

Responses to Council rejection of Inspector recommendations

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>
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)
<i>Objection from</i>			
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
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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 Bullinhope 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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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	
Objection from				
WO & OE Price	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>		
Support from				
Bloor Homes	<p>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.</p>	Support is noted.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	
Support from				
The Association of Rotherwas Enterprises	<p>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.</p>	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)
Objection from				
Mr Aubrey Greene	<p>If the zone of interest is included within the UDP it should be shown on the Proposals Map and consulted upon before adoption.</p>	<p>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.</p>	No further modification be proposed in response to this objected.	

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION	
Objection from				
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.	
Objection from				
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.	
Inspector's Ref No:	5.3/2	Policy/Paragraph	Policy H1 - Hereford - Settlement boundaries and established residential areas (site based issues)	2 comment(s)
Objection from				
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.	
Objection from				
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.	
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Support from</i>			
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	
Support from				
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)
Objection from				
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.	
Objection from				
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.	
Objection from				
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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
<i>Objection from</i>			
Herefordshire CPRE	The Council has not addressed the Inspector's conclusions. The Council puts forward counter arguments that ignore or mis-represent 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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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)
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.	

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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
Objection from			
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.
Support from			
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.
Support from			
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)
Objection from			
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>
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.
Objection from			
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.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.
<i>Objection from</i>			
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.