  | Policy/Paragraph   | Policy H1 - Ross-on-Wye - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (Model Farm and Overross) |
|  |  |  | 3 comment(s)  |
| <b>Objection from</b>                    |  |  |   |
| Mr. L Cosker                             | Council's reasons for rejecting the recommendation are grossly inadequate. All the reasons for rejecting the Inspector's recommendations were considered in full at the Inquiry. The Council's decision amounts to no more than a preference unsupported by any new evidence or reasoning. It would be irrational to exclude land at Overross which has been demonstrated to be superior to the alternatives on the evidence.  | The matters raised have been considered at length throughout the UDP process. In considering the Inspector's conclusions on these and his recommendation, the Council have concluded that the balance of planning considerations favours the Model Farm site, taking into account the wide variety of issues raised including landscape, urban edge, and access. These matters are adequately addressed within the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.  |
| <b>Objection from</b>                    |  |  |   |
| Mr. Gerald Dawe                          | Development at Model Farm will erode local distinctiveness and destroy agricultural land. Climate change would be an implication of this development.  | The planning issues raised have all been considered during the preparation of the Plan. Meeting the employment needs of Ross-on-Wye will require the release of additional land. The question of the site's landscape setting is considered in the Council's rejection of the Inspector's recommendation. The position remains that the overall balance of planning considerations favours the allocation of the Model Farm site. The implications for climate change are appraised through the relevant sustainability appraisal.                         | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.  |
| <b>Objection from</b>                    |  |  |   |
| Herefordshire CPRE                       | If the Model Farm provisions are deleted and the Overross site reinstated, the Ross settlement boundary should be amended accordingly.   | The Council considers that land at Model Farm should be allocated for development in the UDP, for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons. There is a need to ensure that an appropriate settlement boundary is defined around the allocation.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.  |
| Inspector's Ref No:                      | 6.1/1  | Policy/Paragraph   | Policy E1 and paragraphs 6.4.2 to 6.4.5 - Rotherwas Industrial Estate                                       |
|  |  |  | 11 comment(s)   |



| NAME                    | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr. A C Anthony-Edwards | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas.   | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Ms M Burns              | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas. A strong case should be made for building on floodplain with poor road infrastructure.                      | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan. There is an agreed approach to the resolution of flooding constraints and proposals included in the Plan to improve access through construction of the Rotherwas Access Road.                         | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr. Gerald Dawe         | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas, and there will be adverse implications for climate change.  | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan. The implications for climate change are appraised through the relevant sustainability appraisal, although the sites concerned are long standing Plan proposals within an established industrial area. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr. Mark Hubbard        | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas. This is a smokescreen to justify building of the Access Road, seen as getting an eastern bypass by stealth. | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan. The function of the Access Road is to improve access to the Rotherwas Industrial Estate.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>              | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>    |   |   |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. M Lloyd-Hayes | Rotherwas Access Road is ill thought out as several areas are liable to flood. Superior employment land is available at Moreton Park. Little investment in the Rotherwas Estate with competing locations at Cardiff and Birmingham. | There is an agreed approach to the resolution of flooding constraints. The Inspector has recommended a detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford. The role of Moreton Park in meeting Hereford's employment land requirements needs to be balanced against its location clearly removed from the city and the adverse implications this has for achieving sustainable travel. Recognising the established role of the Rotherwas Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |   |   |  |
| Ms Susana Piohtee        | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas.              | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |   |   |  |
| Ms Rebecca Roseff        | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas.              | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |   |   |  |
| Ms Janet Shott           | Need for employment land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated, there is a potential shortage of such land to the north of Hereford. The Council give no evidence of the need for additional industrial land at Rotherwas.              | Rotherwas Industrial Estate has a continuing role to play in meeting the future employment land requirements of the County, and in ensuring that most new employment development is directed to Hereford. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |   |   |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. E Taylor      | Land allocated for employment purposes requires significant investment to protect against flooding. Locations in the north of the city are better placed for employment development.  | Rotherwas Industrial Estate represents an established location for employment development. Infrastructure requirements to address flooding issues will be taken into account in project viability. Pending the detailed assessment of the need for employment land in Hereford recommended by the Inspector and recognising the established role of the Estate, it is appropriate that the allocations concerned should remain in the Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                               | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire CPRE                 | The Council has not addressed the Inspector's conclusions. The Council puts forward counter arguments that ignore or misrepresent the Inspector's recommendations as to the need for employment land at Hereford and the requirement for detailed assessment. The Council's statement is also contradictory and unreasonable regarding which sites at Rotherwas should be deleted. | Rotherwas Industrial Estate is an established employment location, the further promotion of which (including access improvements) is a key priority of the Council. The Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. Given this priority, and pending the detailed assessment of employment land recommended by the Inspector and the fact that there is an agreed approach to the resolution of flooding constraints, it is considered reasonable to retain limited allocations at Rotherwas to be brought forward for employment development within the Plan period.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire Friends of the Earth | Need for industrial land at Rotherwas has been exaggerated and there is insufficient employment land north of the River Wye. Land at risk of flooding should be kept free from development.  | Rotherwas Industrial Estate is an established employment location, the further promotion of which (including access improvements) is a key priority of the Council. The Plan sets out linked housing, employment and transport proposals to further this aim. Given this priority, and pending the detailed assessment of employment land recommended by the Inspector and the fact that there is an agreed approach to the resolution of flooding constraints, it is considered reasonable to retain limited allocations at Rotherwas to be brought forward for employment development within the Plan period.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| Inspector's Ref No:                | 6.10/1   | Policy/Paragraph Policy E4 and paragraphs 6.4.28 to 6.4.29 - New employment land allocations - Ross-on-Wye - Overross and Model Farm site   | 97 comment(s)  |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews              | The land is not suitable for development having regard to insufficient road structure, unacceptable noise pollution in a residential area, propensity to flood, danger to residents from industrial traffic, interference with emergency services based at Hildersley, loss of agricultural land, adverse impact on the approach to the town, and intrusion into open countryside. | The planning issues raised have all been considered during the preparation of the Plan. In terms of the technical suitability of the site, the Inspector comments that many objections do not affect the principle of whether the site should be allocated, or are capable of resolution through planning conditions and obligations, and refers to access and flooding in this regard. The site is suitable for the development proposed and capable of implementation. Meeting the employment needs of Ross-on-Wye will require the release of additional land. The question of the site's landscape setting and the approach to the town is considered in the Council's rejection of the Inspector's recommendation. The position remains that the overall balance of planning considerations favours the allocation of the Model Farm site. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Ms Evelyn Armstrong                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                  | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>                  | <i>RESPONSE</i>                                  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. Bernard Armstrong        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. N. Ashrat                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mrs. L. Ashrat               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| D.J. Bennett                 | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| 50 Mrs. S.E. Bennett         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mrs. S.M. Besant             | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| M.C. Besant                  | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| M.D. & F.L. Blackney         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. T.J.R. Booth             | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. |  |

| NAME                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mrs. J. Booth         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr D Boynton and Son  | Site analysis by both Local Planning Authority and Inspector is flawed. Case for Model Farm presented as being beneficial to support development at Hildersley Farm, therefore most appropriate site is adjacent to this land south of A40. Second reason refers to the poor quality farmyard. This cannot be a planning reason, it would encourage owners of potential sites to allow them to fall into disrepair.   | Land at Hildersley Farm was considered during the UDP process by Herefordshire Council for employment uses and by the Inspector at the Public Inquiry. Neither considered the site to be an appropriate area for employment development. The objector's analysis of the reasons for the rejection of the Inspectors recommendation is incorrect. There is no indication that the Model Farm site will "support the existing development at Hildersley", simply a recognition that business uses are already being introduced into the locality. In terms of the second reason, there is no indication in the Council's reasons for rejection that the site has been chosen because of "the poor quality farmyard", simply that the site accommodates a number of buildings in varying condition which present a developed feel to the area. This in itself provides an opportunity to secure an attractive edge to Ross-on-Wye. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| W.J. Bufton           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Ms Caroline S Camping | Council should accept the Inspector's recommendation regarding Model Farm. Environment Agency would not have supported the proposal had less sensitive sites been proposed. The A40 has not been detrunked and there is no known date for this to happen. Model Farm would generate congestion. Further industrial development is best located at Overross. Land to the north is easily serviced, it has been overlooked by the Local Authority and has no environmental issues. Works at Overross will not be prohibitively expensive. | Careful consideration was given to the Inspector's recommendation, however, the Council remains of the opinion that Model Farm is the most appropriate site for an employment allocation for the reasons set out in full in the Proposed Modifications document. In respect of land north of Overross Industrial Estate, this area was considered by the Inspector for employment uses at the Inquiry (section 6.24 of his report). It is not correct that this area has no environmental issues, as it falls within the national designation of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Inspector considers that such a proposal would "constitute a significant breach of the existing built-up limits of Ross-on-Wye and unwarranted extension into the open Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty."  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. L Cosker          | Council's reasons for rejecting the recommendation are grossly inadequate. All the reasons for rejecting the Inspector's recommendations were considered in full at the Inquiry. The Council's decision amounts to no more than a preference unsupported by any new evidence or reasoning. It would be irrational to exclude land at Overross which has been demonstrated to be superior to the alternatives on the evidence.   | The matters raised have been considered at length throughout the UDP process. In considering the Inspector's conclusions on these and his recommendation, the Council have concluded that the balance of planning considerations favours the Model Farm site, taking into account the wide variety of issues raised including landscape, urban edge, and access. These matters are adequately addressed within the Statement of Decisions and Reasons.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>           | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Ms. Rosemarie Dixon   | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mr. Robert K. Dixon   | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mr. B. Donald         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. Additionally objector questions need for additional employment land.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. With regard to the additional ground of objection the Inspector has acknowledged the need for additional employment land in Ross.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mr. R. Dowding        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. Additionally objector believes it is inconceivable that 2 Inspector's have been ignored in continuing to propose Model Farm. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. The recommendations of the Inspector are not binding upon the Local Authority and the reasons for rejecting this recommendation are set out in the Proposed Modifications document. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mrs. J. Dowding       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. Additionally objection to obtaining an independent recommendation and ignoring the findings.                                 | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. The recommendations of the Inspector are not binding upon the Local Authority and the reasons for rejecting this recommendation are set out in the Proposed Modifications document. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| G.R. Downing          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |  |
| Mr. Mark Eardley      | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

52

| <i>NAME</i>              | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr & Mrs BJ & JM Edwards | The Inspector concluded that the development on Model Farm was unacceptable. The rejection reasons include to secure a more attractive edge of Ross would move the existing edge of Ross a further half mile from the present edge. The reasons also refer to the precedent set by the development behind Hildersley Farm. However, the Inspector indicates that this should not provide justification for employment development at Model Farm. Overross should be developed rather than Model Farm. The Council is not in a better position than the Inspector in determining the most appropriate site. | The planning issues raised have all been considered during the preparation of the Plan. In terms of the technical suitability of the site, the Inspector comments that many objections do not affect the principle of whether the site should be allocated, or are capable of resolution through planning conditions and obligations, and refers to access and flooding in this regard. The site is suitable for the development proposed and capable of implementation. Meeting the employment needs of Ross-on-Wye will require the release of additional land. The question of the site's landscape setting and the approach to the town is considered in the Council's rejection of the Inspector's recommendation. The position remains that the overall balance of planning considerations favours the allocation of the Model Farm site. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| J.V. Field               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. D. Foy               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mrs. M.K. Foy            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mrs. J. Francis          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. R.A. Francis         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. Alan Gane            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>             | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Ms. Karen Gane          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Chris Godwin            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Ms. Clare Godwin        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mrs. W. Goodby          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. Additionally, Ross has many industrial units currently unoccupied, more are not needed.                       | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. With regard to the additional ground of objection the Inspector has acknowledged the need for additional employment land in Ross. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| 54 Mr. P. Goodby        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. Additionally, Ross has brownfield sites and unoccupied industrial units, further developments are not needed. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. With regard to the additional ground of objection the Inspector has acknowledged the need for additional employment land in Ross. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr & Mrs P. Haley       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr R I Hendrie          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mrs. Clare Hetherington | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |



| <i>NAME</i>           | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| A.D. Hunter           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| Mrs J James           | The land is not suitable for development having regard to insufficient road structure, unacceptable noise pollution in a residential area, propensity to flood, danger to residents from industrial traffic, interference with emergency services based at Hildersley, loss of agricultural land, adverse impact on the approach to the town, and intrusion into open countryside. Council ownership of the land should not influence decision to site industrial development in inappropriate location. | The planning issues raised have all been considered during the preparation of the Plan. In terms of the technical suitability of the site, the Inspector comments that many objections do not affect the principle of whether the site should be allocated, or are capable of resolution through planning conditions and obligations, and refers to access and flooding in this regard. The site is suitable for the development proposed and capable of implementation. Meeting the employment needs of Ross-on-Wye will require the release of additional land. The question of the site's landscape setting and the approach to the town is considered in the Council's rejection of the Inspector's recommendation. The position remains that the overall balance of planning considerations favours the allocation of the Model Farm site. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| Mr. Andrew Jones      | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| Ms Rebecca Jones      | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| M.J. Knowles          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| L.N. Knowles          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| Mrs. C.L. Large       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>           | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Dr. D.M. Large        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. Vincent Lewis     | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Ms Leah Lewis         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. P.J. Lines        | New development on Model Farm would have severe impact on the gateway to Ross. Overross is currently being redeveloped. Model Farm is not the more suitable site for sustainable transport, both sites have similar choices. Access to Model Farm is not readily and directly available from the A40 as claimed, significant work to Hildersley and Overross would be required. Access to Model Farm affects greenfield land and the existing organic farm on the site provides habitat for skylarks, a declining bird species. Buffer zone would only last for the UDP period, once there is an increased requirement for housing this would be rezoned. The ownership of the site is felt to be the overriding consideration in the decision. | Development of Model Farm provides an opportunity to improve the gateway to Ross. In respect of access, Model Farm is considered to provide a more suitable, accessible and sustainable location for the provision of employment land. The Inspector in paragraph 6.10.11 recognises that there are no objections from the competent authorities on access grounds. In terms of wildlife value of the site the national and local bodies have been consulted throughout the UDP process and have not objected to the proposal. There is no indication that the buffer zone will be "rezoned" at a future point in time. Any changes to UDP designations would be undertaken as part of the development of the LDF which itself will be subject to consultation. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation are set out in the Proposed Modifications document. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mrs C. Lines          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. P.J. Lines        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>           | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mrs. C Lines          | New development on Model Farm would have severe impact on the gateway to Ross. Overross is currently being redeveloped. Model Farm is not the more suitable site for sustainable transport, both sites have similar choices. Access to Model Farm is not readily and directly available from the A40 as claimed, significant work to Hildersley and Overross would be required. Access to Model Farm affects greenfield land and the existing organic farm on the site provides habitat for skylarks, a declining bird species. Buffer zone would only last for the UDP period, once there is an increased requirement for housing this would be rezoned. The ownership of the site is felt to be the overriding consideration in the decision. | Development of Model Farm provides an opportunity to improve the gateway to Ross. In respect of access, Model Farm is considered to provide a more suitable, accessible and sustainable location for the provision of employment land. The Inspector in paragraph 6.10.11 recognises that there are no objections from the competent authorities on access grounds. In terms of wildlife value of the site the national and local bodies have been consulted throughout the UDP process and have not objected to the proposal. There is no indication that the buffer zone will be "rezoned" at a future point in time. Any changes to UDP designations would be undertaken as part of the development of the LDF which itself will be subject to consultation. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation are set out in the Proposed Modifications document. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. M.J. Lodge        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mrs P. Lodge          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Ms Angela Lukas       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| M.G. Lukas            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mrs. D. Mason         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |   |  |
| Mr. D. Mason          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>              | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| A.B. McAllan             | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| S.A. Meek                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| P.J. Meek                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Peter & Elspeth Metcalfe | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| 58 Mr Stephen Moggs      | The land is not suitable for development having regard to insufficient road structure, unacceptable noise pollution in a residential area, propensity to flood, danger to residents from industrial traffic, interference with emergency services based at Hildersley, loss of agricultural land, adverse impact on the approach to the town, and intrusion into open countryside. Council ownership of the land should not influence decision to site industrial development in inappropriate location. | The planning issues raised have all been considered during the preparation of the Plan. In terms of the technical suitability of the site, the Inspector comments that many objections do not affect the principle of whether the site should be allocated, or are capable of resolution through planning conditions and obligations, and refers to access and flooding in this regard. The site is suitable for the development proposed and capable of implementation. Meeting the employment needs of Ross-on-Wye will require the release of additional land. The question of the site's landscape setting and the approach to the town is considered in the Council's rejection of the Inspector's recommendation. The position remains that the overall balance of planning considerations favours the allocation of the Model Farm site. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr & Mrs J. Morris       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mrs. J. Nesaratnam       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                                   | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>                  | <i>RESPONSE</i>                                  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Dr. Ramesh Nesaratnam                         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Mr. Michael Palfrey                           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Mrs. Alison Palfrey                           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Mr. Simon Pascoe                              | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Ms. Janet Pascoe                              | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Mr. Neil Pascoe                               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Mr. Nick Pascoe                               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b>                  |  |  |  |
| Cllr. N.B. Pascoe (Ross Rural Parish Council) | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                  | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>                  | <i>RESPONSE</i>                                  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mrs. V.J. Porter             | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Rev. D. Porter               | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mrs. V. Price                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. M. Price                 | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| 8 Ms. Betty M. Rich          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. Harold J. Rich           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b><i>Objection from</i></b> |  |  |  |
| Mr. Stuart Rosser            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                                 | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>  | <i>RESPONSE</i>  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| S.A. Sherwood Rogers                        | Model Farm is a organic farm with high quality agricultural land which will require several years to replace. Access approval for the site cannot be obtained in a reasonable time and its implementation is beyond the control of the Council. Traffic noise will increase as a result of the proposal unlike the Overross site. There is a danger of damaging the aquifer which is used for providing drinking water. It is noted that the site is owned by the Council. | The constraints to development in Ross-on-Wye are such that any allocation of this size would inevitably entail the development of greenfield land. In respect of access, the Model Farm provides suitable, accessible and sustainable location for the provision of employment land. The Inspector in paragraph 6.10.11 recognises that there are no objections from the competent authorities on access grounds. In respect of the impact upon the aquifer the Inspector indicates in paragraph 6.10.11 that, subject to detailed conditions, the Environment Agency has no objections to the principle of the allocation. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation are fully set out in the Proposed Modifications document. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Mr. M. Smith                                | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Mrs C.A. Soble                              | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Cllr A.P. Soble (Ross Rural Parish Council) | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Mr & Mrs J. Tatlow                          | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Ms. Marina Taylor                           | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                       |  |  |  |
| Mr. David Taylor                            | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>            | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Mrs. L.E. Wallis       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Mr. N.S. Wallis        | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Mr. A. Weinhardt       | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Mr. C. Wheeler         | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| 9<br>Mrs. A.M. Wheeler | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Mr & Mrs S. Williams   | Comments as set out for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | Response as set for Mr & Mrs R.W. Andrews above.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |   |  |
| Friends of the Earth   | The Council should accept the Inspector's recommendation based on the evidence given at the UDP Inquiry. Further matters have become apparent since the Inspector's report. No research has been undertaken regarding extending the Overross Industrial Estate to the North. There are several reasons why the Model Farm development should be rejected. | Careful consideration was given to the Inspector's recommendation, however, the Council remains of the opinion that Model Farm is the most appropriate site for an employment allocation for the reasons set out in full in the Proposed Modifications document. In respect of land north of Overross Industrial Estate, this area was considered by the Inspector for employment uses at the Inquiry (section 6.24 of his report). He considers that such a proposal would "constitute a significant breach of the existing built-up limits of Ross-on-Wye and unwarranted extension into the open Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty." There is no need to undertake further research into this area at the present time. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |



| NAME                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION  |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Objection from</b> |   |  |   |
| Herefordshire CPRE    | The Council have not addressed the Inspector's conclusions and their counter-reasons fail to address points made by the Inspector. Landscape has not been treated as a factor in the Council's decision. The Council have also failed to counter the Inspector's conclusions in respect of uses at Hildersley Farm, farm buildings at Model farm, urban boundaries, and access issues. The Council have been influenced by their property interests in exercising their planning functions. | The matters raised have been considered at length throughout the UDP process. In considering the Inspector's conclusions on these and his recommendation, the Council have concluded that the balance of planning considerations favours the Model Farm site, taking into account the wide variety of issues raised including landscape, urban edge, and access. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.        |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |  |   |
| Mr D Boynton and Son  | Support rejection of Inspector's recommendation. Overross site is unsuitable due to visual impact and infrastructure issues.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the rejection of the Inspector's Recommendation be noted. |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |  |   |
| Wye Valley AONB       | Support retention of Model Farm site for employment use due to landscape impact of Overross site on Wye Valley AONB.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the rejection of the Inspector's Recommendation be noted. |

|                     |        |                  |  |              |
|---------------------|--------|------------------|--|--------------|
| Inspector's Ref No: | 7.23/2 | Policy/Paragraph | Policies TCR21/TCR20R and paragraphs 7.7.18 to 7.7.25 and 7.7.25R to 7.7.32R - Hereford Livestock Market redevelopment and Eign Gate regeneration area | 1 comment(s) |
|---------------------|--------|------------------|--|--------------|



|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b> |  |   |  |
| The Crown Estate      | Rejection of Inspector's recommendations has not been justified given lack of need. Council's approach to the primary shopping area is inconsistent and at odds with PPS6. Inspector's recommendation should be accepted and a strategy must be in place to ensure gaps in retail provision are not left vacant. | The Inspector supports the Plan's approach to central shopping and commercial areas in policy TCR1, concluding that this is consistent with Government advice on town centres set out in PPS6. Similarly he supports the approach to the assessment of retail development outside central shopping and commercial areas (policy TCR9). He also supports an unrestricted policy in retail terms for the comprehensive planning and development of the Eign Gate Regeneration Area (policy TCR20R), with the recommendation that there should be no significant net increase in convenience goods floorspace. In rejecting this recommendation, the Council is mindful of the possibility that the overall regeneration scheme could lead to net increases in convenience goods floorspace, either through the expansion of redistributed uses or new provision, which would be desirable and justifiable in overall in terms of their planning benefits. Such increases could be significant or otherwise depending on the context and the benefits realised. The policy should not preclude this possibility. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

|                     |        |                  |  |               |
|---------------------|--------|------------------|--|---------------|
| Inspector's Ref No: | 8.35/1 | Policy/Paragraph | Paragraph 8.8.21 - Leominster Zone of Interest | 10 comment(s) |
|---------------------|--------|------------------|--|---------------|

| <i>NAME</i>             | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr. A C Anthony-Edwards | There is no plan or need for additional growth at Leominster. A constraint should not be put in place with no policies to support it. This may have the effect of restricting more suitable developments in the future.   | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr Mervyn L Bufton      | Paragraph 8.8.21 should be deleted from the Plan. Additional to the Inspector's reasons is a recently arisen matter. Polytunnel farming at Brierley involving large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists puts into doubt the feasibility of an east-west bypass cutting across the Brierley-Leominster axis. | The wording of paragraph 8.8.21 is an acknowledgement of the constraints upon development in Leominster in the interests of future planning beyond the Plan period. There is no proposal to develop within the Zones of Interest in this Plan period, should future proposals for an east-west link be proposed road safety will be a consideration at that time. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr. Gerald Dawe         | There is no plan or need for additional growth at Leominster. A constraint should not be put in place with no policies to support it. This may have the effect of restricting more suitable developments in the future. Proposals may conflict with sustainable development and climate change.             | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning. These proposals will be subject to sustainability appraisal, addressing climate change.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr Aubrey Greene        | If the zone of interest is included within the UDP it should be shown on the Proposals Map and consulted upon before adoption.  | The current wording of paragraph 8.8.21 is an acknowledgement of the constraints upon development in Leominster in the interests of future planning beyond the Plan period. Addressing these issues through definition of a specific route will be undertaken at a future date. It is not appropriate to show proposals that will be brought forward post-2011.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr. Mark Hubbard        | There is no evidence to support the Leominster zone of interest. A constraint should not be put in place with no policies to support it. This may have the effect of restricting more suitable developments in the future.  | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Ms Rebecca Roseff       | There is no plan or need for additional growth at Leominster. A constraint should not be put in place with no policies to support it. This may have the effect of restricting more suitable developments in the future.   | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                               | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Ms Janet Shott                     | There is no plan or need for additional growth at Leominster. A constraint should not be put in place with no policies to support it. This may have the effect of restricting more suitable developments in the future.  | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire CPRE                 | The zone of interest is contrary to PPG12 and the Council do not give any reason why this should be overridden nor address the Inspector's objection.  | The paragraph in question does not refer to a Plan proposal as such, but to longer term future growth. It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning.                                   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Herefordshire Friends of the Earth | In the absence of approved policies for development in this area, planning blight will result.   | It is considered reasonable to record the likely requirement for further road infrastructure to enable growth at Leominster beyond the plan period, in the interests of future planning. The area is subject to Plan wide policies for the control of development outside urban areas, restricting the impact of planning blight. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD    | The Inspector states that it would be wrong, unnecessary and premature to indicate that land to the south west of Leominster is most suited to longer term growth with a related bypass. It would be unsound to adopt the UDP with reference to the Leominster Zone of Interest. | The wording of paragraph 8.8.21 is an acknowledgement of the constraints upon development in Leominster in the interests of future planning beyond the Plan period. It is not unsound to indicate matters that should be addressed in the long term within the development plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |



## Responses to Proposed Modifications

| NAME                                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Mod No: 007                           | Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 1.5.4 - Background papers   |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |   |   |  |
| West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium | Welcome urban housing capacity study to inform future housing provision.  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 018                           | Policy/Paragraph: Paragraphs 3.2.1 to 3.2.9 - Regional Planning Guidance  |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |   |   |  |
| West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium | Welcome reference to the Regional Spatial Strategy and focus of housing growth on Major Urban Areas, but stress importance of promoting affordable housing in rural areas to meet local need.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 025                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy S3 and paragraphs 5.3.1 to 5.3.7 and Table 1 in Chapter 5 - Housing  |   | 3 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>                 |   |   |  |
| Church Commissioners for England      | Objection to the proposed overprovision of housing in the UDP. The Inspector considers the housing requirement (12,200) to be met without additional housing allocations. Proposed Modification 025 suggests a total 306 above the Inspector's recommendation. There is no justification for the overprovision and no reason why allocated sites will not be developed within the Plan period without the need for a contingency. Include a sum in policy S3 to show how the distribution reflects the housing requirement of 12,200 as set by RSS. | The Proposed Modification is a consequence of updating the figures on completed allocated housing sites and proposed modifications and the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation for land at Bullinghope. An additional allocation is required to provide certainty that the Regional Spatial Strategy housing requirement (12,200) will be delivered given the proximity of the end of the Plan period and the fact that several allocated sites have yet to commence. The Regional Assembly have confirmed that the UDP, as proposed to be modified, is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |   |   |  |
| Church Commissioners for England      | Support introduction of a four tier settlement hierarchy which gives the strategy more clarity and emphasises Hereford's role as a sub-regional focus.  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |   |   |  |
| West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium | Welcome increase in housing numbers to be built and particular emphasis on meeting housing needs and increase of affordable housing provision   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 033                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy DR3 and paragraphs 4.4.14 to 4.4.15 - Movement   |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |   |   |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands        | Support is given to the proposed modification to include "either" in place of "both".   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |

| NAME   | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|--|---|--|--|
| Mod No: 034 Policy/Paragraph: Policy DR3 and paragraphs 4.4.14 to 4.4.15 - Movement 1 comment(s) |   |  |  |
| <b>Support from</b>  |   |  |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands   | Support deletion of "minimum design standards".   | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 037 Policy/Paragraph: Policy DR7 and paragraph 4.5.9 - Flood risk 4 comment(s)           |   |  |  |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |  |
| Mr Peter McKay   | Objects to proposed modified floodplain for Wellington. Suggests alternative map or adding a note indicating that the Environment Agency flood plain map for Wellington is of questionable accuracy.  | The Inspector has considered that the Environment Agency definition of the floodplain, as shown on the proposed changes map, provides the latest flooding information. In reaching this conclusion the Inspector considered the information presented to him by the objector. Paragraph 4.5.6 of the Plan makes it clear that the areas of flood risk shown are indicative. No further change to the areas at risk of flooding at Wellington is necessary.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |  |
| Dr Tim Mullany   | Floodplain depiction for Cusop is wrong. Proposed UDP is based on inaccurate information and will be open to ethical and legal challenge. The suggestion that this blight can be corrected at time of an application by undertaking flood risk assessments is unjust and uncertain. The floodplain map will appear on Local Authority searches it will increase insurance premiums and possibly prevent properties being insured. New modelling will be undertaken and the flood data and map will change during the spring of next year. This data will show the Dulas brook is in a deep ravine as it passes Dulas House. What mechanism for the updated information to be adopted in the UDP? How often will it be revised? Should it be formulated and adopted on inaccurate information? | National planning policy in PPG25 is clear that "Following discussions with the Environment Agency and other interested parties, local planning authorities should show the areas of flood risk on local plans...." The Inspector considered the issue of defining indicative flood plan maps on the UDP Proposals Maps, including the floodplain defined for Cusop and he concluded that the UDP should include the latest information supplied by the Environment Agency. However, the UDP acknowledges in paragraph 4.5.6 that the information is indicative and that the information will be updated as more detailed information becomes available. The latest information and advice supplied by the Environment Agency would be used in the determination of any planning application. It is not accepted that the UDP is a document which will be utilised to set insurance premiums in respect of flooding issues. The UDP will be replaced over time through the preparation of the Council's Local Development Framework and its constituent documents. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |   |  |  |
| Mr. & Mrs. D Stallard  | Proposed modification indicates that our property floods. This has never happened. Brook floods from "Chapel Field". This should be recognised as no houses currently flood due to water running down the road.   | The Inspector considers that the Environment Agency definition of the floodplain, as shown in the proposed modifications, provides the latest flooding information. The Plan makes it clear that the areas of flood risk shown are indicative. No further change to the areas at risk of flooding at Wellington is necessary.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Support from</b>  |   |  |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands   | Support is given to proposed modifications on Proposals Map showing revised information in respect of flood risk.   | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |

| NAME   | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION  |
|--|--|--|---|
| Mod No: 042 Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.3.2 - Strategy and general policy 5 comment(s) |  |  |   |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |  |   |
| Mr E G Bevan   | <p>Proposed Modifications seek to increase housing requirement to 12458, through rejection of Inspector recommendation 5.14/1. Inspector indicates that future housing allocation should be determined on a comprehensive basis. This would include examination of distribution between Hereford, market towns, larger villages and rural areas. Council have increased requirement from 11700 to 12458 without strategic allocation. In allocating a further 300 dwellings to Hereford the Council has failed to examine all alternatives. In Bodenham Moor there is a need for affordable and open market housing, the argument regarding land coming forward at a sufficient rate could also be made in respect of sites in this village. Council should accept Inspector's recommendation in respect of land at Bullinghope or defer adoption of the UDP until a further public inquiry has been held.</p>                                   | <p>The Inspector recommends increasing the housing requirement from 11,700 to 12,200 to accord with the RSS. The Council have accepted this position and the Proposed Modification 042 and rejection of the Inspector's Recommendation 5.14/1 seek to achieve this. In respect of the distribution to rural areas the Inspector supported the levels of housing development proposed in the Deposit Draft, and suggested in paragraph 3.18.59 that, where appropriate, the opportunity could be taken to reduce rural provision. There is therefore no case at present to reconsider the allocation of sites in main villages.</p>   | <p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p> |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |  |   |
| Messrs MJ, AB & RG Griffiths   | <p>Council has rejected the recommendation of the Inspector that 12,152 dwellings are sufficient to meet RSS target (12,200). Should Council wish to increase the requirement a full assessment of implications should be undertaken. Inspector rejected sites on the basis of there being no need, as the Council now consider there is a need for an additional allocation the reasoning of the Inspector is open to doubt and a further inquiry is required. Mod 042 conflicts with Mod 041. Remove land at Bullinghope or hold a further inquiry to determine the housing requirement and its distribution.</p>  | <p>Proposed modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. The modifications make clear that this will ensure certainty that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. There is no conflict between Modifications 041 and 042. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry.</p>   | <p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p> |
| <b>Objection from</b>  |  |  |   |
| Mr G Hankins   | <p>Most sites were recommended for rejection by the Inspector on the basis that land sufficient for the strategic requirement had been identified and there was no need to search further. Council now indicate that 12152 housing sites will not come forward, contrary to the position at the Inquiry and the evidence provided by the Council and supported by the Inspector. If a shortfall exists other land should be re-examined, including land at Church Way, Holmer, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and that in Modification 042 (12,458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Church Way and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid.</p> | <p>The housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed Modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the sites themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the Modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry.</p> | <p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p> |

| NAME                             | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |  |  |
| WO & OE Price                    | Most sites were recommended for rejection by the Inspector on the basis that land sufficient for strategic requirement had been identified and there was no need to search further. Council now indicate that 12152 housing sites will not come forward, contrary to the position at the Inquiry and the evidence provided by the Council and supported by the Inspector. If a shortfall exists other land should be re-examined, including land at Church Way, Holmer, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and Modification 042 figure (12,458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Church Way and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid. | The housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed Modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the sites themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the Modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry. |  |
| <b>Support from</b>              |  |  |  |
| Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water            | Pleased that previous representations have been incorporated into the document and note that they had previously conditionally withdrawn objections to the Broomy Hill, land off Yazor Rd, North of Whitecross and Whitecross sites. In respect of the site at Merrivale in Ross capital works are not programmed for completion until 2010 and this should be taken into account in producing any future LDF document.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 047                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.1 to 5.4.5 and Table 2 - Hereford and the market towns: housing land allocations (non-site based issues)  |  | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |  |  |
| Church Commissioners for England | Objection to proposed over provision of housing. There is no reason why allocated sites should not come forward within the plan period and there is plenty of time to review the housing position through the Core Strategy and subsequent DPDs in order to have revised policies in place by 2011.  | The dwelling provision figures in the Plan have regard to the overall requirement for the County in the Regional Spatial Strategy and to the need to ensure certainty that this requirement will be delivered, the proximity of the end of the Plan period, and the fact that several allocated sites have yet to commence. It is considered that the strategic housing requirement will be appropriately met through the various identified provisions. The Regional Assembly have confirmed that the UDP, as proposed to be modified, is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| Mod No: 056                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.13 (deleted) - Hereford - Allocated sites - Land at Holmer   |  | 28 comment(s)  |



| NAME                     | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mrs Judy Allen           | Funds from new housing should be allocated to make improvements to works to a number of local road junctions, including traffic lights. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provision for a pedestrian/cycle access across the Roman Road Railway Bridge and College Road Bridge should be made. Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions and restriction of street lighting. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road. | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr J E Arnold            | Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Traffic impact on all three railway bridges is likely to increase. Improvements should be made to the railway bridges to ease traffic flows. Improvements should be made to a number of local road junctions.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr and Mrs R G Beveridge | Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Concern for safety at a number of local road junctions in the area. Provisions for a pedestrian access/bridge across the Roman Road railway bridge should be made. Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions for safe crossing.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Ms. Zena Borthwick       | Traffic impact on Roman Road and road between Lyde Cross and Munstone Road is likely to increase and cause problems at the junction. Additional traffic measures are required but the installation of traffic lights would only increase traffic flows. There should be no access from the new estate on to Munstone Road.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>    |  |   |  |
| Mr. David Borthwick      | The Council has included this site in the plan in an undemocratic way. There has been a lack of public consultation from the onset. The current road infrastructure will not cope with additional traffic. Funds from new housing should be allocated to make improvements to a number of local road junctions. Measures to restrict traffic in the Munstone area as well as no access to Munstone Road from the proposed development.   | The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                   | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>         |   |   |  |
| Mrs D Brimfield               | Traffic in the Holmer area is likely to increase. Make improvements to a number of local road junctions.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>         |   |   |  |
| Mrs F J Brooks                | The Council has included this site in the plan in an undemocratic way. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Concern about the increase in traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.   | The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>         |   |   |  |
| Mrs H E Cantrill              | Traffic surveys are required along the traffic routes close to the Holmer site. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Measures to restrict traffic along the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provision for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road railway bridge and College Road bridge should be made. No further development without a bypass. Retain the rural character of the area. Surface water flooding close to the railway bridge on Roman Road. | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>         |   |   |  |
| Mr & Mrs M Graver             | Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 through Lyde and Munstone. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road and retain the rural character.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>         |   |   |  |
| Mr and Mrs JH and BV Hartland | Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provisions for pedestrian/cycle access at the College Road Bridge. Make improvements to a number of local road junctions. Traffic impact on Roman Road and Munstone Road is likely to increase.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME   | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>                        |   |  |  |
| Doris & Robert Holland                       | Traffic impact on Roman Road over the railway bridge is likely to increase. Funds from new housing should not be allocated to the Roman Road railway bridge and should instead be used for works to a number of local road junctions. Measures should be introduced to discourage traffic to and from the A49 between Lyde and Munstone. Provision for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road Railway Bridge and College Road Bridge should be made. Concern about existing septic tank discharges, existing residents should be linked to the public sewer to avoid pollution. Restrict street lighting along Munstone Road to help retain the rural character. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road. | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                        |   |  |  |
| Mr and Mrs Ian Hague and Jane Thompson-Hague | Funds from new housing should not be allocated to the Roman Road railway bridge and should instead be used for the following works to a number of local road junctions. Measures to restrict traffic along the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provision for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road railway bridge and College Road Bridge should be made. Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic and street lighting restrictions. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                        |   |  |  |
| Mr Malcolm Kee                               | Removing the traffic lights from the railway bridge will free up traffic to a continuous flow making it difficult to enter and exit properties on Roman Road.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                        |   |  |  |
| Mrs K Matthews                               | Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                        |   |  |  |
| V A Pugh                                     | A roundabout at the College Road/Roman Road junction is necessary. Reduce the speed limit along Roman Road to 30 miles per hour.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Mrs P Richards             | Concern about the increase in traffic along Munstone Road, and A49. Concern for the existing traffic problems at a number of local road junctions.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Mr Paul Richards           | Traffic management issues need to be addressed especially along narrow lanes and various junctions in the vicinity.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Cllr. Mrs. Sally Robertson | Concern about existing septic tank discharges, existing residents should be linked to the public sewer to avoid pollution. Traffic measures should be introduced to reduce traffic problems on nearby minor roads and Roman Road. Question the legality of the way the Holmer site was dealt with at the inquiry as the site had already been deleted from the Plan.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. At the Inquiry, HADRA were effectively supporters of the Plan since the Holmer site had been removed in 2004, and submitted written evidence accordingly. Crest Strategic Properties Ltd were objectors to the Revised Deposit UDP and consequently had the right to appear at the Inquiry and submit evidence to it. However, it is clear in paragraph 5.15 of the Inspectors Report that he considered all representations in respect of the site including those in support of the Revised Deposit Draft and all issues are covered in his Report. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Mr PM Stubbs               | Objection to the way in which the Holmer and Bullinghope sites were dealt with at the various Plan stages as the wishes of the local community appear to have been ignored. Traffic impact on Roman Road and surrounding area is likely to increase. Funds from new housing should be allocated to make road improvements to a number of local road junctions. Provisions to widen the railway bridge at the Bridge Inn and at Roman Road should be made. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. | The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>      |   |  |  |
| Mr A P Thomas              | Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. There should be a new river crossing connected to the west of Roman Road.   | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| <i>NAME</i>                             | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>  | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>                   |   |  |  |
| Miss K P Uridge                         | The traffic survey of 2003 is out of date as there has been an increased amount of traffic since Roman Road improvements were made. Funds from new housing should not be allocated to widen the Roman Road railway bridge as the traffic impact on Roman Road over the railway bridge is likely to increase. Provisions for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road railway bridge should be made. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                   |   |  |  |
| Mr A N West                             | Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions. Funds from the Holmer development should be put towards the proposed Relief Road. Concern for the existing traffic problems at a number of local road junctions. There should be no alterations to the Roman Road railway bridge.  | The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Objection from</b>                   |   |  |  |
| Holmer & District Residents Association | Question the legality of the way the Holmer site was dealt with at the inquiry as the site had already been deleted from the Plan. Object to the possibility of a two way traffic system on the A4103 railway crossing. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Funds from new housing should not be allocated to the Roman Road railway bridge and should instead be used for works to a number of local road junctions. Measures to restrict traffic along the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane Provision should be made for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road Railway Bridge and as well as a cycle/pedestrian access on College Road Bridge. Provide a continuous green corridor along the Eastern boundary of the site. Restrict street lighting along Munstone Road to help retain the rural character. Concern about existing septic tank discharges. Existing residents should be linked to the public sewer to avoid pollution. | At the Inquiry, HADRA were effectively supporters of the Plan since the Holmer site had been removed in 2004, and submitted written evidence accordingly. Crest Strategic Properties Ltd were objectors to the Revised Deposit UDP and consequently had the right to appear at the Inquiry and submit evidence to it. However, it is clear in paragraph 5.15 of the Inspectors Report that he considered all representations in respect of the site including those in support of the Revised Deposit Draft and all issues are covered in his Report. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Support from</b>                     |   |  |  |
| Mr W.H.D. Hartland                      | Modification supported.   | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| <b>Support from</b>                     |   |  |  |
| Church Commissioners for England        | The Holmer site is preferred to Bullinghope and can deliver road improvements.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |

| NAME                                  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE          | RECOMMENDATION                                      |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Crest Strategic Projects LTD          | Crest fully support the Council's decision to reinstate land at Holmer for residential purposes and adjust the settlement boundary accordingly in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations. | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Hereford City Council                 | The City Council unreservedly supports the Inspector's conclusion as to the use of the Holmer site.  | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium | Welcome target of 35% affordable housing on land at Holmer and the specific reference to an element of affordable housing and a mix of dwelling units.   | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 059                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp   |                   | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD       | Support acceptance of recommendation to increase estimated capacity at Baron's Cross Camp to 425 dwellings, consistent with PPG3 and recent planning permission on the site.                       | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 060                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp   |                   | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD       | Support deletion of "nursery accommodation" from paragraph 5.4.18 reflecting planning permission of October 2006.  | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 061                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane  |                   | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands        | Support reference to the 2005 development brief.   | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 062                           | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane  |                   | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                   |  |                   |   |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands        | Support the proposed replacement wording with regard to bringing forward the Tanyard Lane site.  | Support is noted. | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 063                           | Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.4.22 - Land at Tanyard Lane  |                   | 2 comment(s)  |

| NAME  | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands                                  | Reference to the new business park remains in para 5.4.22. The Inspector makes clear in 6.10.31 that there is potential confusion over which provisions cover which site in respect of the Overross employment site and Tanyard Lane housing site. No off site pedestrian/cycling works have been proposed in respect of Tanyard Lane therefore "and business park" should be deleted from 5.4.22. Also reference to use of Section 106 or 278 agreements should be stated in the text of 5.4.22 as detailed in the Inspector's report at paragraph 5.23.12. | The Inspector concludes that the paragraphs dealing with Model Farm and Tanyard Lane should not deal with aspects of both sites. However, his recommendation 6.10/2 (which was accepted by the Council resulting in proposed modification 104) only partially succeeds in achieving this, and a reference to the new business park remains in the fourth sentence of paragraph 5.4.22. This is now an outdated reference. Its removal is considered a minor, consequential change following from the acceptance of recommendation 6.10/2 and would be undertaken as a change under proposed modification 219. With regard to the reference to the use of Section 106 or 278 agreements this issue was considered by the Inspector in paragraph 5.23.12. He made no recommendation regarding the inclusion of any reference as a proposed modification. Such a reference is not considered necessary. | Delete the words "and business park" from the fourth sentence of paragraph 5.4.22 (as a minor change consequential upon the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation 6.10/2 and which will not materially affect the Plan). No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| <b>Support from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands                                  | Support is given to including "occupation" instead of "commencement" and to the deletion of "and the new business park proposal" in paragraph 5.4.22.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.  |
| Mod No: 077   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59 - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington  |  | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr Peter McKay  | Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.  |
| Mod No: 078   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59 - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington  |  | 2 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Mr Peter McKay  | Support thrust of modification but would like to see words from modification 079, namely "or on such other site as may be agreed by the Council in substitution" included. Notes also that modification 078 applies to land at Church Farm not Auberrow Road as stated in Modifications document.  | It is accepted Modification 078 refers to the Church Farm site, the reference in the Proposed Modifications reflects the manner which the issue is considered in the Inspector's Report. The recreational facilities proposed by Modification 078 are related to the Church Farm site. It is therefore appropriate that the housing development contribute to this facility rather than facilities elsewhere in the village.   | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.   |
| <b>Support from</b>   |  |  |  |
| Wellington Community Association Parish Plan Steering Committee | Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.  |
| Mod No: 079   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59a - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington   |  | 2 comment(s)   |

77

| <i>NAME</i>   | <i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>   | <i>RESPONSE</i>   | <i>RECOMMENDATION</i>  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr Peter McKay  | Support modification.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Wellington Community Association Parish Plan Steering Committee | Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 096   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy H19 - Open space requirements  |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr Peter McKay  | Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 098   | Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 6.3.5 - Strategy and general policy.  |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |   |  |
| West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium                           | Welcome insertion of the target of 80% housing on each hectare of land.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 103   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 and paragraphs 6.4.28 to 6.4.29 - New employment land allocations - Ross-on-Wye - Overross and Model Farm site                                  |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Mr. L Cosker  | The buffer is not required if land at Overross is allocated in preference to Model Farm. It should be deleted unless the site is allocated in addition to land at Overross. | The Council remains of the opinion that Model Farm is the most appropriate location for an employment allocation and has rejected the Inspector's recommendation 6.10/1. There remains the need to retain the land to the west of Model Farm as a buffer between the existing residential uses and the proposed employment development. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| Mod No: 104   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 and paragraphs 6.4.28 to 6.4.29 - New employment land allocations - Ross-on-Wye - Overross and Model Farm site                                  |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>   |   |   |  |
| Persimmon Homes South Midlands                                  | Support is given to the deletion of reference to Tanyard Lane in order to eliminate confusion over the requirements expected from each site.                                | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 105   | Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 - New employment land allocations - Hereford - west of Beech Business Park  |   | 1 comment(s)   |



| NAME                             | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT   | RESPONSE  | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Support from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Church Commissioners for England | Support extension of settlement boundary which will allow local firms to maintain a presence and benefit from potential of a relocated livestock market  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 149                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy T10 and paragraphs 8.8.11 to 8.8.12 - Safeguarding road schemes - Outer relief road / Rotherwas Access Road   |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Highways Agency                  | Content that the only modification is to include the agreed alignment for the road   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 158                      | Policy/Paragraph: Paragraphs 9.4.1 to 9.4.4 - Landscape introduction   |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Wye Valley AONB                  | Brings the context of paragraph 9.4.1 up to date with the latest Government guidance.  | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 160                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA1 and paragraphs 9.4.5 to 9.4.7 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty   |   | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>              |  |   |  |
| Wye Valley AONB                  | Modification makes policy LA1 clearer in terms of reference to "economic" development in AONB's and more in line with Government statements.   | Support is noted.   | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 161                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA2 and paragraphs 9.4.8 to 9.4.16 - Landscape character and areas least resilient to change  |   | 2 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |  |   |  |
| Savills                          | Representations were previously made to exclude the Madley Satellite Earth Station site from the LA2 provisions, while there has been changed to the Areas Least Resilient to Change the policy wording would still apply negatively to the site. The change would result in a presumption against the expansion and investment by BT could create a more negative policy background. There a similarities between this site and Stirling Lines at Credehill. The site is of National Importance and has been atypical of the surrounding landscape types. Any expansion requirements should be capable of outweighing this policy, but policy does not acknowledge the development to date or allow scope to overcome a policy objection without relying on material considerations. UDP policy should have a presumption in favour of further development subject to criteria. | At the Deposit Draft stage of the UDP process objections were received on behalf of BT plc indicating that policy LA2 could prohibit extension or expansion of existing businesses and suggesting a number of changes that should be made to the policy. The Inspector in paragraph 9.4.4 recognises that objections have been made regarding the recognition within the policy of "atypical" areas. His response to such objections is the recommendation to delete the references to Areas Least Resilient to Change (9.4/1) and this has been accepted by the Council. The policy justification, as proposed to be modified, makes it clear that the intention of the policy is not to prevent necessary development and the policy criteria are not considered to be unduly restrictive. However, it is entirely reasonable that the issue of landscape character is addressed when development proposals are considered. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                             | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Support from</b>              |   |  |  |
| Church Commissioners for England | Support modification. The written policy provides sufficient clarity without the need to identify specific areas on the proposals map.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 164                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows   |  | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |   |  |  |
| Woodland Trust                   | Support deletion of the words "and only permitted where the development is in the public interest" but suggest absolute protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees can be achieved by amending further the second sentence of criterion 2 to read "In particular, proposals affecting protected trees and Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodlands will be refused". These eco-systems cannot be re-created and there should be no further loss of this finite resource. It is essential that this habitat is protected absolutely from development. | The Modification is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector in his consideration of original objections by the Woodland Trust addressed the need for absolute protection or ancient woodland and ancient trees. He did not consider that the policy should be explicit in suggesting that there could be exceptions to the policy (paragraph 9.18). The Council have accepted this recommendation and proposed an appropriate modification. However, the Inspector also accepts, in the same paragraph, that there will always be exceptions to policy. Therefore, the policy, as proposed to be modified, is considered to provide adequate protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees. | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |
| Mod No: 165                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows   |  | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>              |   |  |  |
| Woodland Trust                   | Support replacement of "Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands" with "Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodlands"   | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 166                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows   |  | 1 comment(s)   |
| <b>Support from</b>              |   |  |  |
| Woodland Trust                   | Support the text referring to restoration of Ancient Woodland sites where plantations have occurred (PAWS).   | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.                |
| Mod No: 176                      | Policy/Paragraph: Policy HBA9 - Protection of open areas and green spaces - Additional area - Cradley - Land between St Katherines and Huntingdon   |  | 2 comment(s)   |
| <b>Objection from</b>            |   |  |  |
| HOSAG                            | In producing VDS consultation processes identified that land between St Katherines and Huntingdon should be protected from development. This view was supported by Council at revised deposit stage through the HBA9 designation. Inspector's recommendation ignores community views and should not be accepted.  | In making his recommendation the Inspector clearly considered the views of local residents and the responses in the village design statement. The Inspector clearly considers that the HBA9 designation is not appropriate for this site.  | No further modification be proposed in response to this objection. |

| NAME                                 | SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT  | RESPONSE   | RECOMMENDATION                                      |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Support from</b>                  |   |  |   |
| Mr Anson                             | Supports proposed modification 176 and map PM19. Inspector concluded, having considered the merits of the site vis-a-vis the requirements of the policy, that the site does not warrant protection by policy HBA9.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 200                          | Policy/Paragraph: Policy CF3 and paragraphs 13.4.8 to 13.4.12 - Telecommunications  |  | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                  |   |  |   |
| Mobile Operators Association (MOA)   | Support modifications to paragraph 13.4.12  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 203                          | Policy/Paragraph: Proposed new policy - New prison  |  | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Support from</b>                  |   |  |   |
| National Offencer Management Service | Supports modification 203 which accords with the Inspector's recommendation 13.10/1.  | Support is noted.  | The support for the Proposed Modification be noted. |
| Mod No: 215                          | Policy/Paragraph: Proposals Map - Cusop Map 13  |  | 1 comment(s)  |
| <b>Objection from</b>                |   |  |   |
| Dr Tim Mullany                       | Floodplain depiction for Cusop is wrong. Proposed UDP is based on inaccurate information and will be open to ethical and legal challenge. The suggestion that this blight can be corrected at time of an application by undertaking flood risk assessments is unjust and uncertain. The floodplain map will appear on Local Authority searches it will increase insurance premiums and possibly prevent properties being insured. New modelling will be undertaken and the flood data and map will change during the spring of next year. This data will show the Dulas brook is in a deep ravine as it passes Dulas House. What mechanism for the updated information to be adopted in the UDP? How often will it be revised? Should it be formulated and adopted on inaccurate information. | National Planning policy in PPG25 is clear that "Following discussions with the Environment Agency and other interested parties, local planning authorities should show the areas of flood risk on local plans...." The Inspector considered the issue of defining indicative flood plan maps on the UDP Proposals Maps, including the floodplain defined for Cusop and he concluded that the UDP should include the latest information supplied by the Environment Agency. However, the UDP acknowledges in paragraph 4.5.6 that the information is indicative and that the information will be updated as more detailed information becomes available. The latest information and advice supplied by the Environment Agency would be used in the determination of any planning application. It is not accepted that the UDP is a document which will be utilised to set insurance premiums in respect of flooding issues. The UDP will be replaced over time through the preparation of the Council's Local Development Framework and its constituent documents. |   |



## REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meetings Held on 30th October, 2006; 24th November, 2006 and  
19th January, 2007

---

### Membership:

**Councillors:** TW Hunt (Chairman), JB Williams (Vice-Chairman),  
Mrs PA Andrews, Mrs CJ Davis, PJ Dauncey, DJ Fleet, JGS Guthrie,  
PE Harling, JW Hope, B Hunt, Mrs JA Hyde, Brig P Jones CBE, RM Manning,  
PG Turpin, RI Matthews, Mrs JE Pemberton, R Preece, DC Taylor, WJ Walling.

### REFERRED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. The following Planning Applications were determined by the Committee because (i) they related to the Council's own development or to the development of land owned by the Council; (ii) they were applications referred to the Committee by the Head of Planning Services because the Area Planning Sub-Committees are mindful to approve/refuse them contrary to officer recommendations and Council's Policies; or (iii) they were applications by Members or their relatives.
  - (a) DCSE2006/1907/O - proposed residential development at land adjacent to Westhaven, Sixth Avenue, Greytrees, Ross-On-Wye – approved as recommended;
  - (b) DCSW2006/2417/F - proposed replacement dwelling including removal of existing unoccupied house with new dwelling, to have re-arranged vehicular access from Lyston Lane, Brynfield, Lyston Lane, Wormelow (Near Orcop), – approved contrary to recommendation;
  - (c) DCNC2006/2926/F - erection of timber garden fence on land adjoining Greystones, Wyson, Brimfield near Ludlow - refused contrary to recommendation;
  - (d) DCSW2003/3281/N - waste treatment (using an autoclave) & recycling facility, including construction of a new building, Stoney Street Industrial Estate, Madley – approved as recommended;
  - (e) DCCE2006/3117/F - demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 13 no. two bed apartments with associated external works. amendment to access road previously approved (DCCE2005/0977/F) Mill Court Village, Ledbury Road, Hereford (Phase 2) - approved as recommended;
  - (f) DCNC2006/3364/F - proposed temporary mobile health facilities (temporary for seven years) at Broad Street Car Park, Leominster – deferred for alternative sites to be looked at which would have less impact on town centre car parking;
  - (g) DCSE2006/3238/O - proposed agricultural dwelling with garden at Steppe House Farm, Pencraig, Ross-on-Wye – approved contrary to recommendation; and
  - (h) DCSE2006/1146/F - creation of a green space for recreational use by whole community. landscaping to create two flat areas to provide playground and general use area for children and adults at land behind Goodrich School, Goodrich - approved as recommended.

## **AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEES**

2. Information reports have been received from the three Area Planning Sub-Committees which have dealt with the following matters:

### **(a) Northern Area Planning Sub-Committee**

- Applications approved as recommended – 12
- Applications minded to approve or refuse contrary to recommendation – 7 (0 referred to Planning Committee by the Head of Planning Services)
- Applications deferred for further information or negotiations - 6
- Site inspections – 3
- Number of public speakers – 11 (2 parish councils, 5 objectors, 4 supporters)
- Appeals – 19 have been received and 14 determined (1 upheld 12 dismissed and 1 withdrawn)

### **(b) Central Area Planning Sub-Committee**

- Applications approved as recommended – 16
- Applications deferred for further information or negotiations - 1
- Applications minded to approve or refuse contrary to recommendation – 2 (1 referred to the Head of Planning Services and the Planning Committee)
- Site inspections – 1
- Number of public speakers – 18 (3 parish councils, 7 objectors, 10 supporters)
- Appeals – 7 appeals have been received and 6 determined (4 dismissed, 1 upheld and 1 withdrawn)

### **(c) Southern Area Planning Sub-Committee**

- Applications approved as recommended – 15
- Applications refused as recommended – 1
- Applications deferred - 1
- Applications minded to approve or refuse contrary to recommendation – 0
- Site visits – 0
- Number of public speakers – 10 (1 Parish Councils 6 supporters, 3 objectors)

- Appeals – 8 appeals have been received and 4 determined (0 upheld, 3 dismissed and 1 withdrawn)

### **CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS FOR ROSS ON WYE, MORDIFORD, DILWYN, AYLESTONE HILL**

3. In April 2006 the Committee had recommended a programme for the preparation of appraisals and management proposals for sixteen Conservation Areas in Herefordshire. The first three appraisals approved for initial consultation were Hampton Park, Almeley and Weobley, followed by Ross On Wye, Mordiford, Dillwyn and Aylestone Hill. The next stage was to ask the Cabinet Member (Environment) to confirm the final content of the appraisal documents and the way in which the issues raised through the appraisals should be dealt with. Following this it was intended that consultation upon the issues raised should be undertaken and they would help formulate the management proposals that would form part of the next stage of work in relation to the particular Conservation Areas.
4. It was agreed that the Cabinet Member (Environment) should be requested to accept the appraisals for Ross on Wye, Mordiford, Aylestone Hill, and Dilwyn and the issues raised in association with these for the purpose of instigating the initial consultations with interested parties. It was also agreed that prior to consultation commencing, the Team Leader (Building Conservation) should first meet with the Cabinet Member (Environment) and the Ward Councillors of the Conservation Areas.

### **PLANNING OBLIGATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

5. A Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared as part of the Council's Local Development Scheme and the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The main aims of the SPD are to:-
  - provide as much certainty as possible to landowners, prospective developers and other interested parties;
  - ensure a uniform application of policy;
  - ensure the process is fair and transparent;
  - enable developers to have a 'one stop shop' approach to establishing likely contributions expected; and
  - facilitate a speedier response from the authority to development proposals
6. Under the new planning system, Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) are produced to expand on plan policy and provide additional information and guidance in support of policies and proposals in Development Plan Documents. When adopted, the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP) will have the status of a Development Plan Document (DPD) and its policies will be retained as part of the Council's Local Development Framework for a minimum three-year period. Policies S1 and DR5 of the UDP refer to Planning Obligations. The purpose of an SPD on Planning Obligations will be to make clear to all interested parties the Council's policy stance on the subject. Once adopted, it will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications where contributions are sought. As part of the consultation and information gathering process the Council has sought the views of selected Parish Councils and a number of interested organisations and stakeholders about the content of the SPD. A training seminar was held for

Members in November and the points raised have been addressed within the draft document and a 'one stop shop' approach to establishing likely contributions is anticipated. It has been recommended to cabinet that the Draft Supplementary Planning Document be published for consultation purposes.

## **ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2005-2006**

7. Another aspect of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has been to introduce new provisions and requirements for development planning. The regular review and monitoring of Development Plans through mandatory Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) is a fundamental feature of the new planning system. AMRs are based on a 12-month period from 1st April to 31st March each year and are required to assess:
  - (a) the implementation of the Local Development Scheme; and
  - (b) the extent to which policies in the Local Development Documents are being achieved.
8. The Council's second AMR has been prepared to build upon information obtained from the first one and to meet the requirements of the new planning system. It assesses the extent to which the objectives of UDP policies are being achieved with a comparison to 2004 - 2005. It is a single document which covers all annual monitoring study findings and enables an holistic approach to be taken in assessing the extent to which the policies within Local Development Documents are being achieved. It is noticeable that the development of sites identified within the UDP is gaining momentum with 791 housing completions compared to 560 in 2004 - 2005. There had also been a corresponding increase in the provision of affordable housing and the amount of land developed for employment use was 8.58 ha, an increase of 2.05 ha over 2004 – 2005. Although approximately 8 ha of completions had taken place on greenfield land, the majority of these involved former agricultural buildings and were in accordance with the policies contained within the UDP.
9. The Annual Monitoring Report 2005-2006 has been endorsed and commended to the Cabinet Member (Environment) for submission to Cabinet for approval.

## **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

10. A Local Development Scheme must also be prepared under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It comprised a statement setting out how the Council's forward planning work would be organised over a three-year period. The Scheme has to be revised as necessary and the first Scheme was prepared in 2004, reviewed in November 2005 and came into effect in January 2006. Since then the Scheme had been reviewed in response to a number of factors. The revised Local Development Scheme was endorsed by the Committee and commended to the Cabinet Member (Environment) for submission to Cabinet for approval.

## **CUSOP PARISH PLAN**

11. It has been recommended to the Cabinet Member (Environment) that the planning elements of the Cusop Parish Plan be adopted as planning guidance to the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and as an expression of local distinctiveness and community participation. The aim of the document is to identify measures by which the community aim to improve and enhance the quality of the built environment and to provide a mechanism to inform and influence the decisions of statutory bodies about community priorities and local needs. Key recommendations are included about transport and traffic, landscape and environment, housing, planning and heritage, youth and leisure and community services. The planning issues centre on affordable housing for young people and a



wish to see any new development designed to reflect the character of the local area.

**T.W. HUNT  
CHAIRMAN  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Agenda for the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30th October, 2006; 24th November, 2006 and 19th January, 2007.



## **REPORT OF THE REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

### **Meetings Held on 31st October, 2006; 28th November, 2006; and 30th January, 2007**

---

#### **Membership:**

**Councillors:** R.I. Matthews (Chairman), Brig. P. Jones CBE (Vice-Chairman) H Bramer, Mrs. S.P.A. Daniels, G.W. Davis, D.J. Fleet, J.W. Hope, T.W. Hunt, G Lucas, R. Preece, P.G. Turpin.

#### **HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 119 PROPOSED PUBLIC PATH DIVERSION ORDER – FOOTPATH CG3 (PART) IN THE PARISH OF CODDINGTON**

1. The Committee has considered applications for the following Public Path Diversion Orders for which there has been consultation with interested parties, the local parish councils and the local Ward Councillors where appropriate:-
  - (a) Footpath CS10 Castle Frome - approved;
  - (b) Footpath LV 46 Llanveynoe - refused; and
  - (c) Footpath LW4 Llanwarne – deferred for further investigations.

#### **PROPOSED INCREASE IN HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES 2006/2007 - LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1976 PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO A SPECIALIST PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE (FIRE ENGINE) LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1976**

2. The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 makes provision for Local Licensing Authorities to set the rates/fares within the County together with distance and all other charges. The fares are reviewed each autumn and following consultation, the Trade has requested increases to fares based on small changes to the tariffs charged for distances travelled, rather than a flat percentage increase in fares across the board. The proposals were published in the Hereford Times on 28th September for a two-week public consultation process and came into effect on 6th November, 2006.

#### **ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION IN PUBLIC PLACES - DESIGNATION OF PUBLIC PLACES IN HEREFORD**

3. Local authorities have for some time had the power to bring in byelaws to control the consumption of alcohol in streets, roads and other such places within their areas. These powers were strengthened by the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 which made it easier for the Police to arrest those engaged in anti-social drinking in such designated places. The Council and its predecessor Councils brought such byelaws into effect in parts of the City of Hereford, Ross-on-Wye, Ledbury, and Bromyard. The powers within the 2001 Act have brought about a change in town centres in terms of the previously held perceptions of some that loutish, anti-social behaviour prevailed. A 'tool' was therefore available to control such behaviour and reduce the chances of drinking vessels being used in acts of violence. Since 2001 Herefordshire Council has made 3 Orders relating to areas of the City of Hereford as well as the village of Madley. The Committee has decided to extend its control by making an Order to designate the following places for the control of the consumption of alcohol:

Belmont, Hereford; Whitecross, Hereford; Ledbury; Leominster and Ross-on-Wye. Following concerns raised by the Local Ward Member, it was decided to defer the proposals for Kington for further consultations.

#### **THE GAMBLING ACT 2005**

4. A draft Licensing Statement of Principles and the consultation process for the implementation of the Gambling Act 2005 have been considered. Section 349 of the Act requires all licensing authorities to prepare and publish a statement of the principles that they proposed to apply in exercising their functions under the Act during the three-year period to which the policy applies. The main aims of the Act 2005 are to:
  - prevent gambling being a source of crime or disorder;
  - ensure that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
  - protect children and the vulnerable from being harmed or exploited by gambling.
5. The types of licences that will be covered by the Act, the premises involved and the impact of the work on the Licensing Section have been taken into consideration. Although the implementation date has been postponed until April, 2007, there is much preparatory work to be done in the meantime and the Council's Policy needs to be in place beforehand. A Seminar about the Act had been held in October for Members. The Committee has considered the proposals and decided that
  - (i)- Licensing Officers be granted delegated powers to grant licences for up to four gaming machines in alcohol licensed premises;
  - (ii) the current process where two machines are automatically granted by Licensing Officers and any application for more than two machines will be brought before the Regulatory Committee be retained; and
  - (iii) The Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles be adopted.
6. The Committee considered its first application for an Amusements With Prizes Permit for more than two machines at its meeting on 30th January, 2007 and decided to defer the matter pending a site inspection of the premises at the Grandstand, Grandstand Road, Hereford.

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR THE VARIATION OF CARAVAN SITE LICENCES**

7. Applications for the variation of caravan site licences have been determined as follows:-
  - (i) variation of the Standard Licensing Condition 5.11 for Fayre Oaks Caravan Park, Kings Acre Road, Hereford to enable the removal of a public telephone from the site - approved
  - (ii) variation of Caravan Site Licensing Conditions so that an enclosed porch be permitted to remain at 23 Cottage Park, Ledbury Road, Ross-on-Wye and that a reduced permitted separation space from 6 metres to 5.65 metres be allowed between 23 and 24 Cottage Park, Ledbury Road, Ross-on-Wye for the life of the unit – approved and

- (iii) application for Saltmarsh Castle Caravan Park, Stourport Road, Bromyard to vary Caravan Site Licensing Conditions by removing conditions 5.2 and 5.4 and replacing them with a single condition to allow two 6kg dry powder extinguishers at each fire point to be housed in such a way that they are accessible but not subject to corrosion - approved.

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENCES – LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1976**

8. Seven applications for the renewal or grant of Hackney Carriage/Private Hire drivers licences were referred to the Committee in accordance with the Council's terms and conditions and the advice on the interpretation of spent convictions and medical requirements. The applicants and their representatives gave details of the grounds for their applications and they provided the Committee with the circumstances giving rise to their offences or health situations. Three applications were granted. A suspension in respect of one was lifted pending a court case and one suspension was confirmed pending the outcome of court proceedings. Two applications were refused because the applicants were not considered to be fit and proper persons.
9. Under Section 32 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) the Secretary of State has the power to make regulations to ensure that it is possible for a disabled person to enter and leave a taxi in safety and comfort whilst remaining in a wheelchair. Herefordshire Council has been identified as a "first phase" Local Authority and the provisions of the DDA 1995 will be introduced between 2010 and 2020. Once this is in force the Council will be unable to grant a licence for a hackney carriage unless it conforms to the taxi accessibility regulations. The Council has previously decided that prior to introduction of the Regulations, all new hackney carriage vehicle licences would only be granted in respect of those that had provision for wheelchair accessibility. A request has recently been received from an existing proprietor to allow three saloon cars with wheelchair friendly swivel front passenger seats to be licensed as Hackney Carriages contrary to condition number 1.1 in the vehicle licence conditions. It was decided that the application should be refused because it did not comply with the Council's licensing conditions and aims at meeting the requirements of the Act through increasing the provision of wheelchair accessible hackney carriages.

**R.I. MATTHEWS  
CHAIRMAN  
REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Agenda papers from the meetings of the Regulatory Committee held on 31st October, 2006; 28th November, 2006; and 30th January, 2007.



## **REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**Meetings held on 8th December, 2006 and 19th January, 2007**

---

### **Membership:**

Councillors: A.C.R. Chappell,(Chairman) Mrs. P.A. Andrews, H. Bramer, T.M. James, J.G. Jarvis, R.I. Matthews, Mrs. S.J. Robertson.

### **BENEFIT FRAUD INSPECTION REPORT FOR BENEFIT INTERVENTION AND BENEFITS CORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND BENEFIT CHANGES 2007**

1. Councils are required to carry out benefit interventions each year which are a review of a selection of housing and Council tax benefit claims. The Committee has received an update on the Benefit Interventions report from the Benefit Fraud Inspectorate and noted that the majority of the recommendations in the Benefit Intervention Action Plan produced by the officers had been implemented.
2. The Committee has also noted a report on the Benefit Fraud Inspectorates' Corporate Performance Assessment report and Benefit changes. The Committee was informed of the improved performance and efficiencies in the service since the previous assessment in 2005 and the planned benefit changes which would be effective from April 2007.

### **AUDIT COMMISSION REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF E GOVERNMENT PROGRAMME**

3. The Committee has noted the actions taken in respect of recommendations made by the Audit Commission in respect of its E Government Programme.

### **AUDIT SERVICES INTERIM ASSURANCE REPORT**

4. The Committee has considered a report on the progress made in relation to the Audit Plan which also highlighted key internal control issues. The Committee was pleased to note the Audit Commission's approval of the current position that Fundamental Audits were on track.
5. The Committee has also received an update on the status of audits started during the year. It has noted that a report will be submitted to the next meeting on the progress on recommendations in relation to developing guidance on inventories and Criminal Records Bureau checks in respect of schools.

### **AUDIT COMMISSION REPORT LOCAL AREA AGREEMENTS**

6. The Committee has considered a report by the Audit Commission on the Herefordshire Local Area Agreement and has noted that the Audit Commission had been satisfied with the purpose and structure of the Agreement. The Committee has also noted that the officers were currently working with the Herefordshire Partnership Chief Executives' Group and Performance Management Group to incorporate recommendations made into the partnership Action plans.

**FOREWORD TO THE COUNCIL'S CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

7. The Committee has considered a draft Foreword to the Code of Corporate Governance. The Committee has resolved that the draft be submitted to Cabinet for approval, subject to the agreement of the Standards Committee.

**POOLED BUDGETS**

8. The Committee has received a presentation on Pooled Budgets in respect of the Health Act 1999. A copy of the presentation is attached to the Minutes of the 8th December, 2006 meeting of the Committee.

**AUDIT COMMISSION USE OF RESOURCES REPORT**

9. The Audit Commission has submitted a report to the Council on how well the Council manages and uses its financial resources. The Commission's report focused on the importance of having sound financial strategic management to ensure that resources were available to support the Council's priorities and improve services. The Committee noted the action that was being taken on improvements that had been identified and the Audit Commission's endorsement on progress being made. The Audit Commission had indicated that the improvements would translate into an improved assessment for the Council in due course.
10. The Committee has taken note of the Audit Commission's focus on Members and Officers Disclosures in respect of gifts and hospitality and the Commission's intent to hold a Seminar in the near future for Members on that subject.

**AUDIT SERVICES UPDATED INTERIM ASSURANCE REPORT**

11. The Committee received an update on action being take with regards to Critical 1 recommendations previously made. With regard to new Critical 1 recommendations relating to Information Communications Technology (ICT), Financial Management Systems (FMS) and Procurement, the Head of ICT had signed off the action plan. A report on telephone policy and usage will be submitted to the next Meeting of the Committee

**CLIENT INDEX SYSTEM (CLIX) REVIEW**

12. The Committee has noted a report which gave an update on the current status of audit recommendations in respect of the functionality and security of the CLIX system.

**BENEFIT CORPORATE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND BENEFIT CHANGES APRIL 2007**

13. The Committee has noted a report released in November 2006 by the Benefit Fraud Inspectorate for the 2006 Corporate Performance Assessment which has given an assessment based on performance figures for 2005/6. The figures reflected the adverse impact on benefit processing times following the implementation of new software in March 2005 and this had resulted in a 'Fair' rating. Since then, performance has continued to improve in 2006/7 and the Committee has noted that the Benefit Service was on track to return to the



'Good' categorisation for Corporate Performance Assessment in 2007 which would provide a sound basis for the Council to achieve an 'Excellent' rating for Benefits by 2008. The Committee has also noted the Benefit changes in respect of interventions which set targets for the number of reductions and terminations of benefit. .

**MANAGING PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**

14. In 2005, the corporate assessment process found that performance management was the weakest area of the Council's overall arrangements. The Audit Commission has re-examined performance management and assessed progress over the last 12 months. The audit covered processes, systems and procedures as well as the extent to which these were embedded in the culture of the Council and highlighted areas which required immediate attention. As a response to the recommendations by the Audit Commission, the Committee has considered a report and has approved an action plan on the way forward.

**A.C.R. CHAPPELL  
CHAIRMAN  
AUDIT AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Agenda papers of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 8th December, 2006, and 19th January 2007



## **REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC MONITORING COMMITTEE**

### **Meetings Held on 22nd December, 2006 and 15th January, 2007**

#### **Membership:**

Councillors: T.M. James (Chairman), Councillor Mrs. P.A. Andrews (Vice-Chairman), B.F. Ashton, W.L.S. Bowen, H. Bramer, A.C.R. Chappell, J.H.R. Goodwin, Mrs M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, J.P. Thomas, and W.J.S. Thomas.

#### **SCRUTINY REVIEW OF INFORMATION COMMUNICATION AND TECHNOLOGY SERVICES**

1. A scrutiny review of the Council's Information, Communication and Technology Services has been completed. The report has been submitted to the Cabinet Member (Corporate and Customer Services and Human Resources). The recommendations are appended.

#### **AUDIT OF LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT**

2. The Committee has received a report on the Audit Commission's recent Audit of the Herefordshire Local Area Agreement (LAA). The objectives of the Audit were to focus on three main areas: Governance arrangements, Financial Management arrangements and Performance Management systems.
3. The Committee has noted the progress being made by the Council and its partners in addressing the issues raised by the audit. The Auditor found no serious weaknesses or gaps in the arrangements being developed, and clear enthusiasm among partners to make the LAA process work. There were, however a number of specific points where the Auditor felt that more work could be undertaken. The Committee has considered these recommendations. It has noted that one of these was that the Council should clarify and publicise the role and purpose of the Council's overview and scrutiny function in scrutinising performance against the full range of LAA targets.

#### **MANAGING PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**

4. The Committee was informed of the Audit Commission's re-examination in September 2006 of the Council's performance management processes, systems and procedures and the extent to which these are now embedded in the culture of the Council, as a follow up to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment and Joint Area Review in 2005.
5. The Committee has noted the audit's main conclusion was that the Council is making steady progress in strengthening its performance management arrangements and in embedding a performance culture. However, the report makes it clear that the Council still has a long way to go and needs to move even faster in future if it is to bridge the gap between itself and what the Commission has identified as best practice local authorities.
6. The Committee will consider how it wants to monitor progress against the action plan addressing the fourteen recommendations in the audit report. It will also consider whether there are any recommendations from the Commission to which it will wish particular consideration to be given as part of the overall Scrutiny work programme.

## **BENEFIT INSPECTIONS BY THE BENEFIT FRAUD INSPECTORATE**

7. The Committee has received a report on two recent inspections of the Council's Benefit service by the Benefit Fraud Inspectorate.
8. One of these, in July 2006, related to interventions work - the review of housing and council tax benefit claims that are in payment. Herefordshire had been selected for inspection because it was one of a number of councils that had not met the Department for Work and Pensions target for the number of interventions started during 2005. The Committee has noted the action taken in response to the recommendations of this inspection.
9. The other inspection was the 2006 Comprehensive Performance Assessment of the Service, the results of which were published in November, 2006. The Committee has noted the reasons for the Council's rating for this Service being reduced from 'Good' to 'Fair'. It was advised that based on the current performance the Benefit service was well on target to return to the 'Good' categorisation in 2007 and to meet the aim of achieving the 'Excellent' rating by 2008.

## **INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT**

10. The Committee has considered and noted performance to the end of November 2006 against the Annual Operating Plan 2006-07, together with performance against revenue and capital budgets and corporate risks, and remedial action to address areas of under-performance. It has also noted progress being made against the Council's Overall Improvement Programme.

## **FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE**

11. The Committee has received an update on the Medium-Term Financial Management Strategy (MTFMS). This identified emerging areas of pressure for the 2007/08 budget and remedies to meet these areas of risk. It also set out approved Invest to Save and Invest to Mitigate proposals, Directorate base budgets and capital investment proposals.

## **ANNUAL OPERATING PLAN**

12. The Committee has given initial consideration to the Annual Operating Plan 2007-08 and is to consider the Plan further at its meeting on 12th February alongside its consideration of the budget proposals.

## **PAY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

13. Progress against the Strategy including key achievements to date and future challenges has been noted.

## **COMPLAINTS TO THE OMBUDSMAN (PLANNING SERVICE)**

14. It was reported to Council in November that the Local Government Ombudsman had decided to issue Annual Letters for all Councils reflecting on complaints received by individual authorities and setting out any recommended action. In 2005/06 there had been a significant increase in the number of complaints about planning in Herefordshire, up from 15 in 2004/05 to 35 in 2005/06. The Local Government Ombudsman had remarked that although complaints about planning had risen slightly across the Country in 2005/06 the Council may wish to consider whether special factors had caused the increase in Herefordshire.

15. In response the Committee requested an analysis of the complaints about planning. This advised that no findings of maladministration had been found against the Council. In addition there were no obvious areas of consistency in the various complaints (either type of application or type of complaint). To this extent there were no obvious areas which if improved/modified, would be reasonably expected to reduce such complaints in future years. The Committee has been assured that the situation is being monitored and that consideration is being given to whether clarifying the guidance to people wishing to object to proposals might help to reduce complaints.

### **IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

16. Following consideration of a number of possible themes for the scrutiny programme Members had expressed an interest in pursuing the scope for local discretion in Planning (Development Control) policies, noting implications of some decisions on adult social care provision and other Council priorities. The Committee has received a report noting that the planning system encourages balanced decisions which are soundly based in policy and which respect local character and distinctiveness. It has been advised that the forthcoming Local Development Framework should afford greater flexibility to reflect local aims.

### **ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE INDIVIDUAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

17. The work of the Committees is analysed below as far as practicable under the following five roles for overview and scrutiny: holding the executive to account, best value reviews, policy development and review, external scrutiny, and improvement (performance management and review), the first four of which are identified as key roles in the report on “The Development of Overview and Scrutiny in Local Government published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister”. Issues considered by the Strategic Monitoring Committee are listed for completeness.

### **Summary**

18. The **Adult Social Care and Strategic Housing Scrutiny Committee** met on 1st December, 2006 and considered the following issues:

| Theme   | Reports  |
|---|--|
| Holding the Executive to Account                | Scrutiny Review of Services for People with a Learning Disability – Cabinet’s Response   |
| Best Value Reviews                              |  |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Future Social Care Needs for Older People and Adults with Learning Disabilities in Herefordshire<br>Local Authority Responsibility for Provision of Care in Registered Settings<br>Accessing Minor Adaptations |
| External Scrutiny                               |  |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) | Budget 2006/07<br>Performance Monitoring   |
| Other   | Work Programme   |

19. The Committee has carefully considered the substantial review of future social care needs of older people and people with learning disabilities and the services needed to meet them. The Committee has expressed concern to Cabinet about the current ICT systems for data collection and analysis. It has emphasised the importance of

developing appropriate, effective and compatible ICT systems, including with the Primary Care Trust, as part of the development of the proposed Public Service Trust. Recognising the importance and complexity of the issues raised by the review and that these will require careful consideration the Committee has also advised Cabinet that every Councillor needs to be made aware of these issues and kept informed.

20. The Committee has also welcomed the Executive's response to its review of services for people with a learning disability.
21. The **Children's Services Scrutiny Committee** met on 15th December, 2006 and considered the following issues:

| Theme   | Reports   |
|---|---|
| Holding the Executive to Account                |   |
| Best Value Reviews                              |   |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Change for Children in Herefordshire<br>Behaviour and Discipline Management in<br>Schools Scrutiny Review |
| External Scrutiny                               |   |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) | Revenue Budget Monitoring Report<br>Improvement and Annual Assessment of<br>Performance                   |
| Other   | Work Programme  |

22. Having being advised of the Change for Children progress overall, including extended schools and the recent Education and Inspection Act 2006, as applied to school transport, the Committee has questioned and noted a range of issues including the criteria for locating Children Centres and the method of funding distribution under the Extended Schools programme. The Committee also noted that the implementation of the Council's denominational transport policy had not revealed any particular concerns. While the Act made changes to travel arrangements for pupils from low-income families, the Committee noted that, due in the main to the large distances between Herefordshire schools, it was anticipated that this would have little or no impact on school travel arrangements in the County.
23. The **Community Services Scrutiny Committee** met on 20th December, 2006 and considered the following issues:

| Theme   | Reports  |
|---|--|
| Holding the Executive to Account                | Annual Report by Cabinet member (Rural<br>Regeneration and Strategy) |
| Best Value Reviews                              |  |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Review of the Support for Museums and<br>Heritage Centres            |
| External Scrutiny                               |  |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) | Performance Monitoring   |
| Other   | Work Programme   |

24. A Review of the Support for Museums and Heritage Centres in Herefordshire has been completed. The report has been submitted to Cabinet. The recommendations are appended.
25. The Committee called in the Cabinet decision to relocate the Hereford livestock

market. A range of interested parties, stakeholders, Council Officers and Members gave evidence to the Committee which considered the issue for over 5 hours.

26. After hearing all the evidence and debating it the Committee unanimously backed the selection of the Griffiths site that Cabinet had identified as its preferred site. However, it made a series of recommendations concerning the need for road improvements and transport links; investigation into increasing the rent of Hereford Market Auctioneers; the involvement of local residents and Members in pre-planning consultation; and for high quality buildings and landscaping. The Committee's recommendations were considered and accepted by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January 2007.
27. The **Environment Scrutiny Committee** met on 4th December, 2006 and considered the following issues:

| Theme   | Reports   |
|---|---|
| Holding the Executive to Account                | -   |
| Best Value Reviews                              |   |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Policy Statement for the Use of the Rivers Wye and Lugg<br>Draft Travellers Policy<br>Scrutiny Review of Household Waste Recycling in Herefordshire |
| External Scrutiny                               |   |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) | Capital Programme<br>Revenue Budget<br>Good Environmental Management Review<br>Performance Indicators   |
| Other   | Work Programme  |

28. The Committee considered the draft policy statement for the use of the rivers Wye and Lugg as the basis for public consultation. The draft statement set out the strategic background to the use of the rivers, general policies on the Council's approach to the use of the two rivers and operational policies covering those aspects over which the Council had some powers and responsibilities. Having noted that the draft policy statement attempted to address broad issues rather than individual user or access rights, the Committee recommended the document to the Cabinet Member (Environment) as the basis for consultation.
29. The **Health Scrutiny Committee** met on 7th December, 2006 and considered the following issues:

| Theme   | Reports  |
|---|--|
| Holding the Executive to Account                |  |
| Best Value Reviews                              |  |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Specialist Children's services Development<br>Update on the Development of Stroke Services in Herefordshire<br>Palliative Care<br>Public Service Trust |
| External Scrutiny                               |  |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) |  |
| Other   | Work Programme   |

30. The Committee has responded to the formal consultation exercise conducted by the Primary Care Trust, supporting the development of a central building for specialist community services for children with developmental problems/disabilities.
31. The Committee has also discussed the proposals being developed by the Council and the Primary Care Trust for the development of a Public Services Trust for Herefordshire enabling closer strategic management and co-ordination for the delivery of key public services in Herefordshire.
32. The business conducted by the **Strategic Monitoring Committee** at its meetings on 22nd December, 2006, and 15th January, 2007 is summarised below.

| Theme   | Reports   |
|---|---|
| Holding the Executive to Account                |   |
| Best Value Reviews                              |   |
| Policy Development and Review                   | Scrutiny Review of Information and Communication Technology Services<br>Financial Strategy Update<br>Annual Operating Plan<br>Implementation and interpretation of Planning (Development Control) policies  |
| External Scrutiny                               |   |
| Improvement (Performance Management and Review) | Audit of Local Area Agreement<br>Managing Performance Management<br>Benefit Inspection by the Benefit Fraud Inspectorate and change to Benefit Intervention<br>Integrated Performance Report<br>Pay and Workforce Development Strategy<br>Complaints to the Ombudsman |
| Other   | Scrutiny Improvement Plan.<br>Work Programmes.<br>Scrutiny Activity.  |

**T.M. JAMES**  
**CHAIRMAN**  
**STRATEGIC MONITORING COMMITTEE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Agenda Papers of the Meeting of the Strategic Monitoring Committee held on 22nd December, 2006 and 15th January, 2007.



## **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES**

- (a) Responsibility for the line management for all the authority's ICT staff should be placed within the ICT Services Division and implemented with immediate effect.**
- (b) Consideration is given to the control for ICT expenditure being placed within the ICT Services Division subject to overall responsibility being held by the Director of Resources.**
- (c) A review of the financing of ICT Services is undertaken examining the way directorates account for ICT spend subject to recommendation (b) above, base budget for ICT Services, as well as the corporate funding of ICT programmes.**
- (d) A council-wide policy should be developed and implemented that provides for greater standardisation of desktops and server infrastructure and that ICT Services should have the responsibility for the management and control of this policy ensuring that it provides equipment and software to meet the requirements of the post rather than the wishes of the individual. Further, that this policy provides all ICT assets are corporate and not the possessions of individual services or staff. In effect this means that ICT assets will not be relocated with individuals but rather that individuals will be relocated to existing assets.**
- (e) The existing ICT procurement policies and procedures, including taking positive action to address non-compliance, are enforced. Further that the appointment of the Strategic Procurement & Efficiency Review manager will progress the need to develop the council-wide procurement policy.**
- (f) Consideration is given to dedicated communications/promotion support to the Head of ICT and the means by which this might be delivered.**
- (g) As part of the corporate review of SLAs the ICT Service ensures that the ICT SLAs are clearly worded, and describe clearly the range of services to be provided, charges and any relevant financial arrangements and are communicated to all relevant officers and issued no later than the start of each financial year moving forward.**
- (h) The responsibility for providing ICT training and its procurement be centralised under the management of the ICT service. As part thereof, the identification of ICT training needs should be formalised as part of induction and recorded.**
- (i) The options for offering a variety of income generating services to local partners not covered under existing SLAs are explored.**
- (j) Improvement to the implementation of project management throughout the authority continues and the interface between Corporate Programmes and project delivery within Directorates is strengthened.**
- (k) That the feedback from schools be analysed and an improvement plan prepared to address the many concerns identified, with a view to ICT Services becoming the preferred provider of services to schools funded and maintained by the Local Authority.**

- (l) A single website for all council services is developed ensuring consistent branding and access to services for all. Further that the website should consider the potential for a single, obvious directory of contacts for all council services.**
- (m) The options for “growing own talent” through training and the use of a form of “golden handcuffs”, possibly by means of recouping the cost of training should the individual leave the authority within a given period, be explored by Human Resources.**
- (n) The Executive's response to the Review including an action plan be reported to the first available meeting of the Committee after the Executive has approved its response; and**
- (o) A further report on progress in response to the Review then be made after six months with consideration then being given to the need for any further reports to be made.**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SUPPORT FOR MUSEUMS AND HERITAGE CENTRES IN HEREFORDSHIRE**

**That:**

- (a) consideration should be given to reverting to the title 'Museum Services' to identify the service currently known as Heritage Services;**
- (b) as Museums, Libraries and Archives are grouped together nationally, it should be considered that the three services should be grouped in the same Herefordshire Council division to enable easier cross discipline partnership;**
- (c) all Herefordshire Council Museums and those independent Museums with the capacity to do so in the County should be encouraged to complete the Museum Associations Accreditation process;**
- (d) Hereford Heritage Services should research and consider the possibility of converting to single entity trust status;**
- (e) if Hereford Heritage Services does convert to a single entity trust then any funding agreement with Herefordshire Council should be long-term;**
- (f) it is to be hoped that the Museum Development Officer project will continue through the support of the West Midlands Hub and Museums, Libraries and Archives;**
- (g) independent museums in the County should be reminded that they can apply for Community Grant Funding;**
- (h) it should be made possible for Museums to apply for longer term Community Grant Funding than the one year agreements currently available;**
- (i) the possibility of a partnership insurance scheme for the Herefordshire Museums Forum members should be explored. This could be pursued by the Museum Development Officer on the Forum's behalf;**
- (j) a small hiring collection should be established to loan objects along the lines of the Reading Corporate Loans scheme;**
- (k) a formula should be developed to measure Heritage's impact on both tourism and also to demonstrate its social and economic impact; and**
- (l) preventative measures should be taken to protect Kington Museum from being struck by reversing lorries to a nearby store.**



## REPORT OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### Meeting held on 12 January 2007

---

#### **Membership:**

Robert Rogers (Independent Member) (Chairman); Councillor John Edwards, Councillor John Stone; Richard Gething (Town and Parish Council Representative); John Hardwick (Town and Parish Council Representative); David Stevens (Independent Member).

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATIONS RECEIVED FROM TOWN AND PARISH COUNCILLORS**

1. We have sought advice from the Standards Board for England (SBE) in respect of the Relevant Authorities (Standards Committees) (Dispensations) Regulations 2002, and in particular, the wording of paragraph 3(1)(a)(i) which, in the light of a number of dispensation applications we have considered recently, we think is ambiguous. Did it mean 50% of those who were entitled to take part in a meeting – in other words, half of the total membership, or was the meaning changed by the next phrase “or required” where it could refer either to the quorum or to members who were needed for particular business reasons? The SBE agrees with us that the wording of the Regulations is ambiguous, but suggests that we should make our own interpretation on the basis that any reasonable interpretation is unlikely to be challenged. We are minded to adopt a more generous interpretation as we are concerned that the business of Town and Parish Councils might otherwise be unnecessarily obstructed.
  
2. We have granted a dispensation to three members of Welsh Newton and Llanrothal Parish Council in relation to their roles as members of Welsh Newton Village Hall Committee. The Parish Council’s situation is exactly that described in the above paragraphs, because the application affects less than 50% of its membership. Because the full membership is only seven, it was clear that a decision not to grant a dispensation might affect the Parish Council’s ability to deal with village hall matters.

#### **HEARINGS: DRAFT PROCEDURE GUIDES**

3. We noted the implications of the judgment of Mr Justice Collins in the Mayor of London’s High Court appeal. The ruling provides a more restrictive view of when the Code of Conduct may apply to the actions of a member, narrowing the definition of when he or she is considered to be acting in a public capacity. The judgment is reflected in Clause 134 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill at present before Parliament
  
4. We have finalised our guidance for those attending Standards Committee hearings, and are in a position to start using this before and during hearings, to make participants aware of what to expect from the hearing process. We also considered a second draft of a procedure note for officers, and will finalise this shortly. The two documents together provide comprehensive guidance for everyone involved.

**STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2006**

5. We have finalised our Annual Report. The next stage will be to publish it as a free-standing and distinctive document for Councillors, and for wider issue to stakeholders and other interested organisations.

**HEREFORDSHIRE CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

6. We are awaiting further amendments to the Council's Corporate Governance Code, following the comments we made at our October 2006 meeting. Once they are completed, we will make our final amendments by email, so that the Code can be adopted well before our next meeting.

**PURDAH PERIOD AND GUIDANCE IN RESPECT OF 2007 ELECTIONS**

7. We have considered the Head of Legal and Democratic Services' guidance on the statutory requirements relating to council publicity in the run-up to the 2007 elections (the purdah period). The purdah period begins on 27 March 2007, and during this time, greater care and sensitivity is needed to ensure that the Council's publicity is, and is seen to be, politically neutral. The guidance is governed by section 2 of the Local Government Act 1986, and the Secretary of State's Code of Recommended Practice (in particular Paragraph 4.1). The Guidance is available on the Council's website. You can locate it by accessing the "Committee Meetings" quick link on the homepage, and going to the "Standards Committee" page, where it is included as part of the agenda for 12 January 2007.
8. We decided to produce a separate A4 guidance leaflet for town and parish councils.

**TRAINING**

9. We will be holding a joint training session for Standards Committee members from Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and also the Fire and Rescue, and Police Authorities. The subject will be the new Code of Conduct, due to be published some time this year, and we are hoping to hold the training in September. We will follow this up with our own training for Herefordshire Town and Parish Councillors.
10. The Standards Committee will contribute to the induction literature and the induction training programme, following the 2007 elections.
11. The joint training session with HALC, Herefordshire Council and the Standards Committee on 29 November 2006 was extremely well received. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services spoke about the Code of Conduct and the interpretation of interests, and we are hoping to hold similar events after the new Code of Conduct is in force.

**REFERRAL TO THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE FROM THE STANDARDS BOARD FOR ENGLAND**

12. We have noted the progress made with an investigation into Complaint No. 15104.06, referred to the Standards Committee from the SBE.

**STANDARDS COMMITTEE ON THE COUNCIL'S WEBSITE**

13. Before our meeting, the Chairman met Ms E. Pawley, the Council's Knowledge Manager and Ms R. Dickens, Knowledge and Content Coordinator, to discuss creating a section on standards and ethics on the Council's website. Ms Pawley and Ms Dickens have devised some creative ways of presenting information to the public and raising the profile of this key issue, and new standards and ethics pages should be appearing on the website in the near future.

**ROBERT ROGERS  
CHAIRMAN  
STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

- Agenda papers of the meeting held on 12 January 2007.





**COUNCILLOR P.G. TURPIN - VALLETTS WARD:  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 85****Report By: CHIEF EXECUTIVE****Wards Affected**

Valletts

**Purpose**

1. To consider granting Councillor P.G. Turpin leave of absence until May 2007 because of ill-health.

**Background**

2. As Members will know, Councillor P.G. Turpin has suffered serious ill-health since August last year and has been unable to attend Council meetings. Neighbouring Councillors have been assisting with his Ward work. He will be automatically disqualified from office on 28th February, 2007 under Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, because of his failure to attend a meeting for a period in excess of six months, unless the Council approves an extended period of absence before then (Standing Order 2.9.1 refers).
3. If leave of absence is not granted, the seat will fall vacant. In this case, under Section 89(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, because the casual vacancy would occur within six months of the date on which Councillor Turpin would have retired, a by-election will not be held. In either case the vacancy will be filled at the next election on 3rd May, 2007.
4. Leave of absence cannot be granted retrospectively, so any approval needs to be given at this meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT leave of absence be granted to Councillor P.G. Turpin until he would have ordinarily retired in May, 2007.**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None identified.



## REPORT OF THE MEETING OF WEST MERCIA POLICE AUTHORITY HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2006

### *Draft Strategic Priorities 2007/10 and Operational Priorities 2007/08*

1. The Police Authority is consulting key stakeholders on the proposed policing priorities for 2007 and beyond. These build upon recent successes and take into account national targets, local partnership commitments and local communities' views. The proposed priorities for improvement are:

**Local Policing** – fully implementing 145 locally focused policing teams throughout the West Mercia area. Establishing effective engagement with communities and partners at a local level. Working together to resolve the crime and disorder issues that are of greatest concern to local communities.

**Protective Services** – investing to significantly enhance the Constabulary's capability and capacity to protect communities from the threat of terrorism and to promote safety by dealing effectively with major crime and serious and organised crime.

**Protection of Vulnerable people** – ensuring a more co-ordinated and risk based approach to the protection of vulnerable children and adults, with particular emphasis on domestic violence, hate crime, sex offender management and missing persons.

**Tools to do the Job** – supporting developments in up to date buildings, equipment and improved information technology. Tackling local, regional and national crime through enhanced information quality and effective information sharing between forces.

2. The proposed Priorities are designed to support and be consistent with the national Strategic Assessment 2006, the West Mercia Baseline Assessment, referred to later in this report, and the National Community Safety Plan 2006-2009. This Plan was updated in November 2006 and includes the Government's Community Safety Themes:

- *Making Communities stronger and more effective.*
- *Further reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and building a culture of Respect.*
- *Preventing extremism and countering terrorism*
- *Creating safer environments.*
- *Protecting the public and building confidence.*
- *Improving people's lives so they are less likely to commit offences or re-offend.*

3. Details of the proposed priorities are also included on the Authority's website at [www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk](http://www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk) and comments are invited by 29 January 2007.

### ***Sustainable Policing***

4. The Association of Police Authorities (APA) and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) have made a formal submission to the Government on the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in their report 'Sustainable Policing'.
5. The CSR will shape the funding for the police service between 2008 and 2011 and the APA/ACPO report includes five key statements:
  - *The APA and ACPO call on the Government to acknowledge the realistic approach to the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 and give due account to the APA/ACPO approach.*
  - *The police service has made significant progress in reducing crime and improving public reassurance. The APA and ACPO want to ensure that sufficient funding is available to maintain and build on this progress - for the benefit of communities.*
  - *The Government is called upon to acknowledge the funding gap and the implications this has for policing and to work with police authorities and chief officers to ensure that communities continue to receive the policing services they need and deserve.*
  - *The Government is asked to consider the priorities for the Comprehensive Spending Review Period and take them into account when making decisions that will shape policing in coming years.*
  - *The Government is called upon to give police authorities and chief officers the flexibility and freedom they need to better manage their resources and achieve real outcomes for communities. The Government should also create a lighter, more focused and co-ordinated regime of monitoring and inspection.*
6. All MPs in West Mercia have been sent a copy of the report together with a briefing note on its contents and impact from a West Mercia perspective.

### ***Capital Programme***

7. The Police Authority has agreed additional investment of £0.804m in Protective Services equipment, vehicles, computer and communications equipment. Other additions to the Capital Programme include a new Police Post in Kidderminster and an upgrade of the Central Ticket Office's Network. The items have all been funded from within the existing budget.
8. Provision has also been made for the provision of additional premises in the Shrewsbury area to ease the pressures on the Shropshire Divisional Headquarters and the Police Authority accommodation.

### ***Budget 2007/2008***

9. The budget for 2007/08 is being developed against a background of seeking to continue to improve services whilst operating within Government guidelines and minimising the impact on Council Taxpayers.
10. It is expected that the permitted increase in Council Tax will be below 5% and consequently it is likely that if existing commitments and planned developments are to be maintained, the budget will need to be supported from the Authority's earmarked funds retained for specific purposes and risk management.
11. As part of the consultation process on the draft Policing Priorities comments are invited and the Police Authority will meet on 13 February 2007 to agree the budget for the forthcoming year.

### ***Protective Services***

12. The budget for 2006/07 included an extra £2.9million for the recruitment of an extra 95 police officers and staff to strengthen the Constabulary's ability to tackle issues including serious and organised crime; roads policing; cross border crime and counter terrorism. This recruitment is ahead of schedule with over a third of the posts already filled and the force is set to beat its target to have all the positions filled by April 2008.
13. The new posts, mainly in the central Criminal Investigation (CID) and Force Operations departments, will boost the specialist policing resources available across Herefordshire, Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin and Worcestershire. They will play a vital role in keeping local people safe and help to ensure that those officers and staff involved in local policing teams, who provide a visible and patrolling police presence in communities, remain on the front line, building partnerships and resolving local residents' issues."
14. The Police Authority took this prompt and positive action in February 2006 to address the Government's understandable concerns about a gap in the resources available nationally for what has become known as the protective services. It was recognised that for West Mercia Constabulary to further strengthen its reputation as a strategic police service, additional investment in this area was vital. As a result of financial prudence, it was possible to make this significant additional investment into these critically important areas of policing and ensure that the force has the resources and skills it needs to tackle crime in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### ***Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary***

15. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) has published the Baseline and Combined Assessment 2006 for West Mercia. This has confirmed that the Constabulary continues to be one of the best performing police forces in the country.

16. The Assessment includes Areas for Improvement and the Chief Constable and the Police Authority are considering these. In particular the protection of vulnerable people is included as one of the key priorities for 2007/08.
17. During November 2006 the Chief Inspector of HMIC, Sir Ronnie Flannagan, visited West Mercia and commented on how committed to policing the people he met were.
18. During his visit Sir Ronnie heard about the force's plans to strengthen the resources available to protect vulnerable people and the ongoing programme to recruit additional officers and staff for protective services.
19. Sir Ronnie also visited South Worcestershire Division where he met officers and staff from the Anti Social Behaviour Unit, Public Protection Unit and Hate Crime team.
20. The Police Authority agreed that to receive such praise from Sir Ronnie was a positive tribute to all those who work for West Mercia.

### ***Disability Equality Scheme***

21. Both the Police Authority and Constabulary have published Disability Equality Schemes and copies are available on the Internet at [www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk](http://www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk) and [www.westmercia.police.uk](http://www.westmercia.police.uk) respectively.
22. The Schemes were developed in consultation with disabled people and representative groups and set out how the promotion of disability equality will be central to the way the organisations operate

### ***User Satisfaction Survey***

23. The User Satisfaction Survey for April 2005 – March 2006 indicated that satisfaction had increased at all stages in Burglary, Violent crime, and Vehicle crime, with an overall decrease in satisfaction in Road Traffic collisions and Racist Incidents.
24. For the first two quarters of the current year victims of burglary dwelling and road traffic collisions have showed the strongest levels of satisfaction. Lowest satisfaction was with victims of violent crime and racist incidents.
25. In comparison with Most Similar Forces, satisfaction with treatment and of violent and vehicle crime victims are areas for improvement while the force is performing comparatively very well with respect to police actions, follow up and Road Traffic Collision victims. There is currently a six-month pilot survey of victims of anti-social behaviour.
26. Divisional Commanders are raising awareness of surveys amongst staff and regular reports are made to Performance Group meetings. The Victims Code came into effect on 1 April 2006 and initiatives include: regular focus groups; a DVD of violent crime victims; police officer prompt cards; and regular updates to victims.

Customer service has also been enhanced through the production of the 'Be the Difference' booklet and the 'Speaks Quality' project which was being rolled out to all West Mercia staff.

27. User satisfaction surveys will be conducted by telephone from April 2007 and this should result in a higher response, particularly from victims of racist incidents.

### ***Community Engagement Strategy***

28. The Panel received an update on the preparation of a joint Community Engagement Strategy for the Police Authority and Constabulary.

29. Joint objectives have been agreed and specific roles for the Police Authority and Force identified. The Authority and Force's current activities against the objectives are being reviewed to identify gaps in provision, areas for improvement and suggested actions to improve.

30. As part of the process for developing the strategy Police Authority members have attended workshops and a questionnaire has been sent to Police/Community Consultative Groups with a follow-up workshop planned. Work has also been undertaken within the Constabulary.

### ***Local Policing Programme***

31. The Police Authority has received an update on the implementation of the Local Policing Programme.

32. The Local Policing Database has been launched and this provides public information on PACT (Partners and Communities Together) meetings, details of the local policing teams, local contact details and a summary of the key priorities agreed for the respective local areas. The database is available on the Internet at [www.westmercia.police.uk](http://www.westmercia.police.uk) website and enables people to search for their local details by postcode.

### ***Stop and Search***

33. Stop, Search and Encounter Records for the period 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2006 showed that there were a total of 3365 Stop Searches, a 12.58% increase on the previous year. The number of Minority Ethnic Group stops (307 over the period) was small in numeric terms and equated to less than one MEG per person per day per police division.

### ***Audit***

34. The Authority's external auditors, PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC), have presented the West Mercia 2005/06 Audit Letter. This was a very positive audit and PWC had issued an unqualified audit opinion on the Authority's 2005/06 financial statements..

35. PWC's review of the Police Authority's Corporate Governance Arrangements rated the six principles of corporate governance as two 'Excellents' and four 'Goods'. An action plan has been agreed in order to strengthen the governance arrangements still further.

36. The Police Use of Resources Evaluation (PURE) undertaken by PWC also provided a positive conclusion on the use of resources. The Authority had developed its risk management arrangements over the last eighteen months and as this becomes embedded, risk processes and assessments would be improved. The Auditors stated that the Force and Authority were implementing a highly effective Performance Management framework. Arrangements are particularly effective at the corporate levels of the organisation and there is work ongoing to ensure that the framework is further developed and tailored for use throughout the organisation at all levels.

### ***Medical Care***

37. The Authority in monitoring the sickness absence profile for Police Officers and Staff, noted that the four main categories for absence were musculo-skeletal, psychological disorders, miscellaneous conditions and respiratory. The increase in psychological disorders was a worrying trend. Action being taken to address these concerns included Stress Audits in the South Worcestershire and Hereford Divisions.

### ***People***

38. Assistant Chief Constable Margaret Wood, who heads West Mercia's Protective Services and Serious Organised Crime activities, has secured a prestigious post as ACPO Terrorism Director and will take up the position in January 2007.

39. This newly created post will see Mrs Wood co-ordinating work across the police service to build capacity and capability to counter terrorism and play a major role in the creation of the Counter Terrorism Units and Regional Intelligence Cells at key locations across England and Wales.

40. The Police Authority has placed on record its appreciation of the contribution Mrs Wood has made to policing in West Mercia and also that of Chief Superintendent Julie Harries and Mrs Lynn Anslow who have retired as Head of the Professional Standards and Estates Departments, respectively.

Signed on behalf of the  
West Mercia Police Authority

P Deneen  
Chair



### **Further Information**

*Any person wishing to seek further information on the subject matter of this report should contact David Brierley or Ian Payne on Shrewsbury (01743) 344314.*

*Further information on the West Mercia Police Authority can also be found on the Internet at [www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk](http://www.westmerciapoliceauthority.gov.uk).*

#### *Questions on the functions of the Police Authority*

*The Authority has nominated the following members to answer questions on the discharge of the functions of the Police Authority at meetings of the relevant councils:*

|                                      |                     |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Herefordshire Council</i>         | <i>Mr B Hunt</i>    |
| <i>Shropshire County Council</i>     | <i>Mr M Kenny</i>   |
| <i>Telford and Wrekin Council</i>    | <i>Mr J Hicks</i>   |
| <i>Worcestershire County Council</i> | <i>Mr E Sheldon</i> |

#### *List of Background Papers*

*In the opinion of the proper officer (in this case the Director of the Police Authority) the following are the background papers relating to the subject matter of this report:*

*Agenda papers for the Annual Meeting of the West Mercia Police Authority held on 19 December 2006.*



# REPORT OF THE HEREFORD & WORCESTER FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY TO THE CONSTITUENT AUTHORITIES

Meeting Held on 14 December 2006

## OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY

1. During the period 1 April 2006 to 30 September 2006 the Service attended a total of 5592 incidents (this includes all types of Fire, All False Alarms and Special Service Incidents). More statistics and details of notable incidents have been reported to the Authority and can be found on the Service's website ([www.hwfire.org.uk](http://www.hwfire.org.uk)).
2. The level of operational activity experienced in the second quarter of the year was higher than at any time since 2003/04. An initial analysis has identified extreme weather conditions as a principal factor. The Service is investigating possible actions to mitigate the effects.

## INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

3. The Constituent Authorities have previously been advised of the requirement under the Fire and Rescue National Framework, that all Fire and Rescue Services must produce an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) and associated annual action plans. The purpose of the Plan is to provide a strategic overview of all aspects of service delivery and determine current and future policy. It is intended to make the Service more responsive to locally identified needs and better able to deliver community safety. Plans must undergo a full public consultation process for twelve weeks before being adopted by the Authority.
4. The Authority has received a progress report on progress against the IRMP (3) action plan 2006/07. Following consultation, the Authority has also approved IRMP (4) 2007/08. The Plan carries forward existing objectives:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | <b>Future Response and Intervention Arrangements/Review of Emergency Cover</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Continue to review the Fire and Rescue Service risk area to determine the resources and local response standards required to the identified risk.   |
|                  | <b>Flexible Crewing Implementation</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Continue to review employee work patterns in order to respond to risks within the community. The review will consider flexible working, part-time working, voluntary overtime and the development of duty systems that will enable the Service to deliver an efficient and effective service. |
|                  | <b>Road Safety</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Develop a comprehensive Road Safety Strategy that will enable the Service to engage in a multi agency approach to reducing the number of killed or seriously injured on the roads. Working in partnership to educate road users and engaging with vulnerable                                  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | groups, focusing particularly on potential and actual vehicle users whilst contributing to the wider road safety agenda through intelligence led engineered and intervention programmes.  |
|                  | <b>New Dimensions/Civil Contingencies/Chemical Biological and Radiological and Nuclear/Environmental</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Continue to provide an emergency response to incidents involving hazardous materials but seeking to reduce the number of incidents at which action is taken based upon risk to life and/or the environment. To develop a more robust means of recovering costs outside of those incurred for emergency action.  |
|                  | <b>Community Safety Strategy</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | To develop our Community Safety strategies to incorporate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire Safety in all environments</li> <li>• Road Safety</li> <li>• Water Safety</li> <li>• Home Safety</li> </ul>  |
|                  | <b>Community Safety Maintenance</b>   |
| <b>Objective</b> | To deliver on the following individual projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Outreach</li> <li>• Schools Fire Safety Education Programme</li> <li>• Home Fire Safety Checks</li> <li>• Arson Prevention</li> <li>• Sprinklers – Domestic and in Schools</li> <li>• Domestic Smoke Alarms</li> <li>• Fire Safety Training Programme for the Business Community</li> </ul> |
|                  | <b>Implementation of Service Re-structure (People)</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Migrate to a role based Service structure which meets the needs of the organisation as determined by the IRMP/strategic objectives.   |
|                  | <b>Relocation/Development of Fire Stations</b>  |
| <b>Objective</b> | Having considered a range of implications the Service is proposing to relocate and build a number of Fire Stations throughout the two counties. The situation and reasons for proposing to relocate and build new Fire Stations are specific to each site. Further information is available in the Service's Asset Management Plan.   |

## REGIONAL FIRE CONTROL

5. The Constituent Authorities have previously been advised of the replacement of the existing 46 local Fire Service Control rooms across the Country with 9 regional control Centres by the end of 2009. The Regional Fire Control for the West Midlands is to be located in Wolverhampton. Fire and Rescue Authorities are required to establish Local Authority Companies (LACs) to run Regional Control Centres. A West Midlands LAC was required to be established by 1 January 2007.
6. The Authority has agreed to participate as a Member of the Company and authorised officers to finalise the company documentation in order that the company may be established by January 2007. The Authority has made efforts during negotiations to

ensure that the interests of Hereford and Worcester are properly taken into account by the Company. In order to leave no doubt as to the strength of the Authority's view on this issue it has formally recorded the Authority's support for one Member of the Company, one vote and its opposition to any proposals for weighted voting. The Authority will receive further reports on the detail of the development.

#### **URBAN SEARCH AND RESCUE**

7. The Constituent Authorities have previously been informed that the Authority had accepted the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's request to take receipt of an Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Unit. This was under the New Dimension Programme designed to provide the Fire and Rescue Service with a national capability to respond to major emergencies. One part of the programme includes the development of a national USAR capability with specialist staff vehicles and equipment.
8. Planning permission for development of a site at Droitwich to incorporate the USAR capability has been received, although some restrictive covenants are currently being negotiated. During the building works, temporary accommodation has been arranged at Bromsgrove. Discussions have been ongoing with the Department for Communities and Local Government regarding various elements of the funding arrangements for crewing, accommodation and training facilities, the majority of which have now been satisfactorily resolved. The Authority is expected to declare the availability of its team to fulfil this new role in early 2007.

#### **WORCESTERSHIRE SIGNPOSTING SCHEME**

9. The Service has developed a Worcestershire "Signposting" Scheme. This mirrors arrangements already in place in Herefordshire, offering a single gateway to a range of services designed to help vulnerable and disadvantaged people remain in their own homes safely. This is achieved by "signposting" people to partner organisations who provide advice, support, preventative services and practical assistance.

#### **REGULATORY REFORM (FIRE SAFETY) ORDER 2006**

10. The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2006 came into force in October this year and represents a major change in the enforcement of fire safety matters. Over 100 pieces of legislation were repealed or amended by the new legislation, including the Fire Precautions Act 1971 which had required certain premises to have a Fire Certificate. The new regime introduces a risk based approach to inspection, rather than requiring inspection of all premises at set intervals.

#### **EDUCATION ACTIVITY**

11. Education resources have been upgraded at both Key Stage 2 (Year 5) and at Key Stage 3 (Year 8).
12. The target group of Year 5 children has been provided with an array of new visual and interactive resources to promote their learning when Firefighters visit the schools. Firefighters across the two Counties have received full training on the use of the new supporting resources. The training will continue into the classroom via the Education team, in the forthcoming months, at the request of individual Watches and in response to need.
13. School teachers involved in the visit, will receive a new lesson plan and be asked to evaluate six children of mixed ability within their classes both prior to and one week following the Firefighters' visit. The results of the evaluations will be analysed throughout the academic year with a view to amending the teaching packs accordingly.

14. A PowerPoint presentation will now be included as part of the Year 8 fire safety teaching pack involving the consequences of hoax calls and arson. All fire safety education that is delivered in schools is continuously evaluated by the teachers and responses sent to Opinion Research Survey in Swansea.
15. Two LASER projects (Learning about Safety through Experiencing Risk) have taken place at Gorse Hill Primary School and at Redditch Fire Station reaching all Year 6 pupils in Worcester and Redditch. Retention of fire safety knowledge is particularly noticeable at such events when the children have acquired life saving fire safety skills during their input at Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2.
16. Preparation is now taking place to 'reach' new recruits, with educational support prior to their arrival on a Watch at Station and before the new Firefighters begin their educational input into schools. Key messages to deliver will be highlighted plus general practical advice on teaching young children.
17. The Education team is trying to accommodate requests to talk to young lone parents, one of the vulnerable groups in the two Counties
18. Following Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service attending an 'Arson Combated Together' workshop in Nottingham earlier in the year and liaison with Warwickshire Arson team who use the programme of Theatre Education in their schools, research has continued into the scope of combating arson through drama productions.

#### **YOUNG FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION (YFA)**

19. During July, the Malvern Branch of the YFA embarked on a training expedition and weekend team building at Blackwell Court, near Bromsgrove. During this time a three-mile walk to a wild campsite to learn field craft was undertaken together with a high ropes course, climbing, abseiling and a raft of problem solving tasks.
20. A 180 mile hike along Offa's Dyke footpath was also arranged during the summer in which twenty-four young people participated. Funding came from a local funding group who supplied sufficient support to purchase lightweight tents, lightweight stoves, transport costs, some waterproof outer clothing and paid for all camping fees and food for the two weeks.

#### **LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENT 2/LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT REWARD GRANT**

21. Despite periods of hot weather during the summer, leading to an increase in deliberate fires, the Fire and Rescue Service is at present still within the trend to meet the stretch targets to reduce deliberate fires within Wyre Forest, Redditch and South Worcestershire.

#### **JUVENILE FIRE SETTERS PREVENTION PROGRAMME**

22. To further the work with young people who start fires, 24 employees have volunteered from across the Fire and Rescue Service to form a team of advisors. The team consists of both uniformed and non-uniformed personnel from a wide range of departments within the organisation and will be supervised by the Juvenile Fire Setter Coordinator based within the Community Safety Department.
23. This valuable work will assist those who have been referred by the Youth Offending Teams and other bodies across the two counties to prevent re-offending in arson related activities.

## **MARKETING**

### **Road Safety-1**

24. It has been identified that young male drivers aged between 16 and 24 years old are at a statistically high risk of being involved in a serious vehicle collision. As part of the road safety strategy, a Retained Watch Manager (an accident investigation specialist) and the Service's Marketing Officer attended 'Max Power Live' the largest UK event that many of these drivers attend. Promotional key-rings with a road safety message were given out at the event from the Highways Agency stand supported by West Midlands Fire Service. Consideration will be given to raising the Fire and Rescue Service profile in future years.

### **Road Safety-2**

25. Poorly fitted child seats put vehicle passengers at risk. A number of child car seat safety banners were produced and distributed to each District highlighting free child car seat check initiatives supported by trained staff at various Stations.

### **NATIONAL COMMUNITY FIRE SAFETY CAMPAIGN (NFSC) TOOLBOX**

26. The Services Marketing Officer attended a forum to update the NFSC Toolbox. The revised toolbox will be updated this year and contain enhanced information and features that more closely reflect the challenges faced by Fire and Rescue Services of today. The Smoke Free Worcestershire partnership has been put forward as one of the 'good practice' case studies.

### **NATIONAL SMOKE ALARM MAINTENANCE CAMPAIGN**

27. The Service's Marketing Officer attended the launch of the National Smoke Alarm Maintenance campaign. This campaign involved National TV and regional radio advertising including local/regional commercial stations such as Wyvern and Heart FM. A press release was issued with the assistance of the Services Press Officer resulting in some excellent editorial coverage in the local media including promotion of our Home Fire Safety Checks for 'at risk' residents.
28. A national student fire safety campaign was launched in September aimed at 16-24 year olds. An advert based on last year's student safety campaign – highlighting the dangers of smoking and alcohol, was produced and printed on the inside front cover of cinema magazines for both Hereford and Worcester.

### **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY**

29. The Service has now appointed an Equality and Diversity Manager to support the Head of Organisational Development in delivering objectives against the equality and diversity strategy.
30. The generic equalities scheme is being finalised and takes account of the implications of the Disability Equality Duty. The scheme is also being reviewed for the potential impact of the Gender Equality Duty, due to come into force in April 2007.
31. An initial review of recent age discrimination legislation and its implications for the Service has been undertaken and a programme of work to update policies and procedures in the context of the Authority's new statutory responsibilities has been put in place.
32. A regional equality and diversity strategy has now been completed and presented to the regional Human Resources board, with recommendations for future implementation.

The initial stage of the project is now complete and any future development will now be considered.

33. Progress is continuing against the objectives outlined in the Equality and Diversity Strategy, including a new positive action plan, which will develop the Service's approach to increasing numbers of women and members of black and minority ethnic communities joining the Service.

## **CORPORATE MATTERS**

### **Performance Management Framework**

34. The Authority has received an update on the progress of the Performance Management Framework for 2006/07. A number of interconnected external assessments are underway in 2006/07: the operational assessment of service delivery, the use of resources, and the direction of travel (a judgment on progress compared with the 2005 Comprehensive Performance Assessment.) The final Fire and Rescue Performance Framework results for 2006/07 will be published for all Fire and Rescue Authorities in March 2007 alongside the annual audit and inspection letters.

### **Organisational Development Strategy**

35. The Authority has received a progress report on the Organisational Development Strategy. This is designed to modernise the Service through delivering improvements in communications, culture and change management. It also sets out how progress in implementing the strategy will be delivered and monitored through the Service's Performance Management Systems.

**PAUL HAYDEN  
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER/CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
HEREFORD & WORCESTER FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY  
DECEMBER 2006**

## **FURTHER INFORMATION**

Any person wishing to seek further information on this report should contact Carole Williams on 0845 12 24454.

Further information on the Fire and Rescue Authority and the Fire and Rescue Service can also be found on the Internet at ([www.hwfire.org.uk](http://www.hwfire.org.uk)).

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Agenda papers of the meeting of the Fire and Rescue Authority held on 14 December 2006.