

Statement of Decision and Reasons in respect of representations regarding the Proposed Modifications to the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

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

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

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON				
Support from							
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Support is given to proposed modifications on Proposals Map showing revised information in respect of flood risk.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Mod No: 042</td> <td style="width: 55%;">Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.3.2 - Strategy and general policy</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: right;">5 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No: 042	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.3.2 - Strategy and general policy		5 comment(s)
Mod No: 042	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.3.2 - Strategy and general policy		5 comment(s)				
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.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	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.				
Objection from							
Messrs MJ, AB & RG Griffiths	Council has rejected the recommendation of the Inspector that 12,152 dwellings are sufficient to meet RSS target (12,200). Should Council wish to increase the requirement a full assessment of implications should be undertaken. Inspector rejected sites on the basis of there being no need, as the Council now consider there is a need for an additional allocation the reasoning of the Inspector is open to doubt and a further inquiry is required. Mod 042 conflicts with Mod 041. Remove land at Bullinghope or hold a further inquiry to determine the housing requirement and its distribution.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	Proposed modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. The modifications make clear that this will ensure certainty that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. There is no conflict between Modifications 041 and 042. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry.				

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON
Objection from			
Mr G Hankins	<p>Most sites were recommended for rejection by the Inspector on the basis that land sufficient for the strategic requirement had been identified and there was no need to search further. Council now indicate that 12152 housing sites will not come forward, contrary to the position at the Inquiry and the evidence provided by the Council and supported by the Inspector. If a shortfall exists other land should be re-examined, including land at Church Way, Holmer, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and that in Modification 042 (12,458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Church Way and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid.</p>	<p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p>	<p>The housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed Modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the sites themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the Modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that that the target of 12,200 will be achieved, rather than exceeded. The proposal for housing land at Bullinghope was fully considered at the Public Inquiry, and the rejection of the Inspector's Report by the Council does not raise matters not considered at the Inquiry.</p>
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 Holmer House Farm, to consider requirement to meet regional target (12,200) and Modification 042 figure (12,458). Public Inquiry is required unless proposal to reject Bullinghope proposal is amended and target of maximum of 12200 dwellings re-affirmed. Should Council maintain its position that not all sites are likely to come forward, the reasons stated for recommending rejection of land at Holmer House Farm and for maintaining the settlement boundary are not valid.</p>	<p>No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.</p>	<p>The housing strategy, in terms of both the levels and distribution of housing was the subject of considerable debate at the Inquiry. The recommendations of the Inspector and his reasoning and conclusions, in respect of the strategy, have been carefully considered by the Council. Proposed Modification 042 does not indicate that allocated sites will not come forward within the Plan period, but rather doubts whether all such sites will be completed by 2011. It is delays in the Plan's progress rather than problems with the sites themselves which has resulted in this uncertainty. It is not accepted that the Modification will result in a need to reconsider other alternative housing sites suggested at the Inquiry. The reasons for the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation 5.14/1 make clear that this will ensure certainty that 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			
Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water	<p>Pleased that previous representations have been incorporated into the document and note that they had previously conditionally withdrawn objections to the Broomy Hill, land off Yazor Rd, North of Whitecross and Whitecross sites. In respect of the site at Merrivale in Ross capital works are not programmed for completion until 2010 and this should be taken into account in producing any future LDF document.</p>	<p>The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p>
Mod No: 047	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.1 to 5.4.5 and Table 2 - Hereford and the market towns: housing land allocations (non-site based issues)		1 comment(s)

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON
Objection from			
Church Commissioners for England	Objection to proposed over provision of housing. There is no reason why allocated sites should not come forward within the plan period and there is plenty of time to review the housing position through the Core Strategy and subsequent DPDs in order to have revised policies in place by 2011.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The dwelling provision figures in the Plan have regard to the overall requirement for the County in the Regional Spatial Strategy and to the need to ensure certainty that this requirement will be delivered, the proximity of the end of the Plan period, and the fact that several allocated sites have yet to commence. It is considered that the strategic housing requirement will be appropriately met through the various identified provisions. The Regional Assembly have confirmed that the UDP, as proposed to be modified, is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Mod No: 056	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.13 (deleted) - Hereford - Allocated sites - Land at Holmer	28 comment(s)
-------------	--	---------------

Objection from			
Mrs Judy Allen	Funds from new housing should be allocated to make improvements to works to a number of local road junctions, including traffic lights. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provision for a pedestrian/cycle access across the Roman Road Railway Bridge and College Road Bridge should be made. Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions and restriction of street lighting. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

Objection from			
Mr J E Arnold	Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Traffic impact on all three railway bridges is likely to increase. Improvements should be made to the railway bridges to ease traffic flows. Improvements should be made to a number of local road junctions.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

Objection from			
Mr and Mrs R G Beveridge	Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Concern for safety at a number of local road junctions in the area. Provisions for a pedestrian access/bridge across the Roman Road railway bridge should be made. Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions for safe crossing.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

Objection from			
Ms. Zena Borthwick	Traffic impact on Roman Road and road between Lyde Cross and Munstone Road is likely to increase and cause problems at the junction. Additional traffic measures are required but the installation of traffic lights would only increase traffic flows. There should be no access from the new estate on to Munstone Road.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
Objection from			
Mr. David Borthwick	The Council has included this site in the plan in an undemocratic way. There has been a lack of public consultation from the onset. The current road infrastructure will not cope with additional traffic. Funds from new housing should be allocated to make improvements to a number of local road junctions. Measures to restrict traffic in the Munstone area as well as no access to Munstone Road from the proposed development.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mrs D Brimfield	Traffic in the Holmer area is likely to increase. Make improvements to a number of local road junctions.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mrs F J Brooks	The Council has included this site in the plan in an undemocratic way. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Concern about the increase in traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mrs H E Cantrill	Traffic surveys are required along the traffic routes close to the Holmer site. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Measures to restrict traffic along the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane. Provision for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road railway bridge and College Road bridge should be made. No further development without a bypass. Retain the rural character of the area. Surface water flooding close to the railway bridge on Roman Road.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mr & Mrs M Graver	Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 through Lyde and Munstone. Provide a continuous green corridor along the eastern boundary of the site along Munstone Road and retain the rural character.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

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

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
Objection from			
Mrs K Matthews	Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
V A Pugh	A roundabout at the College Road/Roman Road junction is necessary.Reduce the speed limit along Roman Road to 30 miles per hour.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mrs P Richards	Concern about the increase in traffic along Munstone Road, and A49.Concern for the existing traffic problems at a number of local road junctions.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Mr Paul Richards	Traffic management issues need to be addressed especially along narrow lanes and various junctions in the vicinity.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Objection from			
Cllr. Mrs. Sally Robertson	Concern about existing septic tank discharges, existing residents should be linked to the public sewer to avoid pollution. Traffic measures should be introduced to reduce traffic problems on nearby minor roads and Roman Road. Question the legality of the way the Holmer site was dealt with at the inquiry as the site had already been deleted from the Plan.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan. At the Inquiry, HADRA were effectively supporters of the Plan since the Holmer site had been removed in 2004, and submitted written evidence accordingly. Crest Strategic Properties Ltd were objectors to the Revised Deposit UDP and consequently had the right to appear at the Inquiry and submit evidence to it. However, it is clear in paragraph 5.15 of the Inspectors Report that he considered all representations in respect of the site including those in support of the Revised Deposit Draft and all issues are covered in his Report.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
<i>Objection from</i>			
Mr PM Stubbs	Objection to the way in which the Holmer and Bullinghope sites were dealt with at the various Plan stages as the wishes of the local community appear to have been ignored. Traffic impact on Roman Road and surrounding area is likely to increase. Funds from new housing should be allocated to make road improvements to a number of local road junctions. Provisions to widen the railway bridge at the Bridge Inn and at Roman Road should be made. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Plan has been prepared in accordance with Development Plan Regulations including the requirement for publicity and consultation and proposals have been subject to a Public Inquiry. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
<i>Objection from</i>			
Mr A P Thomas	Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. There should be a new river crossing connected to the west of Roman Road.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
<i>Objection from</i>			
Miss K P Uridge	The traffic survey of 2003 is out of date as there has been an increased amount of traffic since Roman Road improvements were made. Funds from new housing should not be allocated to widen the Roman Road railway bridge as the traffic impact on Roman Road over the railway bridge is likely to increase. Provisions for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road railway bridge should be made. Measures to restrict traffic between the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
<i>Objection from</i>			
Mr A N West	Retain the rural character of Munstone Road with traffic restrictions. Funds from the Holmer development should be put towards the proposed Relief Road. Concern for the existing traffic problems at a number of local road junctions. There should be no alterations to the Roman Road railway bridge.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
Objection from			
Holmer & District Residents Association	Question the legality of the way the Holmer site was dealt with at the inquiry as the site had already been deleted from the Plan. Object to the possibility of a two way traffic system on the A4103 railway crossing. Traffic impact on Roman Road is likely to increase. Funds from new housing should not be allocated to the Roman Road railway bridge and should instead be used for works to a number of local road junctions. Measures to restrict traffic along the A49 and A4103 including Church Way and Attwood Lane Provision should be made for a pedestrian access across the Roman Road Railway Bridge and as well as a cycle/pedestrian access on College Road Bridge. Provide a continuous green corridor along the Eastern boundary of the site. Restrict street lighting along Munstone Road to help retain the rural character. Concern about existing septic tank discharges. Existing residents should be linked to the public sewer to avoid pollution.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	At the Inquiry, HADRA were effectively supporters of the Plan since the Holmer site had been removed in 2004, and submitted written evidence accordingly. Crest Strategic Properties Ltd were objectors to the Revised Deposit UDP and consequently had the right to appear at the Inquiry and submit evidence to it. However, it is clear in paragraph 5.15 of the Inspectors Report that he considered all representations in respect of the site including those in support of the Revised Deposit Draft and all issues are covered in his Report. The traffic impact was fully examined by the Inspector and no overriding problem was identified. Detailed issues regarding individual junctions, traffic management issues, local environmental and sewerage concerns are more appropriately dealt with as part of the consideration of planning applications rather than through modifications to the Development Plan.
Support from			
Mr W.H.D. Hartland	Modification supported.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Support from			
Church Commissioners for England	The Holmer site is preferred to Bullinghope and can deliver road improvements.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Support from			
Crest Strategic Projects LTD	Crest fully support the Council's decision to reinstate land at Holmer for residential purposes and adjust the settlement boundary accordingly in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Support from			
Hereford City Council	The City Council unreservedly supports the Inspector's conclusion as to the use of the Holmer site.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Support from			
West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium	Welcome target of 35% affordable housing on land at Holmer and the specific reference to an element of affordable housing and a mix of dwelling units.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.

Mod No: 059 Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp

1 comment(s)

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON				
Support from							
Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD	Support acceptance of recommendation to increase estimated capacity at Baron's Cross Camp to 425 dwellings, consistent with PPG3 and recent planning permission on the site.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">060</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	060	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp	1 comment(s)
Mod No:	060	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.18 - Leominster - Allocated sites - Barons Cross Camp	1 comment(s)				
Support from							
Taylor Woodrow Developments LTD	Support deletion of "nursery accommodation" from paragraph 5.4.18 reflecting planning permission of October 2006.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">061</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	061	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane	1 comment(s)
Mod No:	061	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane	1 comment(s)				
Support from							
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Support reference to the 2005 development brief.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">062</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	062	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane	1 comment(s)
Mod No:	062	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H2 and paragraph 5.4.22 - Ross-on-Wye - Allocated sites - Tanyard Lane	1 comment(s)				
Support from							
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Support the proposed replacement wording with regard to bringing forward the Tanyard Lane site.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">063</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.4.22 - Land at Tanyard Lane</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">2 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	063	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.4.22 - Land at Tanyard Lane	2 comment(s)
Mod No:	063	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 5.4.22 - Land at Tanyard Lane	2 comment(s)				
Objection from							
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Reference to the new business park remains in para 5.4.22. The Inspector makes clear in 6.10.31 that there is potential confusion over which provisions cover which site in respect of the Overross employment site and Tanyard Lane housing site. No off site pedestrian/cycling works have been proposed in respect of Tanyard Lane therefore "and business park" should be deleted from 5.4.22. Also reference to use of Section 106 or 278 agreements should be stated in the text of 5.4.22 as detailed in the Inspector's report at paragraph 5.23.12.	Delete the words "and business park" from the fourth sentence of paragraph 5.4.22 (as a minor change consequential upon the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation 6.10/2 and which will not materially affect the Plan). No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Inspector concludes that the paragraphs dealing with Model Farm and Tanyard Lane should not deal with aspects of both sites. However, his recommendation 6.10/2 (which was accepted by the Council resulting in proposed modification 104) only partially succeeds in achieving this, and a reference to the new business park remains in the fourth sentence of paragraph 5.4.22. This is now an outdated reference. Its removal is considered a minor, consequential change following from the acceptance of recommendation 6.10/2 and would be undertaken as a change under proposed modification 219. With regard to the reference to the use of Section 106 or 278 agreements this issue was considered by the Inspector in paragraph 5.23.12. He made no recommendation regarding the inclusion of any reference as a proposed modification. Such a reference is not considered necessary.				

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
Support from			
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Support is given to including "occupation" instead of "commencement" and to the deletion of "and the new business park proposal" in paragraph 5.4.22.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 077	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59 - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Mr Peter McKay	Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 078	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59 - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington		2 comment(s)
Objection from			
Mr Peter McKay	Support thrust of modification but would like to see words from modification 079, namely "or on such other site as may be agreed by the Council in substitution" included. Notes also that modification 078 applies to land at Church Farm not Auberrow Road as stated in Modifications document.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	It is accepted Modification 078 refers to the Church Farm site, the reference in the Proposed Modifications reflects the manner which the issue is considered in the Inspector's Report. The recreational facilities proposed by Modification 078 are related to the Church Farm site. It is therefore appropriate that the housing development contribute to this facility rather than facilities elsewhere in the village.
Support from			
Wellington Community Association Parish Plan Steering Committee	Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 079	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H5 and paragraph 5.4.59a - Main villages, housing land allocations - Land off Auberrow Road, Wellington		2 comment(s)
Support from			
Mr Peter McKay	Support modification.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Support from			
Wellington Community Association Parish Plan Steering Committee	Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 096	Policy/Paragraph: Policy H19 - Open space requirements		1 comment(s)

<i>NAME</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT</i>	<i>DECISION</i>	<i>REASON</i>
Support from			
Mr Peter McKay	Supports modification as Wellington needs a children's play area.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 098	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraph 6.3.5 - Strategy and general policy.		1 comment(s)
Support from			
West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium	Welcome insertion of the target of 80% housing on each hectare of land.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 103	Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 and paragraphs 6.4.28 to 6.4.29 - New employment land allocations - Ross-on-Wye - Overross and Model Farm site		1 comment(s)
Objection from			
Mr. L Cosker	The buffer is not required if land at Overross is allocated in preference to Model Farm. It should be deleted unless the site is allocated in addition to land at Overross.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Council remains of the opinion that Model Farm is the most appropriate location for an employment allocation and has rejected the Inspector's recommendation 6.10/1. There remains the need to retain the land to the west of Model Farm as a buffer between the existing residential uses and the proposed employment development.
Mod No: 104	Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 and paragraphs 6.4.28 to 6.4.29 - New employment land allocations - Ross-on-Wye - Overross and Model Farm site		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Persimmon Homes South Midlands	Support is given to the deletion of reference to Tanyard Lane in order to eliminate confusion over the requirements expected from each site.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 105	Policy/Paragraph: Policy E4 - New employment land allocations - Hereford - west of Beech Business Park		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Church Commissioners for England	Support extension of settlement boundary which will allow local firms to maintain a presence and benefit from potential of a relocated livestock market	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 149	Policy/Paragraph: Policy T10 and paragraphs 8.8.11 to 8.8.12 - Safeguarding road schemes - Outer relief road / Rotherwas Access Road		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Highways Agency	Content that the only modification is to include the agreed alignment for the road	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 158	Policy/Paragraph: Paragraphs 9.4.1 to 9.4.4 - Landscape introduction		1 comment(s)

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON				
Support from							
Wye Valley AONB	Brings the context of paragraph 9.4.1 up to date with the latest Government guidance.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">160</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA1 and paragraphs 9.4.5 to 9.4.7 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	160	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA1 and paragraphs 9.4.5 to 9.4.7 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	1 comment(s)
Mod No:	160	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA1 and paragraphs 9.4.5 to 9.4.7 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	1 comment(s)				
Support from							
Wye Valley AONB	Modification makes policy LA1 clearer in terms of reference to "economic" development in AONB's and more in line with Government statements.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">161</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA2 and paragraphs 9.4.8 to 9.4.16 - Landscape character and areas least resilient to change</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">2 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	161	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA2 and paragraphs 9.4.8 to 9.4.16 - Landscape character and areas least resilient to change	2 comment(s)
Mod No:	161	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA2 and paragraphs 9.4.8 to 9.4.16 - Landscape character and areas least resilient to change	2 comment(s)				
Objection from							
Savills	Representations were previously made to exclude the Madley Satellite Earth Station site from the LA2 provisions, while there has been changes to the Areas Least Resilient to Change the policy wording would still apply negatively to the site. The change would result in a presumption against the expansion and investment by BT could create a more negative policy background. There a similarities between this site and Stirling Lines at Credehill. The site is of National Importance and has been atypical of the surrounding landscape types. Any expansion requirements should be capable of outweighing this policy, but policy does not acknowledge the development to date or allow scope to overcome a policy objection without relying on material considerations. UDP policy should have a presumption in favour of further development subject to criteria.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	At the Deposit Draft stage of the UDP process objections were received on behalf of BT plc indicating that policy LA2 could prohibit extension or expansion of existing businesses and suggesting a number of changes that should be made to the policy. The Inspector in paragraph 9.4.4 recognises that objections have been made regarding the recognition within the policy of "atypical" areas. His response to such objections is the recommendation to delete the references to Areas Least Resilient to Change (9.4/1) and this has been accepted by the Council. The policy justification, as proposed to be modified, makes it clear that the intention of the policy is not to prevent necessary development and the policy criteria are not considered to be unduly restrictive. However, it is entirely reasonable that the issue of landscape character is addressed when development proposals are considered.				
Support from							
Church Commissioners for England	Support modification. The written policy provides sufficient clarity without the need to identify specific areas on the proposals map.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;">Mod No:</td> <td style="width:10%;">164</td> <td style="width:50%;">Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows</td> <td style="width:30%; text-align: right;">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No:	164	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows	1 comment(s)
Mod No:	164	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows	1 comment(s)				

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON
Objection from			
Woodland Trust	Support deletion of the words "and only permitted where the development is in the public interest" but suggest absolute protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees can be achieved by amending further the second sentence of criterion 2 to read "In particular, proposals affecting protected trees and Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodlands will be refused". These eco-systems cannot be re-created and there should be no further loss of this finite resource. It is essential that this habitat is protected absolutely from development.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	The Modification is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector in his consideration of original objections by the Woodland Trust addressed the need for absolute protection or ancient woodland and ancient trees. He did not consider that the policy should be explicit in suggesting that there could be exceptions to the policy (paragraph 9.18). The Council have accepted this recommendation and proposed an appropriate modification. However, the Inspector also accepts, in the same paragraph, that there will always be exceptions to policy. Therefore, the policy, as proposed to be modified, is considered to provide adequate protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees.
Mod No: 165	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Woodland Trust	Support replacement of "Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands" with "Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodlands"	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 166	Policy/Paragraph: Policy LA5 and paragraphs 9.4.21 to 9.4.22 - Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows		1 comment(s)
Support from			
Woodland Trust	Support the text referring to restoration of Ancient Woodland sites where plantations have occurred (PAWS).	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 176	Policy/Paragraph: Policy HBA9 - Protection of open areas and green spaces - Additional area - Cradley - Land between St Katherines and Huntingdon		2 comment(s)
Objection from			
HOSAG	In producing VDS consultation processes identified that land between St Katherines and Huntingdon should be protected from development. This view was supported by Council at revised deposit stage through the HBA9 designation. Inspector's recommendation ignores community views and should not be accepted.	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	In making his recommendation the Inspector clearly considered the views of local residents and the responses in the village design statement. The Inspector clearly considers that the HBA9 designation is not appropriate for this site.
Support from			
Mr Anson	Supports proposed modification 176 and map PM19. Inspector concluded, having considered the merits of the site vis-a-vis the requirements of the policy, that the site does not warrant protection by policy HBA9.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.
Mod No: 200	Policy/Paragraph: Policy CF3 and paragraphs 13.4.8 to 13.4.12 - Telecommunications		1 comment(s)

NAME	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT	DECISION	REASON				
Support from							
Mobile Operators Association (MOA)	Support modifications to paragraph 13.4.12	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="103 296 297 328">Mod No: 203</td> <td data-bbox="297 296 1503 328">Policy/Paragraph: Proposed new policy - New prison</td> <td data-bbox="1503 296 1827 328"></td> <td data-bbox="1827 296 2132 328">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No: 203	Policy/Paragraph: Proposed new policy - New prison		1 comment(s)
Mod No: 203	Policy/Paragraph: Proposed new policy - New prison		1 comment(s)				
Support from							
National Offender Management Service	Supports modification 203 which accords with the Inspector's recommendation 13.10/1.	The support for the Proposed Modification be noted.	Support is noted.				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="103 488 297 520">Mod No: 215</td> <td data-bbox="297 488 1503 520">Policy/Paragraph: Proposals Map - Cusop Map 13</td> <td data-bbox="1503 488 1827 520"></td> <td data-bbox="1827 488 2132 520">1 comment(s)</td> </tr> </table>				Mod No: 215	Policy/Paragraph: Proposals Map - Cusop Map 13		1 comment(s)
Mod No: 215	Policy/Paragraph: Proposals Map - Cusop Map 13		1 comment(s)				
Objection from							
Dr Tim Mullany	<p>Floodplain depiction for Cusop is wrong. Proposed UDP is based on inaccurate information and will be open to ethical and legal challenge. The suggestion that this blight can be corrected at time of an application by undertaking flood risk assessments is unjust and uncertain. The floodplain map will appear on Local Authority searches it will increase insurance premiums and possibly prevent properties being insured. New modelling will be undertaken and the flood data and map will change during the spring of next year. This data will show the Dulas brook is in a deep ravine as it passes Dulas House. What mechanism for the updated information to be adopted in the UDP? How often will it be revised? Should it be formulated and adopted on inaccurate information.</p>	No further modification be proposed in response to this objection.	<p>National Planning policy in PPG25 is clear that "Following discussions with the Environment Agency and other interested parties, local planning authorities should show the areas of flood risk on local plans...." The Inspector considered the issue of defining indicative flood plan maps on the UDP Proposals Maps, including the floodplain defined for Cusop and he concluded that the UDP should include the latest information supplied by the Environment Agency. However, the UDP acknowledges in paragraph 4.5.6 that the information is indicative and that the information will be updated as more detailed information becomes available. The latest information and advice supplied by the Environment Agency would be used in the determination of any planning application. It is not accepted that the UDP is a document which will be utilised to set insurance premiums in respect of flooding issues. The UDP will be replaced over time through the preparation of the Council's Local Development Framework and its constituent documents.</p>				