

17. PROPOSALS MAP

17.1 GENERAL

Objections

P830/2306	Herefordshire Friends of the Earth
P830/2319	Herefordshire Friends of the Earth
P830/2408	Herefordshire Friends of the Earth
P975/2884	Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd
P977/2925	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
P1090/5739	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
P1108/3543	Hereford & Gloucestershire Canal Trust Ltd
P1108/3555	Hereford & Gloucestershire Canal Trust Ltd

Summary of Objections / Issues

- Objection is raised to the omission of potential railfreight sites from the Proposals Map. (830)
- Objection is raised to the omission of a complete set of cycle networks from the Proposals Map. (830)
- Safe routes to school should be shown on the Proposals Map. (830)
- Allocations within Policy H2 should be referenced on the Proposals Map. (975, 977)
- Allocations which affect railways should take account of operational requirements. (1090)
- The route of the Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal should be shown comprehensively on the Proposals Map. (1108)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Railfreight sites - 830

17.1.1 These sites are in fact shown on the Proposals Map and there is no need for any modification.

Cycle networks – 830

17.1.2 Policy T7 gives protection to existing cycle routes. I accept the Council's view that it would be impractical to show proposed routes where feasibility remains to be demonstrated and route options evaluated. Such proposals can be progressed through the Local Transport Plan. There is no need for any modification.

Safe routes to school – 830

17.1.3 Notwithstanding the importance of this issue, I consider it would be impractical to address this at an appropriate level of detail in the UDP. Schemes need to be addressed in the context of individual schools and their neighbourhoods.

Referencing of housing sites – 975, 977

17.1.4 The Council acknowledges that a referencing system would provide clarity when reading the maps alongside the text, but has not found it practical to do so on the maps. Subject to technical feasibility, I consider that this would be a worthwhile clarification of the Plan.

Effect of allocations on railways – 1090

17.1.5 Paragraph 8.5.2 was amended in the Revised Deposit Draft to require consultation with rail infrastructure operators in such cases. I consider that this satisfies the objection and there is no need to modify the Proposals Map in response to the objection.

Route of Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal. – 1008

17.1.6 Changes were made to the Proposals Map in the Revised Deposit Draft to show the full extent of the canal route. I consider that the objection has been satisfied and no further modification is necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17.1/1 Subject to considerations of feasibility, reference the housing sites on the Proposals Map.

17.1/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objections.

17.2 HER1 HEREFORD

Objections

P171/6861	Mrs A D Brian
P830/4501	Herefordshire Friends of the Earth
P1108/3544	Hereford & Gloucestershire Canal Trust Ltd
P1098/3495	G F M Dawe

Summary of Objections / Issues

- The area south of the A438 Ledbury Road should also be shown as Lugg Meadow on the Proposals Map. (171)
- Objection is raised to the inclusion of the A4103 Roman Road improvement on the Proposals Map and to the unclear presentation. (830)

- The route of the Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal should be shown comprehensively on the Proposals Map. (1108)
- Cycle routes should be shown clearly on Proposal Maps HER1 and HER2. (1098)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Lugg Meadows - 171

17.2.1 The notation shown on the Proposals Map is part of the Ordnance Survey base map. I do not consider that it is necessary for the Council to seek an amendment to this as proposed by the objector.

A4103 Roman Road improvement – 830

17.2.2 A change was made in the Revised Deposit Draft which deleted the roundabout notation. I consider that this change satisfies the objection and no further modification is necessary.

Route of Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal – 1108

17.2.3 Changes were made to the Proposals Map in the Revised Deposit Draft to show the route of the canal. I consider that the objection has been satisfied and no further modification is necessary.

Cycle networks – 1098

17.2.4 Policy T7 gives protection to existing cycle routes. I accept the Council's view that it would be impractical to show proposed routes where feasibility remains to be demonstrated and route options evaluated. Such proposals can be progressed through the Local Transport Plan. There is no need for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

17.2/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.3 HER2 HEREFORD

Objections

P1108/3545	Hereford & Gloucestershire Canal Trust Ltd
P1098/3496	G F M Dawe

Summary of Objections / Issues

- The route of the Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal should be shown comprehensively on the Proposals Map. (1108)
- Cycle routes should be shown clearly on Proposal Maps HER1 and HER2. (1098)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Route of Hereford and Gloucestershire Canal – 1108

17.3.1 Changes were made to the Proposals Map in the Revised Deposit Draft to show the route of the canal. I consider that the objection has been satisfied and no further modification is necessary.

Cycle networks – 1098

17.3.2 Policy T7 gives protection to existing cycle routes. I accept the Council's view that it would be impractical to show proposed routes where feasibility remains to be demonstrated and route options evaluated. Such proposals can be progressed through the Local Transport Plan. There is no need for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

17.3/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.4 HEREFORD MAP G

Objection

P746/11016 Bloor Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The boundary of the housing allocation at Bullinghope should be amended. (746)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Boundary of Bullinghope housing allocation - 746

17.4.1 In Section 5 of my report, I have determined that there should be no housing allocation at Bullinghope. It follows that no amendment of the area originally allocated would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

17.4/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.5 HEREFORD MAP L

Objection

P746/11018 Bloor Homes Ltd (Conditionally Withdrawn)

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The alignment of the Rotherwas Access Road should be amended. (746)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Alignment of Rotherwas Access Road - 746

17.5.1 Under Proposed Change No 23, the alignment of the Rotherwas Access Road would be amended to that for which planning permission has been granted. My Recommendation 8.25/1 refers. No other modification of the Plan is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.5/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.6 KINGTON MAP A

Objection to Proposed Change

P358/20108 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- A flood risk assessment will be needed for the employment allocation to be retained. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Employment land at Kington – 358

17.6.1 The Environment Agency has indicated that surface water is likely to be considerable and that a flood risk assessment would be required in this case. Be that as it may, I have recommended in Section 6 of my report that the allocation should be dropped. It follows that modification of the text is not necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.6/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.7 KINGTON MAP C

Objection

RW1261/11543 Sport England

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Objection is raised to the extension of the housing allocation west of Eardisley Road and the deletion the Policy RST4 designation at Millrace. (1261)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Deletion of designations at Kington – 1261

17.7.1 Neither of these sites is currently usable public open space. The Council's approach to the land west of Eardisley Road is that the whole site, including open space provision, should be considered as part of the housing allocation through the preparation of a development brief. The Mill Race and other land at Arrow Mills does not meet the criteria for designation under Policy RST4. No modification is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.7/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.8 LED2 LEDBURY

Objections

P743/1814 Ledbury Town Council
P743/1815 Ledbury Town Council

Summary of Objections / Issues

- The AONB boundary may be incorrectly shown in the Southend. (743)
- Buildings between the Southend and Worcester Road should be shown as residential. (743)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

AONB boundary – 743

17.8.1A change was made in the Revised Deposit Draft which satisfied the objection.

Designation of buildings at the Southend – 743

17.8.2In my judgment these buildings meet the relevant criteria for inclusion within the Central Shopping and Commercial Area boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.8/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.9 LEO1 LEOMINSTER

Objections

P677/4683	Brasenose College
P977/2895	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Summary of Objections / Issue

- Whether land west of Barons Cross Camp should be allocated on the Proposals Map for housing and additional open space. (677, 977)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Land west of Barons Cross Camp – 677, 977

17.9.1In Section 5 of my report, I have determined that land west of Barons Cross Camp should not be allocated for housing or open space purposes. It follows that such an allocation should not be shown on the Proposals Map nor should the town boundary be amended.

RECOMMENDATION

17.9/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.10 ROSS1 ROSS-ON-WYE

Objections

P686/6875 Mr B Owen
P1046/6930 Mr S P Little

Summary of Objections / Issues

- Land at Lower Greytrees should be shown as residential to take account of existing commitments. The flood risk area should be amended as the Environment Agency has accepted that the land is not liable to flood. (686)
- The boundary should be amended to identify the land as suitable for housing. (1046)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Lower Greytrees – 686

17.10.1 A change was made to the Revised Deposit Draft to include the land at Lower Greytrees within the development boundary. Housing development is now under construction on the land in question. I consider that this satisfies the objection.

Land at Greytrees – 1046

17.10.2 A change was made to the Revised Deposit Draft to include the northeastern triangle of land within the development boundary. This partially satisfies the objection. The remainder of the site to the southwest is open land which lies adjacent to the A40 dual carriageway. Notwithstanding the planning history submitted by the objector, I consider there is inadequate justification for including the land within the settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.10/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.11 ROSS2 ROSS-ON-WYE

Objection

P331/652 B S Group

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The Proposals Map should be amended to include land at Brookend Street / Kyrle Street within the town centre. (331)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Land at Brookend Street / Kyrle Street – 331

17.11.1 I conclude in Section 7 of my report that the land is properly excluded from the Central Shopping and Commercial Area of Ross-on-Wye. Accordingly it would not be appropriate to modify the Proposals Map in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

7.11/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.12 ROSS-ON-WYE MAP C

Objection

RP1499/11110 Mr S Sherwood Rogers

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (1499)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood - 1499

17.12.1 The Council acknowledges that the extent of the land liable to flooding as shown on Ross-on-Wye Map C is out of date. In this regard, I consider that the Proposals Map should show the latest information available from the Environment Agency. I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

17.12/1 On Ross-on-Wye Map C, vary the extent of the land liable to flood to accord with the latest information available from the Environment Agency.

17.12/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.13 MAP 1 ALMELEY

Objection

P823/2126 Almeley Parish Council

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The Plan should be amended to show the boundary of the conservation area correctly. (823)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Map 1 Almeley – 823

17.13.1 The Council accepts that the conservation area boundary should be amended once more to reflect a recent change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17.13/1 Modify Map 1 Almeley to show the boundary of the conservation area as delineated in the map accompanying the Council's letter dated 8 July 2004.

17.13/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.14 MAP 11 CRADLEY

Objection

P684/5040 Mr B Harrison

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Land east of Cradley Brook should be included within the settlement boundary. (684)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Settlement boundary of Cradley - 684

17.14.1 In Section 5 of my report, I have determined that the settlement boundary of Cradley should not be changed. It follows that there should be no related modification of the Proposals Map.

RECOMMENDATION

17.14/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.15 MAP 13 CUSOP

Objections

RP1490/11020 Cusop Parish Council
RW1276/500143 F J Williams

Objections to Proposed Change

P390/20117 The Moor Estate
RP1490/20145 Cusop Parish Council

Summary of Objections / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (390, 1276, 1490)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 390, 1276, 1490

17.15.1 I note that Proposed Change No 6 to Policy DR7 allows for the review of flood risk data in considering proposals for development. This would ensure that any more recent justified data refining or superseding that shown on the Proposals Map could be taken into account. I consider that this change should ensure that development is not unnecessarily prevented through reliance on outdated information, whilst retaining a proper emphasis on the avoidance of development in locations which are likely to be affected by flooding.

17.15.2 In its response to these objections, the Council attaches a plan showing more recent information provided by the Environment Agency in January 2005, which shows some reduction in the area affected by Flood Risk Zone 3 at Cusop. In this regard, I consider that the Proposals Map should show the latest information available from the Environment Agency. I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17.15/1 On Map 13 Cusop, vary the extent of the land liable to flood to accord with the latest information available from the Environment Agency.

17.15/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.16 MAP 15 EARDISLAND

Objection

P1055/3190 Mr R Canning

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (1055)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 1055

17.16.1 I note that Proposed Change No 6 to Policy DR7 allows for the review of flood risk data in considering proposals for development. This would ensure that any more recent justified data refining or superseding that shown on the proposals maps could be taken into account. I consider that this change should ensure that development is not unnecessarily prevented through reliance on outdated information, while retaining a proper emphasis on the avoidance of development in locations which are likely to be affected by flooding.

17.16.2 In its response to these objections, the Council attaches a plan showing more recent information for Eardisland provided by the Environment Agency in January 2005. In this regard, I consider that the Proposals Map should show the latest information available from the Environment Agency. I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17.16/1 On Map 15 Eardisland, vary the extent of the land liable to flood to accord with the latest information available from the Environment Agency.

17.16/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.17 MAP 16 EARDISLEY

Objection

P358/764 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.17.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17.17/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.18 MAP 17 EWYAS HAROLD

Objections

P169/408	Mr and Mrs C and S O’Gorman
P360/757	Ewyas Harold Parish Council
P408/843	Mr and Mrs B Gwilliam
P412/847	Mr D C Smith
P421/880	R J and R B Mailes
P423/882	Mr and Mrs R B Mailes
P424/885	Mr and Mrs G T W James
P652/1462	Mrs V M and Mr T P Wright
P654/1477	D W G and Mrs R Mills
P655/1487	Mr J N Jones
P656/1500	Mr and Mrs M Ponting
P720/1760	R H Weaver
P721/1761	Mr G C and Mrs F M Hands
P722/1762	Mr and Mrs M A Mclean
P723/1763	Mr P Dean
P724/1764	Mr W T Morgan
P725/1765	Miss M V Marfell
P726/1766	W P and Mrs D A Powell
P787/1955	Mr and Mrs A Lee-Jones
P788/1956	Mrs G Reece
P789/1957	Mrs M Tovey
P822/2124	Mr M Foster
P1010/3103	Mr J Whitehead
P1012/3106	Mr D Dale
P1053/3186	Mr I Benjamin
P1105/3535	Mr and Mrs R Bradley
P1167/3694	Miss L Prowse
RP1432/10551	Mr and Mrs J P Jordan
RP1463/10662	Mr S Gray

Objections to Proposed Change

W13/20172	Mr F Smith
P169/20177	Mr C and Mrs L O’Gorman
P360/20157	Ewyas Harold Group Parish Council
P408/20167	Mr and Mrs B Gwillim
P421/20174	Mr and Mrs R J Mailes
P423/20173	Mr and Mrs R B Mailes
P424/20171	Mr and Mrs G T W James
P652/20176	Mrs V M and Mr T P Wright
P654/20166	D W G and Mrs R Mills
P655/20160	Mr J N Jones
P656/20158	Mr M Ponting

P721/20169	Mr and Mrs G C Hands
P722/20163	Mr and Mrs M A Mclean
P723/20161	Mr P Dean
P724/20168	Mr W T Morgan
P726/20165	Mrs D A Powell
P787/20175	Mr and Mrs A Lee-Jones
P788/20164	Mrs G Reece
P789/20178	Mrs M Tovey
P822/20170	Mr M Foster
RP1432/20162	Mr and Mrs J D Jordan
RP1463/20159	Mr and Mrs S Gray

Summary of Objections / Issue

- Whether there should be amended reference to the land liable to flood. (All objections)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Land at Ewyas Harold liable to flood – all objections

17.18.1 I would normally expect that land shown on the Proposals Map as liable to flood would reflect information provided by the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency is the competent authority in this regard. In respect of Ewyas Harold, the information has been refined a number of times. The latest information from the agency, dating from January 2005, is shown in Appendix 1 to the Council's statement Map/18/DR7/ARCH3/Ewyas Harold.

17.18.2 In the present case, however, detailed and convincing professional evidence was presented to the inquiry which indicated that the area liable to flood is much more limited than shown on the Proposals Map or in the latest information provided by the Environment Agency. In particular, there are only a limited number of properties that are vulnerable to a 1 in 100 year flood event. The road crest (73.22m AOD) at the petrol filling station is the major influence in this regard.

17.18.3 The information presented at the inquiry accords with a detailed flood study of the Dulais Brook at Ewyas Harold that was reported in March 2002. This preliminary economic appraisal report (Appendix B to the Council's statement) states that "A total number of 13 residential and commercial properties are considered to be at risk" (Paragraph 4.3). The properties are identified on an accompanying plan and do not include properties the subject of the objections to the UDP.

17.18.4 On the basis of the evidence provided to and tested at the inquiry, I am satisfied that the objectors' evidence, supported by the March 2002 report, should inform the Proposals Map. In reaching this conclusion, I am aware of the distress, blight and increased insurance premiums that have been attributed to the information currently shown. In these circumstances, and notwithstanding the fact that the areas shown are stated to be only indicative, I believe that it would be wrong to show the broad-brush information provided by the Environment Agency.

17.18.5 In conclusion, I am recommending that the extent of the area shown as liable to flood on Inset Map 17 should be based on the objectors' plan. However, I would expect the detailed situation to be reviewed by the Environment Agency. As such, the notation should be expressed as "preliminary". The matter would be confirmed in due course through the production of a development plan document under the new system subject to the Council's priorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17.18/1 On Inset Map 17, base the extent of the land liable to flood on the cross hatched area coloured blue on the objectors' plan (Document EH 1) extracted off Messrs Atkins flood risk assessment. In the Inset Map key, use the description "Land Liable to Flood – Preliminary (DR7)".

17.18/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objections.

17.19 MAP 32 ORLETON

Objection

P358/768 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.19.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17.19/1 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.20 MAP 33 PEMBRIDGE

Objection

RP1426/10475 Mr and Mrs K Wheeler

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Land on the north side of the A44 is incorrectly shown as a Special Wildlife Site. (1426)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Land on north side of A44, Pembridge – 1426

17.20.1 The site is included in the register of Special Wildlife Sites for the Leominster area (Document R 16) where it is identified as unimproved pasture containing meadow saffron. Identification of the site was based on the criteria in "A Nature Conservation Review 1977".

17.20.2 Whilst I accept that an up-to date survey of the site's value would be useful, the objector does not put forward any evidence of a decline in wildlife interest since the site was originally identified. The Council intends to undertake a review of the whole County to allow the value of sites to be assessed in a robust and consistent manner. I consider this is preferable to a piecemeal response to individual objections to the UDP and, pending this, I consider the designation should remain.

RECOMMENDATION

17.20/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.21 MAP 37 SUTTON ST NICHOLAS

Objection

P358/765 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.21.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17.21/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.22 MAP 40 WELLINGTON

Objection

P14/2997 Mr D T Williams

Objections to Proposed Change

W205/20143 Mr P McKay
P358/20144 Environment Agency

Summary of Objections / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (14, 205, 358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 14, 205, 358

17.22.1 The latest flooding information is shown on Proposed Changes Map PC8 and indicates that the Church Farm allocation is not at risk of flooding, though a flood risk assessment may still be required. My Recommendation 4.7/2 refers. No other modification is needed in response to the objections.

RECOMMENDATION

17.22/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.23 MAP 50 MADLEY AIRFIELD

Objection

P1088/3447 MPD Ltd

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The whole of the access bay should be shown as safeguarded employment land. (1088)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

17.23.1 In Section 6 of my report, I consider that the whole of the access bay should be treated as safeguarded employment land. A related modification of Inset Map 50 is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.23/1 Modify Inset Map 50 so that the whole of the access bay is shown as safeguarded employment land.

17.23/2 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.

17.24 MAP 51 MORETON-ON-LUGG DEPOT

Objection

P602/5538 Herefordshire Nature Trust

Summary of Objection / Issue

- The proposed employment allocation at Wellington Marsh Special Wildlife Site should be deleted. (602)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

17.24.1 Paragraph 6.4.8 of the Revised Deposit Draft makes specific reference to areas of land within the proposal to be safeguarded for their biodiversity and landscape value. Specific protection is afforded to the Wellington Marsh Special Wildlife site under Policy NC4 and to Long Coppice, which will both be retained and managed for their biodiversity, ecological, landscaping and amenity value. The site has a long established storage and distribution use and I consider that sensitive development in accordance with the above principles will provide satisfactory safeguards for the biodiversity interest of the site. No modification is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

17.24/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.25 MAP 57 BODENHAM CONSERVATION AREA

Objections

P358/766 Environment Agency
P551/1238 Bodenham Parish Council (Conditionally Withdrawn)

Summary of Objections / Issues

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)
- The Inset Map Key should include the SSSI designation. (551)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.25.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

SSSI designation – 551

17.25.2 The SSSI designation was included in the key in the Revised Deposit Draft which has allowed the objection to be conditionally withdrawn.

RECOMMENDATION

17.25/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objections.

17.26 MAP 66 LUGG BRIDGE

Objection

P358/769 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.26.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17.26/1 Do not make any modification in response to the objection.

17.27 MAP 67 MORDIFORD

Objection

P358/767 Environment Agency

Summary of Objection / Issue

- Whether the extent of land liable to flood is correctly shown on the Proposals Map. (358)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Extent of land liable to flood – 358

17.27.1 In response to this objection the latest available information provided by the Environment Agency was included in the Revised Deposit Draft. This satisfies the objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17.27/1 Do not make any other modification in response to the objection.