

Hereford Area Plan – site options consultation August 2018– on-line responses

Question 1: Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as potential are the most suitable sites to consider for future housing development?

Name	Q1.	Site ref	If no, please explain:
A. Storrsson	No	Three Elms	The notion of "development" as being constituted solely by "growth" is outdated; there is much work that could be done in and around Hereford, that would not amount to the construction of additional living or working space, that would nevertheless lead to the development of both the city's economic and social wellbeing. Three Elms in particular would be a disastrous site to attempt to build on, given the quality of the terrain (presence of aquifers, instability etc.) and the extra weight it would put on an already overstretched transport network. It might be necessary to accept that, given their geographical situation, cities have predetermined limits, beyond which they cannot expand: at that point, the question is not one of "where to build next", but how to improve what we already have.
Adrian	No	Tup26/27	All areas of green amenity space should be protected - the benefit of living in a rural area is that we do not all live on top of one another. I do not consider we have an over supply of amenity green space. I have an overall concern about all spaces but naturally am particularly concerned over the areas I know best which are Tupsley 26 and Tupsley 27 - both areas provide highly valued open space for the local community.
Adrian Pudsey	Yes		
Alan Preece	No	Tup25	You are just destroying open spaces for children to play safely on especially Tup 25
Alice Bowerman	No	Tup25	The Site Tup25 is not suitable for development into housing. This a recreational green space, the only space that is accessible for residents of Foley Street and surrounding streets without crossing the busy roads. It is so valuable for peoples mental health to have green spaces between housing. This will especailly be nessecary if the bungalows on Eign Mill Road are developed as there will be more users to this space. Housing needs to be built on brownfield sites first not take away peoples access to green space.

Alice Devereux	No	Tup25	Tup 25 - not suitable for the following reasons. 1) this is the only space for children to play safely. Removing or reduction in the space would lead to unsafe playing, riding of bikes on either the congested foley street or the busy trading estate traffic on eign mill road. 2) the area is predominantly made up of low income residents in small terraced houses and bungalows, gardens are very narrow and unsuitable for activities. Therefore the park is much needed place for health activities and to connect with nature. 3.) the park is a highly used dog walking spot, being big enough for multiple dogs to play without issue, even when the pitch is in use. It is popular as it is relatively enclosed and the trees provide much needed shade. The only other suitable areas for walking is bartosham fairies which is owned by the church and could be built upon in the future. Any development of this site would mean local dog walkers having to drive to the next nearest parks of the quarry, bishops meadows or alyestone park which have limited parking or involve driving though congested areas.
Amanda Martin	No		There should no new housing on small informal green areas used by communities for informal recreation.
Amy Cannon	No	Tup25	Foley field is completely unsuitable for building on. The access roads would not be able to cope and you would be stealing a valued resource from local children and families, in a time when the council is already stealing their services (libraries, children's centres, youth services etc). The mental health effects of lack of outdoor space are well researched and documented.
Angela Downing	No	Tup27	Tup 27 is a valuable semi-natural woodland which is home to hedgehogs, frogs and toads, and many species of birds. It provides linkage (green corridor) between other habitats. It has been used more by the woodpeckers since the development of Bishop Fields.
Anon	No	Bur09/Kings Acre Rd	All sites off the Kings Acre Road and BUR09 will create extra traffic approaching the Monument roundabout which currently cannot sustain "rush hour" levels.
Anon	No	Tup27	I am opposing the proposal build on Tup27. I believe that it is significant environmental importance. This is due to all the new builds already taking place and currently passed planning that will put pressure on already strained local schools and the extra vehicles that will result on already difficult roads. So already locally we have lost a lot of green space. Tup27 has a large number of wild birds (nearly 30+) including several types of owls. I would hope that a serious bat survey would be required as bats of different sizes are seen each evening in this area. Hedgehogs also feed within this area each night also. There has been lots of sightings also of Muntjac deer within this park and locally. When looking at this site I believe account should be taken of the plot next door to it that already has planning permission for a further 6 to 8 houses which will already destroy a decent sized wild environment. I believe the loss of Tup27 would have a devastating environmental impact to local wildlife that cannot be replaced.

Anon	Yes		
Anon	No		Stop knocking down peoples houses needlessly for the bypass when you can pick a route where nobody needs to loose their homes and also stop building on the green belt when you have old derelict buildings in the city that could be redeveloped first stop taking the countryside and park areas away which are valuable for our children. We do not want a concrete jungle thank you.
Brett Jenkins	No	Hol12b	Hol12b is a bad site for development, it is landlocked with the railway to the north, and two single country lanes to the east and west, with the village of bullinghope to the south. These roads are not suitable for the extra traffic that this development would bring.
Brittany winchester	No	Tup25	The field at the end of Foley Street should not be bulid on.Because it was given to the children of foley street and it is used regularly Fodor children,dog walkers ect
Carl Green	No		Green spaces were introduced to make people feel less enclosed not in a concrete jungle to start building on them would be a tragic mistake for current and future generations
Catherine Knowles	No	Tup25	Tup25 Land adjacent to Foley Trading Estate (Tup02) The site is widely used by dog walkers, people and particularly children. It is the only large green space for the kids to play on and run around. I am aware that there is Central Park, which is great but does not double up as a kick about area. Children of all ages use the Land adjacent to Foley Trading Estate whereas the park is generally used by younger children. These open spaces are of huge value to those who use them (both physically and mentally) - I can send examples of studies confirming this if required. It is my understanding that the Land adjacent to Foley Trading Estate was left to the children and residents of the area and is, therefore, not to be built upon.
Charles Markham	Yes		
Charlotte Moreau	No	Tup25	TUP25 would mean the loss of an important green space for children to play in the town, and would have a severely detrimental impact traffic wise on the residents of Eign Mill Road
Chris Amor	No		There need's to be a limit in how many new houses we take on and to keep more protected green spaces, else there will be nothing left. No point giving people houses without the adequate accompanments including decent quality open green space and countryside. Hereford is becoming a disgusting eye sore

Coralie Jones	No	Tup26	<p>Specifically in relation to Site ID Tup 26. This has been a green open space since the construction of the current housing estate some 32 years ago. When the original planning permission was granted to Bryant Homes by Hereford City Council in 1983 a condition of such planning was that "a landscaping and tree planting scheme should be carried out in order to ensure a satisfactory and well planned development and to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment." It also stated that "the trees form an integral part of the visual environment" and that the condition was imposed "to preserve the character and amenities of the area". The site Tup 26 now has a number of mature trees, planted when the estate was built. These trees are important for wildlife and the biodiversity of the area and the enjoyment in general of the local population. If preserving and enhancing the quality of the environment was a specific planning condition then, why is it considered no longer necessary for that quality to be preserved? It is well used by local residents and has been for the past 32 years. If the land is used for housing then the only green space left for residents of the area for leisure use and dog walking will be the Bishops School Playing Fields (not in reality a community area) and the community green playing area fronting Gurney Avenue. These areas are not available at all times as various sporting activities are regularly held on both sites therefore restricting usage of other residents. Removing Tup 26 will also mean that more dog walkers will use the community space and the school playing fields thus potentially increasing the incidence of dog fouling to the detriment of public health, particularly school children playing rugby/football in these areas. Road Network. The road access is already busy. In addition, houses tend to have more than 2 vehicles and thus vehicles are frequently parked on the side of the road restricting traffic flow. There is also an increased instance of residents' works vehicles such as large vans/trucks being parked on the side of the road or on the pavement/road which would likely increase with further housing. The traffic and parking is particularly bad on the days that football matches are being played with traffic parked all the way down the road into the cul-de-sac area, restricting visibility and traffic flow. In the event of a further 20 houses being built on the site then this will increase the traffic flow/congestion and the parking issues. Increase in local population. Over the past 2 years some 120 houses have been built on the new development known as 'Bishop Fields', a site within a quarter of a mile from Tup 26, which has increased the local population greatly and thus increased the need for green space rather than decreased it. Finally, to state that the city has an oversupply of green space is not a good reason to take away local green space. The reality is that people will not travel miles to access green space. To state that its loss would need to be compensated by improving existing open space is also not a viable option. The only other open spaces are the school sports field and the community area fronting Gurney Avenue. The school sports field belongs to the school and is not in reality a community area. Should the school impose restrictions on use/access of the sports field then there will only be the community green area, an area already heavily used for organised children's activities, being the only green area available for local residents, those of any new proposed housing and the residents of the newly constructed Bishops Fields site.</p>
---------------	----	-------	--

Daniel Green	No	Tup26	The Queenswood Drive location is frequently used by dog walkers. Areas surrounding are for recreational use meaning this will be an issue for local dog walkers. Parking during footballing event is busy anyway. With additional cars this will create further problems and potential hazards for these children and drivers.
David Harding	Yes	Cen21h	
David Harrison	No	Tup26	Site ID Tup 26. This site is eminently unsuitable, the area is already congested.1)the increased traffic for a narrow Queenswood Drive would be dangerous 2)the loss of amenity land can not be replaced easily and this comes on top of 120 houses recently constructed.
David Thame	No	Thr29	The refusal to use the racecourse site - which, as a racecourse, is a poor economic use of centrally-placed land - hobbles the entire strategy. This large area could be a planned zone for both housing and employment, providing exactly the kind of co-ordinated low travel environment most towns aspire to. Instead this draft places housing and employment sites on the extremity of the city where contact with services, travel impacts and social isolation is far more likely. No adequate planning reason has been offered for failing to allocate the racecourse site. It's a waste of a valuable resource: town centre land.
Debby Chalk	No	Tup26	Tup26 Traffic on Queenswood Drive is quite congested particularly when an event is taking place on the football pitch. Parking on both sides of the road is not uncommon and additional houses will only exacerbate the situation. Additional works would be required to sort out the flooding potential elsewhere upstream of the stream that runs between the Bishop's school pitches and the Tupsley soccer pitches, which currently utilizes this area (Tup26) as a flood plain if necessary.
Diane Donkin	No	Tup26	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	Hol12a/b	I am concerned about the vast quantity of development that is proposed to take place in the south. This would cause a massive demand on the A49 going south of city, which is already over subscribed. I am concerned that the lovely village of Bullinghope will be ruined by some of the plans for that area, and I think that is disgusting and the council should be ashamed of themselves. I'm talking about Hol12b & Hol12a specifically.
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	Tup25/Three Elms	Green leisure spaces are being taken away from city residents. For example, Foley Fields and the village planned for the land at Three Elms wipes out clean, green space. For thousands of people as well as the eco system.

Emma Hall	No	Tup26/27	I am against developing houses on the tupsley 26/27 area. There is a brook bordering tup 26 which floods every year. This is the only green space for leisure time/dog walking. The narrow road already gets congested particularly at weekends with sporting events. 110 houses have just been built nearby on bishops fields- how are the local schools supposed to accomodate all the extra houses/children?
Emma Talboys	No	Tup25	The site at the end of Foley Street is used by daily by the people and children of Foley street. There is also a considerable issue with traffic and parking in Foley Street and to add to that would put far to much pressure in the current residence.
G J Shingler	No		Building on car parks will drive people away
Gary Pritchard	No		Do people of Hereford really want Hereford to grow as big as the council think!
Ginnie Jaques	No		Excessive number of houses planned for conservation areas, flood plains, impact on water supplies, without investment in alternative transport options than cars these houses will contribute to increasingly jammimg up Hereford with more cars, increasing pollution, threatening our environment and public well being
Grace Cooke	No	Tup25	Foley Street field. I grew up on Foley street and regularly played on the field as a child. My children now play there, as do other children on the street. When I was younger, I would ride my bike up and down the street, but it is now so busy with the traffic for the industrial estate and people parking for the hospital/town, it is too dangerous for my children to play out. The nearest park is across a very busy main road. This is the only safe space for children to play. I had written on a previous questionnaire that it would be lovely to get play park facilities on the field, as it would benefit many local streets this side of the main road. People regularly walk dogs and picnic on the field. It is well used, and the residents of Foley Street have had enough taken from them in terms of traffic and business. Please do not take the last part we have left!
Harvey winchester	No		

HILARY GODDARD	No	Tup26	Reasons against the use of land TUP26 for housing are 1. The 120 houses (Bishop Field Estate) are not shown on the map but are less than 150 meters from the proposed development area. This development will use TUP26 and is already having an impact on the sports fields. A further 20 houses (as proposed) will only add to this problem. 2. TUP26 is the only informal recreational green space 3. Queenswood Drive currently has problems especially when cars are parked on the road - increased housing will exaggerate this issue. 4. The proposal that the loss of TUP26 would be compensated by improving existing open space is not viable as the only existing open space nearby is used for sports by the local school. 5. Bishops Field housing already are using the sewage and drains of the Queenswood Drive sewage and drains which were only built to cope with the Bryants/Westbury houses built at the time. 6. Local schools are already over subscribed.
Holly Munn	No		This area is a valuable resource for dog walkers and children alike. There are always kids playing or dogs running around this field and it would be a real shame to see another green space destroyed!
Holly vaughan	No	Tup25	Tup25 poor access no other football pitch nearby
J Talbot	No		
Joanne Jones	No	Tup26	TUP26, Concerns over the already low water table as when heavy rain falls part of this area floods. It sits on the proposed area and covers the lower part of Queenswood Drive. Houses have had sandbags outside them before during heavy rain fall. A large number of mature trees sit all over this land. The land is used by both local children and families as well as dog walkers. There are a large number of houses looking onto this area. The top field is used for football practise/matches. When this is going on (normally every weekend and once or twice during the week) the road is full of parked cars already making it difficult to pass in a car. The area is already over populated due to the good schools.
Jodie Williams		Tup27	TUP 27. This land is regularly used by children and dog walkers. The site is surrounded by residential properties any new housing would overlook these homes. There is poor access to the site as the only entrance would be opposite St Pauls school. This road is seriously congested at points during the day. This area is a fantastic natural habitat for many animals including bats, newts etc
Jonathan Casey	No		

Jonathan Devereux	No	Tup25	With regards TUP25, the proposed development of the green space between Foley Street and Eign Mill Road will severely disrupt the local community who rely on this area for recreation. The specific area has no other nearby locations which allow the mix of different activities such as dog walking, safe children's play and also sports. The area has a high population density, much of which tends to be lower income, young families. Whilst much of the housing stock have gardens, typically they are terrace style long thin gardens which are unsuitable for children's play and sports. Removing the green space would severely impact on the community activities that take place, whilst adding to the already crowded area. This in turn would also have an impact on both Foley Street and Eign Mill Road traffic and parking which already is congested and has led to accidents (only recently a child was badly injured from through traffic).
K Lee	No	Hol12/13/14 /Stm01/05/17	Hol 12-14 inclusive and Stm 01,05&17 will completely change the make up of the southern boundary of the city, seriously affecting the availability and quality of green space recreation for some of the most disadvantaged residents
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans	No	Tup25	Site ID Tup25 This is Foley Street's (and neighbouring street's) park. Where we exercise play,relax. It is ours, and it is needed for children and adults alike.
Karen Amos	No	Tup26	Tup 26 for housing; not having Tup 26 for recreational space would have a huge impact on my family life. Our children use that outdoor area to play, it's close to home and safe. They explore what has fallen off the trees, watch the wildlife, our kids see squirrels and said they one saw a lizard! Seeing wildlife is beneficial for them. we walk our and play with our dog. Walking our dog on Tup 26 really does play a huge part of us maintaining a good state of mental health, after a stressful ay at work, dog walking and just being outdoors playing with our dog and kids has been proven to help reduce stress. How are our children supposed to walk safely to and from school during works on Tup 26? The current roads have car parked on them so they become single lane roads. Increased housing on Tup 26 would make the congestion considerably worse on our roads. Noise pollution and air pollution (during works) would play a bit part of reducing our good quality of life. There has recently been another development of 120 houses built to the right of the Bishops playing fields meaning there is an increase of possible up to 300-400 residents also using Tup 26. We live on Copsewood Drive, without Tup 26 we would have no close safe green space near our house for informal recreational use. We were infomred that Tup 26 was gifted to the community as recreational land and not to be used for building on - has this been properly researched? The stream on the border of Tup 26 floods every year.

Keith Wright	No	Tup27	Site Tup 27: There is insufficient room for my specific concerns in this form. I shall submit a written response by letter.
Kevin Bray	Yes		
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	Tup26	My reasons against the use of tup 26 for housing are as follows. The residents will lose the only informal green space remaining for leisure activities and dog walking. The increased use of the two playing fields will lead to more rubbish in those areas and interference in formal sports activities. The road infrastructure is inadequate for an extra 20 houses and possibly 40 cars. Queenswood Drive is too narrow to permit access for construction vehicles at the same time as the cars of the current residents. Tup 26 is an area of ecological richness with an abundance of trees, shrubs, and hedgerows, with birds (including Buzzards), squirrels, moles, and rabbits. Unfortunately a stream on the border of tup26 floods across Queenswood Drive into the houses. Tup 26 might be a heritage asset. Local knowledge suggests that the area was gifted to the community as recreational land when the isolation hospital was closed.
Liz armitage	No	Tup25	Foley street field
Lucinda Timmins	No	Hol12b	Hol12b - This site has numerous issues which would make it wholly unsuitable for development. Both Bullingham Lane and Green Crize only just accommodate the houses on these lanes and there is no possibility that access from either lane to a new development would be plausible. The site is also prone to flooding so will be costly for the council to investigate the options (a waste for an already cash strapped authority) and would be very concerning for potential buyers.
Lucy Chuter		Ayl01	
Lynnette lobban	No		Some wrong side of city.Keep development south side near enterprise zone

Martin Gilleland	No	Bel14	<p>Bel 14: Land at Argyll Rise, Newton Farm, Hereford HR2 7BN - Newton Farm Town Green Action Group's Argyll Rise town green application was rejected by Herefordshire Council's Regulatory Committee on Tuesday 11 January 2011?. ? Mr Vivian Chapman QC advised the committee it had four options: reject the application, seek a court ruling on the true meaning of a section of the Housing Act 1957, defer or accept the application. Mr Chapman told the committee there was no court ruling on the part of the Housing Act and barristers varied in saying what it meant. On balance Mr Chapman recommended rejection as argued for by Miss Morag Ellis QC on behalf of Herefordshire Housing Ltd. Two councillors urged the Council to get a court ruling on the Housing Act 1957 and voted against rejection. The Council's solicitor had recommended acceptance. "We are extremely disappointed after four and half years of hard work by local residents to protect this open space for prosperity. To see the council's regulatory committee dismiss this application without any real interest and knowledge on the evidence put forward, only adds to the distrust that communities have with local politics" said Martin Gilleland, NFTGAG chairman. "We feel the Council took the cheap way out. NFTGAG can't afford to start a court application." "I much regret the Council's decision not to seek a court ruling", said Christopher Whitmey who assisted NFTGAG. "Whilst the point of law remains uncertain there will be further town green applications up and down the country. A few thousand pounds, spent on a court application now, would save councils and housing associations nationwide many thousands in the future."?</p>
Martin Palmer	No		<p>The building of so many houses may fit in with the government target for housing but does not reflect needs of this city</p>
Michael Howard	No	Tup26	<p>Site Tup 26- The report in poorly written, and does not state any of the the evidence support the decision to use this land. Queenswood drive is very narrow, increased housing in this area would have a detrimental effect. The report states it would have little impact on city centre traffic (which is the equivalent of saying congestion on the M25 has little impact on the traffic outside the houses of parliament). Recently development at the Bishops fields has already put pressure on local services. Just because there are green spaces is not an argument to take them away. The area floods regularly. The land was given to the community when the infectious diseases hospital was closed , the report makes a brief un-researched mention of this.</p>

Mike Ewins	No	Tup26	TUP26 - 1. Land was gifted on basis that remains Green belt and that no building would take place on it. 2.Stream runs along boundary by playing field which floods . 3.Protected species of Newts are present in stream (so i am told)4. is recreational space for Dog walkers (avoiding use of playing field)5.Area for local children to play away from sports fields providing safe secure recreational space.6.Surrounding area ie Bishop field development has already increased road use and put strain on local infrastructure eg schools,surgery etc and more housing,traffic and population would increase this further to an unsustainable level. 7.TUP26 is currently part of a safe and secure pedestrian route home for numerous children from neighbouring schools which would change to road/pavement use if this area was built upon
Miss Camden	No	Tup25	Area TUP 25 is not a suitable site. It is a well used play area and dog walking area. It is stated that access would be through Eign Mill Road, after stating that Foley Street is unsuitable due to on street parking. Eign Mill Road is a narrow road that also deals with on street parking as driveways are limited at the nearby properties.
Mr & Mrs Wright		Tup27	
Mr Michael Craig	No	Tup25	The site at foley street is not appropriate for building due to its locally, access and potential for huge build up of traffic for existing residents. The green field land is regularly and heavily used by the local community for sports, recreation and dog walking. It is an rare piece of natural green land within the area and removing such will damage local wildlife and ruin much needed green space.
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	Tup26/27	Tup 26 & Tup 27 I consider the road network around the whole Tupsley/Hampton Dene area unable to safely support any increase in volume of motor traffic, school days are absolutely manic. I also believe that the area is already seriously over populated and so to further reduce amenity green space would be inappropriate
Mrs C G Combstock	No	Tup25	Lots of residents; lack of parking; busy road. Currently this green space is used for recreation purposes and has the added bonus of being easily accessible to resident children without the need for them to cross any main roads.

Mrs J Owen	No	Tup26	Reference Tup26 Tupsley land north of Queenswood Drive Hereford HR1 1AT. This site is a very small area to consider cramming 20 houses on. The access road is very narrow and we already experience traffic problems. Cars are always parked at the side of the road reducing it to a single lane. With a build of 20 new houses I expect every house to have at least 1,2 or even more vehicles this will cause traffic congestion. Visitors to these houses will start parking in adjoining roads reducing available parking space even more. There is never enough parking spaces allocated to builds like this. There is not an oversupply of amenity green space in this area. The site referred to is a beautiful spot with mature trees which is well used by dog walkers, children playing, people walking, sitting on the bench etc enjoying green space with a little peace and quiet. It is not just local people who use this space and with the new Bishops Field estate more and more people use it. The sports field is not suitable for dog walkers due to health hazards from dog waste. The point of having local green areas is you don't have to get in a car and travel to an open space(creating more traffic congestion). When I moved into my property I was assured that this small patch of land would not be built on as it had been given to the local community as recreational land. I do not understand how you propose to compensate the local community for the loss of this green space once it's gone it cannot be replaced. I did not know about this plan until 2 days ago and I have since discovered many people who will be affected by this application who were also unaware of it. I think we should have been notified by post as many people will not now have the opportunity to object and you will be unaware of the true extent of the opposition to this plan.
Mrs P cleaton	No	Tup25	Tup 25 This is a safe area for the children to play on as not much space due to cars in this area and close to their homes so not good to build on.
Mrs S Gilbert	No	Tup26/27	I have several concerns regarding any plans to develop several scattered small pockets of land in order to build what looks to be a handful of houses in each location. I struggle to see how this would be cost effective and any benefits would not outweigh the loss of the small open spaces. Unlike other towns and cities Hereford does not have much in the way of parks and gardens and the loss of the few small open green spaces that are scattered here and there would be keenly felt. Of particular concern to me are the proposed developments at TUP 26 and TUP 27, both of these areas are small, have mature trees which should be maintained in these times of striving for sustainability and it would be a crying shame for them to be removed. TUP 26 and TUP 27 both provide small areas for dog walkers and TUP 27 in particular is an area where dogs can be exercised safely. Some of the dog walkers using these areas are retired or stay at home so the dog walking activity also provides opportunity to interact with others. Having personal knowledge of TUP 26 and TUP 27 I feel that it would be a great shame if they were lost to housing. I feel sure that my thoughts are echoed by others who have concerns about other specific potential sites.

Mrs Susan Green	No	Tup26/27	<p>Tup 26 and Tup 27. As the football pitches off Gorsty Lane have been leased to a local football club the only local amenity land for exercising dogs is the land earmarked for potential development. The area of Tupsley/Hampton Dene has a high proportion of bungalows together with Kryle Pope Court and anyone living in these types of accommodation who own dogs frequently feel safe in walking their animals in the land outlined. Where would it be safe for them to walk their dogs - responsible dog owners do not want to walk their dogs on football or rugby pitches. The elderly feel safe because the public land in open there is no issues of rough sleepers or youths setting fires late a night. If Tup 26 was developed it would leave the area behind the Doctors Surgery on Gorsty Lane very enclosed making it attractive to unscrupulous characters. Queens wood Drive is a narrow road and very congested particularly when the football teams are training, playing matches or whe there is a tour nament. With regard to the city having an over supply of green space why is this a reason to think it should be built on - with are a rural city and should pride ourselves in having green spaces and celebrate this fact and not destroy it. It is the larger developments with less impact on local residents that should be development first and see if owner/occupiers can be found to fill them.</p>
Mrs W Brewer	No	Tup25	<p>TUP25. This is the only green space in the local area that is within walking distance for children and adults that live in the surrounding area without crossing a main road. Site options states that the site has no contaminated land. This site was used as a refuse tip, which ended up being closed down when Foley Street became over-run with rates, it was then grassed over. Therefore has the site been tested for contaminates?. Transport. Foley Street at present is supposed to be a no through road but is already heavily used by vehicles, pedestrians/cyclists to gain access/exit to Foley Trading Estate, Eign Mill Road, Greenway Cycle Route and Rothewas Industrial Estate the present highways facilites cannot cope with the volume of usage.</p>

Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	Tup26	Reasons against the use of land TUP 26 for housing. 1) THE IMPACT OF THE LOSS OF INFORMAL RECREATIONAL SPACE : If the land TUP 26 is used for housing then the only green space left for residents of the area to use for leisure time and dog walking will be the Bishops School playing field and the community sports playing field. This will mean there will be increased dog excrement and rubbish in designated sports areas (worth noting there has recently been incidents of drug related litter being found in the green area). This will have significant impact on the health and well being of the people (mostly children) playing in the sports area. 2) ROAD NETWORK NOT ABLE TO SUPPORT THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC : Queenswood Drive is a narrow mostly single lane road, cars are often parked on the side of the road opposite the green area so traffic at the moment has to wait to get past if there is any incoming traffic. This is more so when football matches are on during the weekend and week da y evenings. Increased housing of this narrow road will cause traffic congestion that will be difficult to ease. 3) OVER POPULATING OF THE AREA WITH LACK OF GREEN SPACE TO MAKE IT AMENABLE : There has already been 120 x houses built to the right of the Bishops playing field (Bishop Field Estate). This is less than 150m from the proposed developement area meaning there will be potentially 400 x more people using the green space TUP 26 and the amenaties in the area. 4) RISK OF FLOODING : We do not agree that there is only surface water on TUP 26. The stream on the border of TUP 26 floods significantly. Only recently residents in Copsewood Drive had flooding in their back gardens from the beginning to the end of Copsewood Drive as a result of the stream flooding. Council was contacted and sent out a drainage truck the next day to help alleviate the problem. Flooding occurs in the green area whenever there is any significant rainfall.
Nick	Yes		South West looks to press into herefordshire countryside which is not good. The expansion seems regressive to the infrastructure just built
Nicky Page	No	Tup25	I have concerns about the park area by Foley Trading Estate being developed. It is much used by local children for whom there is little recreational space in the area, especially when so much emphasis is put on children being active
Nicola kempson	No	Tup26	Tup 26 , this is a well used recreational area you should not be building more houses until you have sorted out herefords traffic problem
Nigel Cooper	Yes		
Nigel Merriman	No	Tup26	tup 26 Destruction of existing trees.disturbance of bats and other wildlife. Flooding of stream.Lack ofadequate vehicle accesss
P cleaton	No		T22 the TA field if this is to be developed in any way it should be a community space a play area for local children to play outside close to their homes or a village green, with some memorial to all those men who played a role in the TA

Pam Fox	No	Tup26	TUP 26 Impact of the loss of dog walking area. also increased flood risk due to stream. plus already 120 new properties in this area using existing medical and educational facilities.
Paul Moon	No	Bur09/Thr19 /Thr26/Cre2 5/Thr35/Thr 23	Several of these sites are too large an in areas where alot of development is already happening or has taken place. Particularly: BUR09, THR19, THR26 CRE25, THR35 and THR23
Paulette White	No	Tup26/27	Tup 26 & 27- This is a residential area with few recreational spaces and as a dog walker feel that if this is used for housing limits yet another informal space for recreation and dogs. There is access to the Bishops school playing field, however dogs are not permitted to access this area and could mean that if used as such, there will be an increase in excrement which puts children's lives at risk. I have also noticed that since the recent development of Bishops Field estate there has been an increase in rubbish and drug related litter. The closest area for recreation would then be the community park or for some the Quarry which is a drive away which then poses an environmental issue. As a resident of Queenswood Drive, access on days when football events take place means an increase in cars and as it is primarily a single track road, increasing housing to the area would put a further strain on the road and the parking on those days could cause further congestion. With the addition of the Bishops Estate this has increased the potential of people being able to access green spaces closer to their homes and taking this away from them means they are more likely to have to travel by car. The stream on the border of Tup 26 is also renowned for flooding badly, and the impact of additional housing is going to only make this problem worse. It has been suggested that the land that was frequented by Tupsley infectious diseases hospital when disbanded was given over to the the local community to be used for recreational space. When the council have hinted that there are no "significant issues" has this been thoroughly researched? Residents do not expect to have to travel to access green space and the loss of this for housing would mean that many would as the only space left is used for sports and school. I personally chose to live in this area due to the outlook and paid a premium for living in this part of Hereford, I feel that to build more and more house s and take away peoples space and choice and possibly devalue their houses as a result is wrong. Further housing also puts an additional strain on the schools in the local area. When the Bishops Field Estate was built, since then there has been an noticable increase in flies during the summer months and this could also be a further potential problem.
Pete Crisp	Yes	Tup26	TUP 26
Poppy talboys	No		No you shouldn't do it

Rayer	No	Tup25	TUP 25 - Foley street is supposed to be a no through road with no access to Foley trading estate it is also stated it is a no through road and is a cul-de-sac .I would like to point out that traffic to Foley trading estate has to cross a public footpath to access the trading estate. As you state Foley Street is too narrow and suffers from heavy street parking but this is only a very small problem compared to The already big problem of it being a Cutthrough for cars/pushbikes and pedestrians when it should not be as it's a no through road /Cul-de-sac
S Perkins	No	Tup25	Foley street area, green park space
S Walmsley	No	Tup25	Site tup 25 is not suitable. It's one of few limited green spaces in Tupsley area. If the area is developed it will only increase traffic and congestion with parking in the area especially along Foley st which is already used as free parking by people who don't live in the street.
Sabrina Chan	No	Tup26/27	I object that site Tup 26 to be used for housing development. Reasons against the use of land Tup 26 for housing: (1) The impact of the loss of informal recreational space - If the land Tup 26 and Tup 27 is to be used for housing then the only green space left for residents of the area to use for leisure and dog walking would be the Bishops School playing field and the community sports playing field. These playing fields are very small even for the current residents in the area, any additional houses would put pressure on the usage of these fields - increased dog excrement and rubbish in these designated sports areas, not enough playing areas for children especially during weekends. Building houses in the Tup 26 area will have significant impact on the health and well-being of the residents, mostly children. (2) Road network is unable to support the increase in traffic - Queenswood Drive is a narrow single lane road, vehicles are often parked on the side of the road opposite the green area, cars have to wait to get passed if there is any oncoming traffic. Increased housing off this narrow road would cause traffic congestion that would be difficult to ease. (3) Over populating of the area with lack of green space to make it amenable - There have already been 120 houses built to the right of the Bishops playing field (Bishop Field estate). This is less than 150 metres from the proposed development area, it means there are potentially 400 people using the green space in Tup 26 and Tup 27 and the amenities in the area. These are currently already having an impact on the playing fields in terms of the amount of litter that is left lying around, adding more housing to the area and reducing the green leisure space means more people are being pushed to the already overcrowded playing areas which could potentially cause social and health issues in the location. (4) The local green land on Tup 26 was gifted to the current residents - it is local knowledge that when the Tupsley infectious diseases hospital was disbanded the local green land was gifted to the community as recreational land and not be used for building on. The promise that this green land would not be used for housing development is written into the title deeds of the current houses in this location. Has the Council properly research this when they state 'there are no significant issues with regard to heritage assets'?

Sally Stone	No	Tup25	The field st the top of Foley Street and Eign Mill Street.
Scarlet Talboys	No	Tup25	The field at the end of Foley Street should not be built on because it was given to the children of Foley Street and is regularly used every day
Sheila Milne	No	Tup25	I do not consider Tup25 (land adjacent to Foley Trading Estate, Hereford HR1 2SF) suitable for housing development, because it is situated between a railway line and a trading estate, and building on any part of it would damage or destroy a much-valued green space and recreation area.
Simon Price	No	Tup26/27	Tup 26 & Tup 27 are in frequent use by dog walkers in the area who will then be forced to exercise their dogs on the sports fields instead and the development will add to existing traffic congestion in close proximity to 3 schools.
Simon Warburton	No	Tup26	The area TUP 26 is not suitable at all. This is a communiy space which is much used by local residents and should not be used for housing. Local residents have already had a major 120 house build over the last 2 years only 150 metres away from this site causing disruption from noise and pollution. Local residents will oppose this and if required take legal action to stop the council from this land grab. Our local MP Jessie Norman will be lobbied in order to find out why a Conservative led council seeks to destroy the local community.
steve Chalk	No	Tup26	Tup26. Decreasing the area of green space available will concentrate dog walkers and leisure seeking residents together which will be detrimental to both. Dog excrement, drug paraphernalia and general litter will increase and lead to a lowering of the attractiveness of the area and potential health and safety issues.
Sue Bucknell	No	Cen21h	Part of Cen21h covers land on which the Aspire Community Hub (Canal Road) is based. The Aspire Community Hub a community centre for young people and adults with a learning disability, as well as other members of the community attend on a daily basis. It would be a huge loss to our charity to lose this building to make way for housing, particulary if there was not any alternative provision made for the people we support. The Centre is a purpose built community centre, if housing was proposed in the area it would make an asset to the community. We could provide activities for a wide range of people in an inclusive manner.
SUSAN POWELL	No	Tup25	Tup25 at the end of Foley St. Where would resident's access be? Where would site Foley St already has traffic from the industrial estate, and on the other side of the site(Eign Hill) residents live in quiet cul-de-sacs.
T.Armitage		Tup25	
Tracey	No	Tup25	Tup 25 is widely used by the local community young and old on a daily basis
Trix Craig	No	Tup25	

Zara Roberts	No	Tup26	TUP26 The culvert to the top left of the identified area serious flooded 2 years ago due to non-maintenance. This caused damage to mine and a number of properties (photos are available). Additional housing will mean more surface water and limited access to the culvert for maintenance. Queenswood Drive is a narrow road that on occasions is dangerous to drive down due to the volume of cars parked at the side of the road. More housing will increase this congestion. Local knowledge states that this land was gifted to the community when the infectious diseases hospital wad disbanded. This land is used by children to play when, climb trees, walk dogs and use as a community area.
Anon	No		

Question 2: Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocations?

Name	Q2.	If yes, please supply site details to identify the site: ...
A. Storrsson	No	There are very, very few sites that would be suitable for further construction, and, if there are any, those are amongst the last, beyond which the city cannot expand in a contiguous way. There are areas outside the region of the map which may be suitable for development; whether these would constitute part of the HAP or another Herefordshire development is another question.
Adrian	Yes	I have no specific knowledge of site locations but brown field sites should be exhausted before green spaces are built on.
Adrian Pudsey	Yes	Spare land at St Mary's Park Burghill.
Alan Preece	No	
Alice Devereux	Yes	Build on new developed roads that will manage any congestion - such as sites around Rotherwas and north of the Roman road
Amanda Martin	Yes	Brownfield land around Cargill
Amy Cannon	Yes	Market towns or rural areas with good transport links.
Anon	Yes	Suggest that Hereford Football Club, Bulmers, Cargill & Wiggins are offered sites on Rotherwas with incentives to relocate. These areas would offer the city fantastic opportunities for redevelopment.
Anon	Yes	Anywhere thats not a bloody park we don't want to lose the natural green belt of the city
Brett Jenkins	No	
Brittany winchester	No	No,because it's not our job to find them
Carl Green	No	
Catherine Knowles	Yes	Old records office - Harold St - previously planning turned down for change of use.
Charles Markham	No	
Charlotte Moreau	No	

Chris Amor	Yes	The council offices!
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	Yes	The other side of the bishop field development which can be further expanded.
David Harding	No	
David Harrison	Yes	Land fronting Hampton Park road either side of Sudbury Avenue
David Thame	Yes	As above, the racecourse. Allocating it would certainly inspire its use by raising values: the owners would certainly not ignore that hope-value.
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	
Emma Talboys	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	
Ginnie Jaques	Yes	Affordable social housing in central Hereford, smart transport solutions including tram, electric buses, more trains. We do not need an out dated 'bypass' destroying our heritage, our environment and ecology, increasing traffic through Herefordshire that doesn't visit Hereford but increases pollution and threatens our well being.
Harvey winchester	No	I don't agree at all
HILARY GODDARD	No	
Holly Munn	No	
Holly vaughan	Yes	
J Talbot	No	Lower Bullingham
Joanne Jones	Yes	Another area out of town that is not having a knock on effect to those already build houses and families living there. Areas that are not already built up and are densely populated. . All brownfield land within Hereford

Jodie Williams	Yes	more sites outside city center
Jonathan Casey	Yes	
Jonathan Devereux	Yes	Rotherwas area. North of the Roman Road towards Stratton Sugwas.
K Lee	Yes	Brownfield sites only
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans		I don't know as I don't live somewhere else. That is a stupid question.
Karen Amos	No	
Keith Wright	Yes	Brownfield sites in and around the city.
Kevin Bray	No	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	
Liz armitage	No	
Lucinda Timmins	Yes	The council already extended the city limits beyond the railway line to include Hol12b as it suited their purposes when the site was proposed previously (High Court ruled against this), so maybe the council need to do this to the East of the City as there is lots of scope for development there.
Lynnette lobban	Yes	As above
Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	No	
Michael Howard	No	
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	Yes	
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	
Mrs J Owen	No	
Mrs P cleaton	No	

Mrs S Gilbert	Yes	It feels as if it would make sense to expand outwards from the city borders, building on a larger scale (rather than a piecemeal approach) would be more economic due to economy of scale and nothavingto face the need to make the plans fit very limited size spaces
Mrs W Brewer	Yes	The vacant Countrywide site and overgrown land in Mortimer Road. The un-used land off Holbrooke Close, Hampton Park Road. Demolition of the prefab bungalows in Eign Mill Road to provide more suitable housing
Neil and Marisa Catterall	Yes	A more suitable area would be the field down Hollywell Gutter Lane opposite Sophies House leading onto Hampton Park Road.
Nick	No	
Nicky Page	No	
Nicola kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	Develop HFC football club. Relocate it outside town where there's good access. The details of the planning consent to be predicated on HFC transferring to the City a proportion of the site free of charge for the development of low cost housing.
P cleaton	No	
Pam Fox	No	
Paul Moon	No	
Paulette White	No	
Pete Crisp	Yes	
Poppy talboys	Yes	The old social services buildings in bath street
Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	Yes	Holmer and lower Bellingham would be more suitable
Sabrina Chan	Yes	I do not have the full information, hope that the Council will look into it.
Sally Stone	Yes	Land on Mortimer Road.
Scarlet Talboys	No	No because it's not our job to find another site

Simon Price	Yes	Build a new "village" both north & south outside of the new bypass complete with village hall, shop etc
Simon Warburton	Yes	The apple Orchards on the Hampton Bishop Road have been identified and planning permission given by the local council to build 100+ homes. This will also benefit Hereford Rugby Club and local residents providing community facilities - why has this not been given approval to proceed?
steve Chalk	No	
Sue Bucknell	No	
SUSAN POWELL	No	
Tracey	No	
Trix Craig	Yes	Any other sites but this one
Zara Roberts	No	
Anon	Yes	

Question 3: Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term?

Name	Q3.	Please explain your answer:
A. Storrsson	Yes	The city centre is in need of a degree of development, and has pre-established constructions (outdated, abandoned or dilapidated) and empty lots primed for development.
Adrian Pudsey	No	Build on all sites.
Alan Preece	No	The city is congested enough with very little green spaces
Alice Bowerman	Yes	All the brownfield, derelict spaces such as Merton Meadow should be used first as they are creating an eyesore and have no environmental or social benefits currently. All housing that is designed should be encouraged to maximise sustainability, community interactions and affordability.
Alice Devereux	Yes	Build on new developed roads that will manage any congestion - such as sites around Rotherwas and north of the Roman road
Amanda Martin	No	Developments of social housing by housing providers that take green spaces and reduce footprint represents cramming and should be avoided.
Anon	Yes	Short term for Brownfield sites, not the usual crammed together boxes but leaving a few square metres per dwelling to create green space. All the other mass development plots shown on the Plan need to be built slowly over 10 years and with greater thought to the loss of countryside, traffic impact and the upheaval to current residents.
Anon	Yes	Short term - Develop Three Elms and get the Western Bypass up and running to help the city move
Anon	Yes	Any derelict buildings or old sites I. E brown belt first
Brett Jenkins	No	
Brittany winchester	No	It's not my job to find sites for you, no sites need to be developed on
Carl Green	No	

Catherine Knowles	Yes	However far more careful consideration should be given and meaningful consultation must be undertaken to ensure that developments are sustainable and do not detract from the reason most residents chose to live in Hereford.
Charles Markham	Yes	Bullinghope
Charlotte Moreau	No	
Chris Amor	No	
Coralie Jones	No	Specifically in relation to Tup 26.
Daniel Green	Yes	Short term the site near deaconsfield is ideal to be started straight away
David Harding	No	I think there needs to be a balanced delivery across Hereford and the wider county so all identified areas should be taken in the round.
David Harrison	No	
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	
Emma Talboys	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	Hereford is not ideally positioned to draw big businesses in. The bypass will make no difference to transport getting to the main routes out if your planning to add more traffic in.
Ginnie Jaques	Yes	We have a historic city with the Wye running by. We have spaces freed up by the city link road as well as others identified centrally. Build affordable socila housing in the city, free the city from cars. Encourage small independent business and community cohesion will follow, supported by tourism. Internet shopping is transforming town centres. Hereford could be a pleasant, traffic free, socially responsible community with much to enhance income from tourism.
Harvey winchester	No	

Holly Munn	No	As explained before it would be sacrilege to loose the playing field. Childhood obesity is a national epidemic and how are we meant to deal with it when our council are actively destroying our playing fields.
J Talbot	No	Building on beautiful countryside is a travesty. So many people enjoy this area and walk their dogs there. There is wildlife too which would be endangered. There is no evidence that more houses are required.
Joanne Jones	No	No development should happen in TUP26
Jodie Williams	No	
Jonathan Casey	No	Parking in these areas is already appalling, more housing would make this unsustainable!
Jonathan Devereux	Yes	Yes but only specifically for the right type of development. Hereford needs more affordable housing that has adequate transport links. Out of town developments providing this type of housing stock pose the problem of transport and amenities. We should be developing in areas with already good links.
K Lee	No	See above response 1a
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans		How on earth should I know.
Keith Wright	No	Tup 27 as an area of vital natural importance within Tupsley/Hampton Dene.
Kevin Bray	Yes	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	I do not know of any particular site which should be developed.
Liz armitage	No	Lack of parking and play area for children
Lucinda Timmins	No	
Lucy Chuter	Yes	AYL01. Although this has been shown as a 'discounted site' my client owns Essington House, which has a brownfield/windfall site adjacent which could be developed for a housing site.
Lynnette lobban	No	Wait to see where employment arises

Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	No	There aren't the jobs here to justify the number of houses. There is not enough infrastructure to support this number of houses . Not enough hospital provision or schools and no plan to cope with increase in traffic
Michael Howard	Yes	From the looks of the planning guide someone has looked at a map from above with little knowledge of any of the areas being suggested
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	Yes	I think sites that have the best access and are not stamping out the small amount of the cities green spaces are the best sites to move forward in the short and long term.
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	Development should only take place in areas where or when the infrastructure can support it.
Mrs J Owen	No	
Mrs P cleaton	No	
Mrs S Gilbert	Yes	As above, in the main, I feel that pushing outwards rather than infilling small sites would be preferable.
Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	See above in Q1
Nick	Yes	Medium
Nicky Page	No	
Nicola kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	Spread development as widely as possible to give communities a chance to bed down.
P cleaton	No	
Pam Fox	No	no means no, how else can I explain it
Paul Moon	Yes	For short and medium term I think the most central sites should be the focus as this will be most effective from lessening traffic and also reusing old/disused areas before carving up more of the beautiful countryside.

Paulette White	No	
Pete Crisp	No	
Poppy talboys	No	It's not our job to do that
Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	No	Sites that aren't already heavy populated
Sabrina Chan	Yes	In the long term there may be a need for more development as the population grows. However, currently there are quite a number of retirement flats and home being built. More houses would be released when the older generation move into these retirement properties.
Sally Stone	No	
Scarlet Talboys	No	I do not know of any sites that should be developed
Sheila Milne		
Simon Price	No	Tup 26 & Tup 27 have too much traffic congestion already with a poor road network.
Simon Warburton	Yes	There should be full emphasis on the development of Brown field sites which are plentiful around the City.
steve Chalk	No	
Sue Bucknell	No	
SUSAN POWELL	Yes	The Bath St site which previously held the Births/Deaths/Marriages registrar could be redeveloped into a multiple occupancy building, with parking spaces for residents.
T.Armitage	No	Re Foley street,unsuitable access/parking
Tracey	No	Most of the sites being looked at to develop are areas which local communities utilise daily and could add potential risk particularly to younger children having to find other areas to play further away from home. The youth of today are limited to access play areas safely and would further limit the ability to maintain healthy outdoor play.
Trix Craig	Yes	Short term;the ex registry offices on Bath Street;a disgrace and NOT a greenfield!
Zara Roberts	No	
Anon	No	

Question 4 :Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as having potential are the most suitable sites to consider for future employment land development?

Name	Q4.	If no, please explain:
A. Storrsson	No	As above, I would say that there are already established areas that could do with being developed, rather than constructing entirely new areas of housing etc.
Adrian		
Adrian Pudsey	Yes	
Alan Preece	No	Tiny sites for tiny houses. wheres the space for businesses?
Alice Bowerman	Yes	
Alice Devereux	Yes	
Amanda Martin	No	Car dependent development on green field sites adjacent to new roads are traffic generators and disadvantage those without private transport, and are against planning guidance and should be avoided
Amy Cannon	No	
Anon	No	"Suitable" for who? What employment does the Council envisage for those living in these new developments? I am at a loss here...
Anon	Yes	
Brett Jenkins	Yes	
Brittany winchester	No	Because they are regularly used sites
Carl Green	No	There is no employment in the close vicinity of the sites
Catherine Knowles	Yes	
Charles Markham	No	There should be further expansion at Rotherwas. It is accessible by road. There is a demand that the Council has not addressed properly
Charlotte Moreau	Yes	

Chris Amor	No	Rotherwas otherwise the existing dozens of empty shop units in High Town and nearby such as Widemarsh Street and Eign Gate
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	Yes	The site by Deaconsfield has no real use and further green spaces are local
David Harding	Yes	
David Harrison	Yes	
David Thame	No	As above, racecourse site: placing employment on the city fringes means the daytime spend and animation benefits of employment are lost to the city (everything from a sandwich at lunchtime, to popping into a shop, to a drink or cinema after work). Employment could have much higher economic multiples if it focuses on the city centre.
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	Yes	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	Exactly what employment opportunities will there be? This is unclear. Bulmers are moving out it seems and is the successor of Cargill Meats going to stay?
Emma Hall	No	
Emma Talboys	No	
G J Shingler	No	Companies will have difficulty recruiting without parking areas
Gary Pritchard	No	Where is the guaranteed jobs! Our town is dreadful with so many empty shops yet your ripping up and renewing the pedestrian areas to make it look nice! Wages low but property high, but when new are built out of work or re housing people move in. with growth of towns and cities comes more cost and problems, good luck!
Ginnie Jaques	No	there is no evidence to support a demand for employment land in areas identified. Still much empty capacity at Rotherwas
Harvey winchester	No	

Holly Munn	No	I am sure you are aware that there was a new global warming warning today, that said we need to limit the warming amount from 2 to 1.5, and doing all we can to slow down warming. One of the suggestions was planting forests. So how about you don't ruin another green space, but rebuild derelict building first. Use the existing places and spaces.
Holly vaughan	No	
J Talbot	No	The countryside must be preserved
JM	No	Most are too far from Rotherwas
Joanne Jones	No	Future development should be more diverse and not focus so heavily on land development. A larger development site would create more permanent employment.
Jodie Williams	No	To many sites in the city. increased congestion.
Jonathan Casey	No	The only people to benefit will be the developers!
Jonathan Devereux	No	
K Lee	No	See above response 1a
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans	No	Why are you asking us. Why have you not consulted over specific sites that effect particular communities such as Foley Street
Karen Amos	No	
Keith Wright	No	Tup 27 is not suitable: to much traffic in the area all-ready and a number of new housing developments have been completed.
Kevin Bray	Yes	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	Except tup 26 I do not know the sites identified as having potential for employment land development and therefore cannot express an opinion.
Liz armitage	No	Play areas are vital for all children
Lucinda Timmins	Yes	
Lynnette lobban	No	See above
Martin Gilleland	No	This cosultation

Martin Palmer	No	Employment land should be in eaSt of the city joined up with a logical bypass on that side of townt
Michael Howard	No	See above
Mike Ewins	Yes	
Miss Camden	Yes	
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	No not all, there has to be areas of green amenity to make it an attractive area for people to live
Mrs C G Combstock	No	Too congested.
Mrs J Owen	No	See above
Mrs P cleaton	No	No this site is for the people children of the area Portfields and St James to use for recreation purposes .
Mrs S Gilbert	No	
Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	As above
Nick	Yes	
Nicky Page	No	I think it is important to keep these recreational areas undeveloped for future generations of children in the city.
Nicola kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	
P cleaton	No	no we need open green spaces where old and young can come and enjoy close to their homes We need light and green and air not factories in historic residential area or any residential areas.
Pam Fox	No	
Paul Moon	No	For the same reason as 1 - some of these sites are too large. Also "employment land development" is too broad - it is not clear if this means office space, manufacturing, warehouse or other.
Poppy talboys	No	I don't think so

Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	No	
Sabrina Chan	No	Tup 26 is not suitable for housing development as explained above and therefore would not be suitable for consideration.
Sally Stone		
Scarlet Talboys	No	No because they are regularly used
Sheila Milne	No	I do not consider Tup25 (land adjacent to Foley Trading Estate, Hereford HR1 2SF) suitable for employment land development, because building on any part of it would damage or destroy a much-valued green space and recreation area.
Simon Price	No	No industry in Hampton Dene and 99% of people won't walk, cycle or take the bus if they have a car - fact (unless they're pensioners and get a free bus pass)
Simon Warburton	No	Priority should be given to the development of the many unused shops in the City Centre for employment land.
Sue Bucknell	No	As above with regard to Cen21h, Aspire employs over 250 staff across Herefordshire. Approx 75 are based from the site on Canal Road. It doesn't seem to make sense to demolish our building where we provide jobs to build something else to create jobs.
T.Armitage	No	See above
Tracey	No	Same reasons as above
Trix Craig	Yes	See above ;use brownfield NOT the few green spaces Hereford has left
Zara Roberts	No	TUP26 does not have the infrastructure to support employment
Anon	No	

Question 5: Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future employment allocations?

Name	Q5.	If yes, please supply site details to identify the site: ...
A. Storrsson	No	
Adrian Pudsey	Yes	St Mary's Park.
Alan Preece	Yes	Plenty of room in Rotherwas still
Alice Devereux	No	
Amanda Martin	Yes	Brownfield land around Cargill
Anon	No	
Anon	No	
Brett Jenkins	No	
Brittany winchester	No	No sites should be built on and it's not our job why don't you bulid on the old buildings bath street
Carl Green	Yes	Closer linked into the new link road is more appropriate
Catherine Knowles	No	
Charles Markham	Yes	Rotherwas
Charlotte Moreau	No	
Chris Amor	No	No more too many as it is
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	No	
David Harding	No	1432271643
David Harrison	No	
David Thame	Yes	racecourse for one
Debby Chalk		Hampton Dene
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	

Emma Talboys	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	
Ginnie Jaques	No	
Harvey winchester	No	
HILARY GODDARD		HAMPTON DENE
Holly Munn	Yes	As I suggested about, derelict buildings and houses. These are existing plots that need using first. I.e. council building down central Av.
Holly vaughan	Yes	
Joanne Jones	Yes	The Apple orchard on the Hampton Bishop road - It's a more substantial site to develop creating future long term employment
Jodie Williams	No	
Jonathan Casey	No	
Jonathan Devereux	Yes	
K Lee	Yes	Brownfield only
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans		I don't know what you mean
Karen Amos	No	
Keith Wright	No	
Kevin Bray	No	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	
Liz armitage		Not sure
Lucinda Timmins	No	
Lynnette lobban		See above
Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	No	
Michael Howard	Yes	Redevelopment of derelict sites would be higher priority
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	No	

Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	
Mrs J Owen	No	
Mrs P cleaton	No	
Mrs W Brewer	Yes	Vacant Countrywide site and un-used land in Mortimer Road
Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	
Nick	No	
Nicky Page	No	
Nicola kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	As above, the football ground.
P cleaton	No	
Pam Fox	No	
Paul Moon	No	
Paulette White	No	
Pete Crisp	No	
Poppy talboys	No	
Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	Yes	As above
Sabrina Chan	Yes	As explained housing section.
Scarlet Talboys	Yes	Bath street old social services Hereford buildings
Simon Price	No	N/A
Simon Warburton	Yes	As 4a above.
steve Chalk		Hampton Dene
Sue Bucknell	No	

T.Armitage	No	
Tracey	No	
Trix Craig	Yes	Ex NHS Victoria House
Zara Roberts	No	
Anon	No	

Question 6: Are there any sites being considered in the Site Options that could be suitable for use solely or in part for other uses such as university educational buildings, student accommodation, community and leisure uses or other commercial activities?

Name	Q6.	If yes, please supply site details:
A. Storrsson	Yes	Areas around Three Elms would make the most sense for e.g. university buildings or student accommodation; a decentralised campus, making proper use of green space, and constructed according to the limitations of the area, would be the most economic use of that land if development is to be undertaken.
Adrian Pudsey	No	
Alan Preece	No	
Alice Bowerman	Yes	If any sites are developed their should be sufficient community and leisure provision for whatever is removed, and to provide for the new inhabitants.
Alice Devereux	No	
Amy Cannon	No	
Anon	Yes	Brownfield sites for university. Park and Ride schemes taking people into Hereford from sites in Holmer and Belmont.
Anon	Yes	The Old Odeon Cinema on Commercial Street - site needs redeveloping & could be a brilliant site for Uni buildings
Brett Jenkins	No	
Brittany winchester	No	
Carl Green	No	
Catherine Knowles	Yes	CEN08 TUP22
Charlotte Moreau	No	
Chris Amor	No	
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	Yes	The Queenswood Drive location could be used to further add to the leisure area. An outdoor gym would be great to fight obesity

David Harding	Yes	Herefordshire Mind own and occupy a building within area Cen21h and we are keen to be at the heart of the new community that is established there, providing facilities and support for this new centre.
David Harrison	No	
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	
Emma Talboys	No	
G J Shingler	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	
Ginnie Jaques	No	
Harvey winchester	No	
Holly Munn	No	
J Talbot	No	
Joanne Jones	No	
Jodie Williams	No	
Jonathan Casey	No	
Jonathan Devereux	Yes	
K Lee	No	
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans		It is ridiculous to put all sites together like this
Karen Amos	No	
Keith Wright	Yes	Tup 27 is an area of natural interest and should only be developed for outdoor related leisure activities.
Kevin Bray	No	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	

Liz armitage		There are loads of empty buildings that could be redeveloped
Lucinda Timmins	No	
Lynnette lobban	No	
Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	No	
Michael Howard	No	
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	No	
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	
Mrs J Owen	No	
Mrs P cleaton	No	
Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	
Nick	No	
Nicky Page	No	
Nicola kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	All sites should have a share of mixed use to avoid concentration, thus helping avoid stereotype housing. (We live on a new 12 house estate with 4 'social' houses. There's an interaction between folk which wouldn't normally be expected. Socially good, but design standards, pastiche vernacular are ghastly.
Nigel Merriman		
Pam Fox	No	
Paul Moon	Yes	The central sites are probably best suited to this.
Paulette White	No	
Pete Crisp	No	
Poppy talboys	Yes	Bath street
Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	

S Walmsley	No	
Sabrina Chan	Yes	Former Bath Street Council premises (opposite Bath Street long term car park) has been closed down for many years, it could be developed for university educational building or other uses.
Scarlet Talboys	No	
Simon Price	No	N/A
Simon Warburton	Yes	City centre buildings that are empty could be used.
Sue Bucknell	Yes	Cen21h the Aspire Community Hub (Canal Road) could be utilised as a community building offering activities to the wider community outside of our core hours.
T.Armitage	No	
Tracey	Yes	The old Broadlands school site as closer to the colleges for student access
Trix Craig	Yes	Ex council offices bath street,Victoria house,Whitecross RoadBuild a new fire Station and use this great building it is too big for purpose
Zara Roberts	No	
Anon	No	

Question 7: Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for other uses as set out in question 6 above?

Name	Q7.	If yes, please supply site details to identify the site: ...
A. Storrsson	No	
Adrian Pudsey	No	
Alan Preece	No	
Alice Devereux	No	
Amy Cannon	Yes	
Anon	No	
Anon	Yes	Hereford United Football Club
Brett Jenkins	No	
Brittany winchester	No	
Carl Green	No	
Charlotte Moreau	No	
Chris Amor	No	
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	Yes	The other side of the bishop field development
David Harding	No	
David Harrison	No	
Diane Donkin	No	
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	No	
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	No	
Emma Talboys	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	
Ginnie Jaques	No	
Harvey winchester	No	

Holly Munn		Any derelict building or plots. They are not only an eye sore but a waste of space and not point ruining green spaces. Put some flats at the end of town?
J Talbot	Yes	Convert empty buildings in town.
Joanne Jones	Yes	Sites out of town and can accommodate parking needs.
Jodie Williams	Yes	Why is the site of the former Robert Owen school considered as part of the university?
Jonathan Casey	No	
Jonathan Devereux	Yes	
K Lee	Yes	Brownfield sites only
K.R. Kimber and D.M.Evans		Why are there so many questions the same but different here.
Karen Amos	No	
Keith Wright	No	
Kevin Bray	No	
Lesley Ann Watkins	No	
Liz armitage	Yes	
Lucinda Timmins	No	
Lynnette lobban	Yes	Keep within. It's limits
Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	No	
Michael Howard	Yes	See answer for 5a
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	Yes	
Mr & Mrs Wright		
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	
Mrs J Owen	No	
Mrs P cleaton	No	

Neil and Marisa Catterall	No	
Nick	No	
Nicky Page	No	
Nicola Kempson	No	
P Cleaton	No	
Pam Fox	No	
Paul Moon	Yes	Are there possible sites to be considered around Tupsley near tup28? This will be near to where the colleges and I presume the university would be and there are areas inside the boundary near here not even considered.
Paulette White	No	
Pete Crisp	No	
Poppy Talboys	Yes	Bath street
Rayer	No	
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	No	
Sabrina Chan	Yes	Former Bath Street Council premises (opposite Bath Street long term car park) has been closed down for many years, it could be developed for university educational building or other uses.
Sally Stone	Yes	Keep the original buildings on Bath Street and build affordable housing behind.
Scarlet Talboys	No	It's not our job to find them
Simon Price	Yes	N/A
Simon Warburton	Yes	Buildings such as the old Chads stores which has most of the space unoccupied could be used.
T. Armitage	No	
Tracey	No	
Trix Craig	Yes	All the brownfield sites in town; do some PROPPER planning ; get rid of the stupid little bridges that cause bottlenecks
Zara Roberts	No	
Anon	No	

Question 8: Do you have any comments on the document and the approach used to identify potential sites?

Name	Q8	If yes, please explain:
A. Storrsson	Yes	As above, the notion that "growth" on the horizontal level (i.e. of spread, populace, and business) can be maintained indefinitely is quite absurd: pending outrageously expensive initiatives geared towards buying up agricultural land and converting it piece by piece to industrialised cityscape (which will surely not make up for that initial expenditure outside of a very long time frame), there would appear to be few ways in which to expand the city in the literalistic sense. Rather, I would focus on cultivating and developing pre-established housing and business infrastructure (incl. transport) so that the quality of life in Hereford can be maximised, if not the quantity of people and services. With a strong core - a financially efficient core - the city might become self-sustaining to the point of being able to isolate appropriate satellite areas into which to expansion could be possible. I feel that the rush to expand at this point in the city's development, however, is unde rpremeditated, and therefore detrimental to the city's health as a whole. To sum up: seeking "lebensraum" beyond the current borders of the city is perhaps not the best response to the desire to elevate and exponentiate the city's potential; rather, development of the city-as-is would surely produce better results at a lower cost over a shorter time frame.
Adrian Pudsey	No	
Alan Preece	No	
Alice Bowerman	Yes	It would be good to involve other organisations such as the Hereford Community Land Trust who have some good ideas about how developments could be encouraged to be as sustainable, affordable and pleasant to live in not just cheap to build.
Alice Devereux	No	
Anon	No	
Anon	Yes	The council needs to think outside of the box. Get a move on with the Western Bypass. Open up all of Three Elms site NOW!
Brett Jenkins	Yes	Hereford cannot cope with vast quantities of additional housing, the hospital has had to build a portakabin ward due to over-spill, and this is before all these developments proposed have been in most cases started. I think that the council should consider expanding other towns and villages in the county, as Hereford's infrastructure is groaning under the weight of the populous.
Brittany winchester	No	
Carl Green	Yes	The document was only found by chance it should have been marketed more widely

Catherine Knowles	No	
Charlotte Moreau	No	
Chris Amor	Yes	Too much destorying of beautiful countryside. It is too far, Hereford was once a beautiful country city, now aside from the few positive aspects left such as Cathedral, River Wye and Castle Green there is next to nothing left or will be if we carry on building useless bypasses and houses never ending! It is a disgrace! There are other options! This is crimilising! It must stop!
Coralie Jones	No	
Daniel Green	Yes	I feel local residents should have been informed about the potential building site. The Queenswood Drive location is used constantly by people of all ages and for multiple purposes. These assessments should be done iwth actually visiting the locations and seeing what takes place on them
David Harding	No	
Diane Donkin	Yes	Where are all these people coming from too many houses being built in Hereford and this road can't cope with any more traffic
Dorethy Waring-Jenkins	Yes	I don't understand why you want to build everywhere. This is the biggest proposed expansion to Hereford I think I've ever seen, and I think it is going to change the very nature of our lovely city.
Elizabeth Bowring-Lossock	Yes	Consultation is understated and not fit for purpose. Having a few days of displayed material is insufficient to meet needs of all residents. The PP for the Land at Three Elms has had its determination date (currently 31.08.18) put back by literally years without communication. Members of the public address their questions on matters of planning permissions and plans to the backs of the councillors heads in council meetings in the Shire Hall, quite literally standing behind them. That is really odd. Some of the artists impressions of city centre developments are not intended for Hereford. I tweeted a question to Hfdshire council re this to find one image was of Ledbury. Hereford city doesnt have the infrastructure to be bigger. Cycle lanes for example: drawing lines down Three Elms Road / Whitecross Road does not make them into cycle lanes. The council has tried this tactic and it doesn't work. I'm sure this is a matter for Balfour Beatty but Hfd Council is still account able for such things, Cleary .
Emma Talboys	No	
Gary Pritchard	No	

Ginnie Jaques		Herefordshire is an increasingly rare asset in a country rapidly turning into an amorphous and sterile concrete land. We should be preserving the landscape, the ecology, the historic assets, nurturing the county as a place people want to come to for these assets. The current Transport plan is out of date. The people set to gain from the housing plans are the developers. We do not need a 'by pass'. It will not help employment or traffic flow in Hereford. It will increase traffic through Herefordshire and all the associated damage. The new houses will exacerbate the traffic problems unless the council invests in modern alternatives to car travel. The by pass and proposed housing will destroy areas of scientific and conservation importance and contribute to irreparable destruction of our ecology, heritage and environment.
Harvey Winchester	No	
Holly Munn	Yes	Don't use this plot.
J Talbot	No	
JM	Yes	It seems too many houses jammed in everywhere on small sites that are not really appropriate to current home owners given the disruption that will occur. Yet again shops, jobs, road systems recreation??
Joanne Jones	Yes	Not notifying local residents about on the proposed site. The council's communication with local residents MUST be improved
Jodie Williams	Yes	Residents have not been informed of any proposed sites. Letters should have been sent to all houses near to any potential site.
Jonathan Casey	Yes	Housing development by stealth, utterly appalling! Do Hereford Council not want any green sites anymore!
Jonathan Devereux	No	
K Lee	Yes	The approach has failed to consider the wellbeing, mental health and quality of life of residents. Incredibly blinkered. People live in Hereford because it provides these things, even for the most disadvantaged residents - your plan totally disregards this.
K.R. Kimber and D.M. Evans	Yes	Yes, it is insensitive and you are putting one community against another. You are asking questions we have no knowledge of. Deliberately leave too little consultation time. People don't trust you.
Karen Amos	No	

Keith Wright	Yes	Public consultation is good only if the concerns of residents are taken into account for planning allocations.
Kevin Bray	No	
Lesley Ann Watkins	Yes	I am concerned about the lack of consultation with the current residents of the area before this small green space, tup 26, was included in the Site Options. Little consideration seems to have been given to infrastructure and environmental issues, together with the reduction of green space in an area that already has a large new development, the Bishop Field estate.
Liz armitage	No	
Lucinda Timmins	Yes	The documents are not clear about the approach used, and there should have been more proactive engagement events (the two at the courtyard are not sufficient). This document is of course linked to previous city/area plans, but the links are not clear and it is not explicit which documents supersede others. I believe the consultation, approach and document has been intentionally difficult to understand to allow the council free reign. This is especially concerning considering the authority's history of not being transparent or honest regarding such matters (see [2008] EWHC 1741 (Admin)).
Lynnette lobban	Yes	Quickly bodged plan. No thought or consideration of historical city. Already being ruined in pointless plan of unwanted and unnecessary development
Martin Gilleland	No	
Martin Palmer	Yes	Another ticket box exercise that will have no effect on decisions that have already been made
Michael Howard	Yes	Combination of all comments above, some have potential but as ever there is an apparent 'need' to rush decisions. For example vast tracts of unused land behind 'Wiggins' including old and disused buildings
Mike Ewins	No	
Miss Camden	No	

		<p>1. The housing map relating to TUP27 is not correct. The most recent developments, Bishops Fields, north of the track known as Hollywell Gutter Lane and also the development to the south of the track, adjacent to the Bishop's school playing field. These are significant developments and it is remiss that these developments are not included in the potential development area map. The Bishop's School playing fields have also been the subject of a development plan that did not go ahead because of the financial crisis. If this development had gone ahead, TUP27 would have been surrounded by housing developments. It must be an ongoing assumption that the Bishop's school playing fields could be developed in the future. 2. TUP27 abuts onto Hampton Dene and is directly opposite St Pauls Junior School, 100 metres along Hampton Dene road is the Bishop's Secondary School and 50 metres away is Hampton Dene Junior School. Between 8:15 and 9:15am and 2:30 to 4pm in term time the area can best be described as traffic havoc. The Development of more housing accessing directly onto Hampton Dene road will seriously exacerbate the already difficult traffic flow and parking situation. It is stated that Highways have no major concerns with access. I would suggest that Highways visit Hampton Dene road during the hours I have stated in Paragraph 2 during term time for a prolonged period. they would then appreciate the traffic problems in this area. 3. TUP27 is a site of biodiversity and wildlife, in fact for number of years the council did not carry out mowing in this area as it was considered an important bio-diverse site. 4. TUP27 contains an abundance of trees, 2 copses and is a nesting area for birdlife. 5. It is a haven for wildlife ranging in diversity from amphibians to foxes. 6. It is a well utilised dog walking area and is very popular with residents. As already pointed out, here have been large developments in the close vicinity of TUP27 that has necessitated the removal of trees and the loss of wildlife habitation. This loss only adds to the importance of TUP27 remaining as a bio-diverse green space.</p>
Mr & Mrs Wright	Yes	
Mr Michael Craig	No	
Mr. D.P. Vaughan	No	
Mrs J Owen	Yes	See above
Mrs S Gilbert	Yes	I learnt of this consultation by chance and so it does not feel that it has been particularly open and transparent. Possibly there was an item in the Hereford Times? Not everyone reads that paper or visits the Library. Possibly I missed a communication that was sent to all residents? I don't believe that I did and feel that would have been the best way to communicate that the identification of potential sites was ongoing.
Neil and Marisa Catterall	Yes	Residents affected in the area in question should be notified by letter/e-mail. We only became aware of the proposal after a concerned neighbour informed us.
Nick	No	

Nicky Page	No	
Nicola Kempson	No	
Nigel Cooper	Yes	Process seems pretty thorough. Stress must be placed on better design standard than achieved in completed developments so far, which is very mediocre. More green areas and more play spaces should be provided. I would like the LPA to introduce planning rules whereby windfall profits from planning gain went 90% to the community and 10% to the landowner such that the council could acquire sites under CPOs and reap the benefit of added value of planning gain which would allow them to build truly affordable housing and some for profit housing which they sell at market rates thus enabling further sites to be similarly acquired developed.
P Cleaton	No	
Pam Fox	Yes	very difficult to find information relating to any council planning
Paul Moon	Yes	I feel like the amount of houses proposed in the HAP is excessive! I do not feel there is any need for there to be such rapid growth of Hereford above and beyond the central government housing guidelines. I feel that the deliberate over population of Hereford is being considered here to raise the council tax income and I am strongly opposed to such rapid growth of housing in Hereford. I would like to see more Brownfield and smaller sites used before anymore huge housing estates like Holmer West get introduced. With this number of houses being built and the so called bypass (relief road) Hereford will no longer be a cultural place of beauty but a Balfour Beatty building site! The most troubling aspect of the scale of the HAP is the complete disregard for improvement of local services (that are already stretched) mainly schools, transportation and doctors surgeries. Case and point my wife recently needed to have stitches removed and instead of being able to go to our local doctor s urgery the newly formed "Hereford Medical Group" meant struggling to get an appointment in any surgery for days in advance and having to use the furthest surgery away from our house. These services should be front and centre of any HAP not a forgotten about footnote. As such I cannot take this plan seriously beyond a way for the council to line their pockets.
Paulette White	Yes	see above.
Pete Crisp	No	
Poppy Talboys	No	No I don't
Rayer	Yes	Made more public to the surrounding area and neighbours

Rebecca Pickup on behalf of Public Health	Yes	Active travel - we support the location of housing development and employment development areas close to or within the existing urban environment and therefore with the potential to support active transport (walking and cycling) provision and uptake. It will be important that provision for active transport is considered as an integral component in the detail of the developments.
S Perkins	No	
S Walmsley	Yes	Greater publicity, local residents should be notified.
Sabrina Chan	No	
Sally Stone	Yes	I am saddened that residents of Foley Street were not kept informed about these plans.
Scarlet Talboys	No	
Sheila Milne	No	
Simon Price	No	N/A
Simon Warburton	Yes	The residents of Queenswood Drive and surrounding community will oppose any plans to develop TUP 26.
Sue Bucknell	Yes	As a charity occupying a site identified in the plans whilst we appreciate that it is at consultation stage there has been no communication as to timescales for building should the site be identified as suitable.
T.Armitage	No	
Tracey	Yes	There has not been enough publicity and exposure to the public or consultation. The old Bath Street offices have been sold for private development which the council could have utilised particularly for student and university buildings whilst retaining some of the historic features. The bypass and 6000 houses are about to be built so why look at taking some of the smaller community play areas for use?! The old building next to the old Victoria Eye hospital is now derelict surely that could be utilised?
Trix Craig	Yes	PROPPER consultation from all residents;by. E mail and leaflet not just a bit of plastic on a lamppost!
Zara Roberts	Yes	TUP26 why was the local community and residents not consulted directly regarding this survey? It was by chance that a resident was made aware of this. How many other areas have not been made aware for the benefit of the council just to push through without objection?
Anon	No	