

This report was generated on 28/03/19. Overall 32 respondents completed this questionnaire. The report has been filtered to show the responses for 'All Respondents'.

The following charts are restricted to the top 12 codes. Lists are restricted to the most recent 100 rows.

**Are there other priorities we have missed in the section 'key principles for design and development in Hereford' (Part A of the Design Guide)?**



**If yes, please explain:**

No Pastiche - no Poundbury. Variety of building. Proposals take account of disabilities, mobility issues and dementia needs.

The most serious problem is that something that should give specific guidance that developers follow we see the use of the vague term "the grain" of vernacular architecture. You kindly clarified for me that this term has no specific meaning in planning terms, it is indeed a very vague and general term. In fact, when you wade through the verbiage the reports say little more than "you should think whether the proposed design fits with what's already there", which doesn't advance us very far.

In Figure 1.7 you describe the Urban Village area as having 'Course Grain'. You also describe it as having 'little in the way of established urban grain and historic built assets'. In reality this is an area of previous industrial and commercial uses not intended to be front of house, a number having been exposed by the building of the new link road. This area would be better described as being a blank canvass on which to create a new urban quarter to complement the uses contained in the historic core of the city.

All about visual things and nothing about the function of the spaces and teh need for people to move through them and enjoy them.

Principles not followed in current design for Medical Centre and partially followed by revised Student accomodation block.

No comment

Core Strategy (CS) Policy SD1 (Sustainable design and energy efficiency) states that development proposals, including change of use, should utilise water conservation measures and demonstrate how they have been designed to make them resilient to climate change in respect of carbon reduction, water efficiency and flood risk. We would recommend that you include a section on the need for water efficiency standards. You should look to see how you might either join up with the policy requirement (for minimum water consumption standards) perhaps with an advisory section on the type of water efficiency that could be employed, with some best practice examples. The link below details how construction standards, including water efficiency, can be incorporated into the build and design of new development and redeveloping existing buildings. We note within the CS that the use of upper floors within Town Centres for residential and offices uses will be supported (Policy E5 - Town Centres). W ithin the guide we would welcome reference to flood risk and, specifically, how development, new build or conversion, can be designed to be safe and resilience in a flood event. This may be linked to the Area Guidance within the document, for example the 'Widemarsh to Station' area has known flood risk issues.

**If yes, please explain:**

---

It would be good to have parity of consideration of walking and cycling with road transport expressed in Part A

---

You are aware that the Environment Agency commissioned work upon 'Retrofitting SUDs' that highlighted areas within the City Centre where measures could be introduced to reduce storm water entering the public sewer. This included promoting permeable paving and green roofs, among others.

---

A comprehensive design guide for Hereford should cover the whole city and peri-urban areas, not just the city centre. The city needs a master design plan.

---

work out where the parking will be as part of the design guide. the transport hub needs parking space but its not shown. St.Peters square needs vehicle access to the church and shops.Dont set new trees in concrete as on newmarket st

---

Biodiversity enhancement - This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit. The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts. For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die. The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity.

---

Historic England welcomes the analysis of historical form contained in this section and the identification of hierarchy of streets. We also welcome way that this will inform creation of new routes and blocks to create staggered routes and an irregular block structure. However, there is no analysis of existing materials or those appropriate to different levels of the hierarchy and it is recommended that a reference to Historic England's 'Streets for All' publication is included: <<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/>>. The principle of bigger more regular blocks in the station area becoming smaller and more irregular into the city is reasonable, however we would expect the station area extending as far as Blackfriars Priory to be informed by analysis of historical development of the area, including the religious houses and canal basin etc. The principle of bigger more regular blocks in the station area becoming smaller and more irregular in to the city is considered reasonable; however consideration should be paid to the approach taken for the station area. Consideration should also be paid to heights of buildings on thoroughfares and boulevards. We welcome the principle and analysis of building styles and materials but it is not always clear in the examples (throughout the document) which are from Hereford and which from other locations. The principle & analysis of building styles and materials is welcomed. The analysis and identification of opportunities to improve activity and quality and shopfronts is welcomed. (Refer to original for full version)

---

The section on shop fronts is passable.

---

## Are there other priorities we have missed in the section 'key principles for views and building heights in Hereford' (Part B of the Design Guide)?



### If yes, please explain:

As long as you make the city attractive to look at so more people will want to visit but stick to the history that we pride ourselves on do not make it too fake and just another city.

Flats! - build more to attract workers & older people. Style fitting with city.

The draft document and presentations of the SPG have stressed that building heights and densities are guidance and not absolutes and subject to detailed view analysis and responses, this should be made very clear to avoid the SPG becoming too restrictive in the future and developments not been given approval simply because they do not fall within the guidelines of the SPG. As noted in our response to Part A, there are large tracts of land either side of the new link road which have little in the way of established urban grain and historic built assets. The document suggests a finer grain of development be delivered in this area, similar to that of the historic core however, given the lack of constraints and notwithstanding the other important guidance on views cones etc. it could be an option for the scale of these buildings to be larger in this area given the fewer constraints, providing this is done sensitively, particularly around the interfacing of other zones. Such an area could create its own identity and character, different to the scale and grain of the historic core which could better serve the needs for larger city centre buildings such as university, sports/health facilities, higher density living as well as creating more flexibility to attract different investors and employers into the city. Whilst it is very important to consider the interfacing of any new development with sensitive aspects of the existing built environment, this can be done very successfully using a high quality and considered design approach utilising techniques such as broken down forms incorporating stepped facades without restricting the overall height of buildings, again notwithstanding key views, we would suggest such a well considered approach could be an appropriate alternative in certain locations. We have taken on board the principles of creating a denser urban grain without going too high, but are concerned that designations such as '3 - 4 storeys' is interpreted too rigidly and excludes, for example, 4 storeys if sympathetically designed and in the right location and part(s) of a larger site. The text on p46 talks about '2 - 4', '3 - 5' and '6 - 7 storeys' whereas the key to Fig 1.19 is more rigid at 2 - 3, 3 - 4, 4 - 5 and 5 - 6. We consider the overlap in the text of 3 - 5 as more helpful in bringing forward a new urban quarter in urban village.

Nothing about the non-built views e.g. river, parks and open spaces. These contribute greatly to views and how people perceive a town.

1) No mention of views of key surrounding hills - Aconbury, Dinedor (except from Green Street) and Credenhill 2) View of Art College Tower should be protected 3) Best views of the steeples and Cathedral tower is from the City Link Road at Essex Arms where it is unimpeded by Morrisons and Royal Mail Depot 4) no justification for residential buildings over 4 stories-- do we really need that level of density

No comment

Hereford city centre has very poor green infrastructure provision. Flat roofs on denser new builds can offer a partial solution by facilitating roof and skyline gardens

the transport hub - the station is being dwarfed by 2 new buildings, so the principle is that historic buildings need to set off as the focal point rather than dominated by out of scale new buildings

**If yes, please explain:**

We welcome the emphasis on the skyline, but the City Walls are also visible in short views from a number of the thoroughfares and boulevards and it is recommended that the Draft SPD emphasises that such views should be opened up where possible. Historic England welcomes the identification of the 'trilogy' of skyline features -cathedral tower (50.5m), spires of All Saints (73m) and St Peter's - and the emphasis on maintaining their visual dominance. It would be prudent to indicate the City Walls boundary here too to highlight the historic core of the city. Additional key views should also be explored further in respect of skyline impacts. It is noted that the introductory paragraph correctly identifies a city core characterised by mid-scale buildings on tight plots without tall buildings, but this is followed by mixed messages regarding appropriate new building heights. Historic England considers that greater depth of analysis and clearer guidance on heights is required to ensure the SPD provides suitable guidance. The aim of the townscape section is welcomed. However, Fig1.20 suggests alternative block layout for new development to that in Fig1.19 which is rather confusing and clarification on this is sought. It is clear that improvements to views from the Station are intended but it is not clear how plans would deliver them. It is recommended that the City Walls should also be a key focus point. We welcome this important section of the guide which is critical to achieving the aims set out in the section on Skyline and achieving density within forms appropriate to the historic city. (Refer to original for full version)

In Part B Section 3 the important views from the south have been ignored. Do we want more 4-7 storey buildings anywhere near the station?

**Are there other priorities we have missed in the section 'key principles for the public realm in Hereford' (Part C of the Design Guide)?**



**If yes, please explain:**

I think the current public realm proposals within developments seeking or recently granted planning permission should have been included in this section. For example: the GP surgery next to the railway station which a County Councillor described as 'not the most attractive building in the world, but then people don't come to Hereford because it is the most attractive city either' (quoted from Hereford Times, 14 October 2018, p. 14). How can planning permission for this building be justified against the aspirations of this Draft Design Guide?

Paving - style consistent. Dementia friendly paving.

I like the ideas for introducing more foliage into the city as this will help the environment as long as they are protected to stop vandalism - hopefully there will be comprehensive CCTV in the city that actually is switched on. A friend of mine had her handbag stolen from Martha Trust in 2017 and certainly the nearest web cam wasn't functioning and she lost everything, keys to her home, diary personal information etc. Police did nothing to help her.

Relationship between traffic and pedestrians / cyclists and the need to provide for pleasurable and safe movement for the latter.

1)Liked the idea of linking GWR with Rotherwas by Eign Brook corridor, but not mentioned in the HTP consultation. 2) The idea of using trees to edge boulevards is good, but why nothing on the City Link Road? 3) Identifying the inconsistent and potentially dangerous cycle lane on King Street was good, but why did the HTP only mention this superficially? 3) After normal business hours Widemarsh and High Streets revert to being roads for exclusive use by cars. What additional steps can be taken to prevent this? Let's sort this out before going further

No comment

**If yes, please explain:**

In addition to the NPPF the widely accepted principles of the planning and design process of 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' (CPTED) should also form an integral part of the Hereford Core and Supplementary strategies. CPTED is a crime prevention theory focusing on tactical design and the effective use of the built environment, which when applied, reduces both crime and the fear of crime. A main objective of CPTED is to reduce/remove the opportunity for crime to occur in an environment, and promote positive interaction with the space by legitimate users. CPTED is a preventative, pro-active model, and not a reactive one. CPTED is crucial element of the service that Design for Security provide, and the benefits are optimal when the strategy is applied in the earliest possible stage of the design process, before integral design decisions are set in stone. CPTED however, should not operate alone as the sole crime prevention method; and instead should work in conjunction with other social, environmental and community-based strategies. Refer to published original for specific reference to NPPF

We welcome, and support, consideration of a green infrastructure route for the City. Linked to this we would support references to appropriate blue infrastructure, for example to mitigate for flood risk; promote improved biodiversity and water quality; as well as providing for enhanced landscape and good quality spaces that improve public amenities in the area. Along with green infrastructure they help form an interconnected network of environmental enhancements within and across catchments. We would welcome identification of such opportunities for and measures to secure net environmental gains for biodiversity in line with the NPPF recent revisions. We would also support reference to enhancing 'water quality' linked to Water Framework Directive (WFD) objectives. We would seek measures to improve water quality and water body status to help achieve good ecological status.

We note that The River Wye is within the area covered by the guidance although little reference is made to opportunities that might increase access to it from the City Centre and increased use in promoting improved accessibility to parts of the city along both sides of its banks and associated green infrastructure enhancements.

I applaud the circular GI route suggestion - we have been arguing for this for several decades now. But this should include upgrading all the existing green and blue corridors that criss cross the city in order to prioritise connectivity. See The Yazor Brooks restoration project.

The two green infrastructure rings 'Continuous Green Network' is a superb approach and I can see this being a great vision for Hereford. What would be good to see in the document is what are the core elements 'the bones' and the 'structure' to this vision. Would it be a high density of trees to create literally two green rings? Is it a vision that every possible opportunity (walls, left over spaces, medians, fences, etc.) are planted green. Is it just a path, but done brilliantly. I think the SPG needs a stronger sense of vision or framework. Hereford needs a vision with backbone. Where is the vibrancy in this document? It feels safe and conservative!

We would welcome further discussions with Herefordshire Council on the conservation needs of the river as proposals are developed. Activities or works would have to ensure that they do not impact on species, affect water quality and ensure that they do not damage or destroy the special qualities of the River Wye SAC and SSSI. We welcome the provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within the document (page 56). The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should 'take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure'. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this. Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities. There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through: green roof systems and roof gardens; green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.

**If yes, please explain:**

It is recommended that Historic Landscape Characterisation data could help inform how and where this takes place. We recommend the use of a pallet of materials/ colours, as suggested in 'Streets for All', to ensure the character of the place is conserved and enhanced. There is concern that emphasis on tree planting may be at the expense of existing good quality views that contribute to historic identity of the city and possibly at the expense of archaeological deposits through direct impact and any impacts of dewatering. Prior to any proposals for development, a greater depth of analysis should be carried out to ensure that the value of the historic environment is maximised in the designs. Potential disturbance of underground archeological remains through planting of trees/shrubs and/or dewatering should be considered. The SPD lacks analysis of existing materials in the public realm and how they would inform choices for new works. The concept of pocket squares is supported but care needs to be taken with tree planting which is not always beneficial in close proximity to historic buildings or in archaeological sensitive areas. (Refer to original for full version)

Sport England supports the references in this part of the guide to improving the green infrastructure by creating a continuous cycle network, particularly where this provides an opportunity to connect existing destinations that include existing parks and sports facilities such as at Widemarsh Common. Sport England supports the examples of creating high quality public spaces within the City centre, such as pocket squares that provide suitable spaces that encourage a range of activities including physical exercise. Provision of well designed street furniture including cycle stands, benches, water fountains etc can help activate these spaces. (Refer to original for full version)

The maps are not easy to navigate. Not enough places or roads are labelled. . A large number of trees are drawn. That is good, however, are there constraints of underground services and/or archaeology that ought to be mapped first? Making busy Newmarket Street into a boulevard is a challenge because the new City Link Road is currently not a popular alternative. Also concerns relating to the position of searting areas and the opportunity to address air quality. (Refer to original for full version)

**Are there other priorities we have missed in the section 'key principles for movement in Hereford' (Part D of the Design Guide)?**



**If yes, please explain:**

Maybe a few bridges to get you from A to B faster high bridges

I don't understand how this section can have been prepared without reference to the Council's consultation on Active Travel Measures in the Hereford Transport Package running at the same time. I have tried and failed to cross-relate the two and I can only assume the authors of the two consultation documents did not bother. See, for example: the entire section on Link and Place and the green infrastructure route shown in Figure 1.21.

Walking routes - walking friendly. Buggies and wheelchairs.

Please don't forget the elderly & disabled population who rely on cars.

People still need to travel into Hereford from the country side. They will do this by car and when they get to Hereford there is limited parking in the City and it is very expensive

Why is the City Link Road treated as a Distributor and not an Interurban route?

No comment

The recognition for safe, attractive and logical human (and wildlife) desire lines - a key design principle for optimum and healthy movement in urban settings - doesnt seem to be given sufficient weight in this section.

**If yes, please explain:**

---

The link and place approach is welcomed although the section is very brief. We would welcome the inclusion of the new link road in front of the Station as an area to receive greater emphasis on place. The proposed reduction of road space at St Peter's Square and greater emphasis on place is welcomed. This public transport hub section should be emphasising the importance of the new hub relating to the townscape to be created in front of the station, its potential to bridge the barrier created by the new link road, and its integration with new pedestrian and green routes from the station into the city centre. We welcome the active travel networks principle but the section should be supported by an awareness of the importance of achieving a high quality outcome in terms of materials and appearance in the historic context. It would be good to see a commitment to an analysis of council owned car parks and a strategy for their enhancement/redevelopment that includes assessment of their archaeological as well as townscape potential.

---

The HDG outlines an intention to create a city boulevard which includes a section of the A49 along Victoria Street. This boulevard would include a reduction on the width of the carriageway and the integration of improved walking and cycling facilities. Highways England welcomes ambitions for enhancing opportunities for sustainable travel, as a method of reducing the need to travel by private car and therefore reducing vehicular movements on the SRN. Nonetheless, the design schemes included within the HDG currently lack the detail necessary to be able to provide specific comments in terms of locations and impact on the Strategic Road Network. As stated within the HDG, the design schemes included have not yet been subject to detailed assessment, site surveys or transport modelling. It should also be noted that as the A49 through Hereford is currently a Trunk Road, any proposed alterations along this section of carriageway would need to accord with Highways England requirements, and be delivered in accordance with standards set out within the DMRB. (Refer to original for full version)

---

In Part D the section on block plans is difficult to understand. There is a great deal on improving cycleways which shouldn't be here and duplicates what is in Local Transport Plan. P.62 The existing cross section of Commercial Road shows only two lanes when there are three. There is almost nothing about location of future car parks and surely this is a key subject. P.87 mentions a concept drawing for the Transport Hub at the station. This does not appear to have been made public. P.96. City link road "has had a transformational effect". Certainly it has produced an eyesore with too many unlinked traffic lights this hindering the desired free flow.

---

Sport England supports the proposals for creating a walkable City and is pleased to see the link being made to creating healthy streets. The case examples of reducing space for vehicles to reclaim spaces for pedestrians and cyclists and to provide new crossing points to improve connectivity across the ring road are particularly welcomed, as is the reference to providing a continuous legible network. (Refer to original for full version)

---

The maps are not easy to navigate. Link and Place approach is not helpful. It is assumed that the A49 will be de-trunked, however, the "bypass" may not happen. and could be up to 10 years away. Greater focus on (low-cost, reliable, frequent, well-networked, clean, electric) buses should be prioritised. There are too many traffic lights in Hereford. . 20mph across all residential streets is welcomed. Making the city better for walking is also welcomed. There is a positive effect through having better bus services. Emphasis needed on a transport hub that caters for those travelling, including bus users & cyclists. Also concerns relating to the proposed position of city bus station and the timing of implementation of bus lanes.

---

**What do you think of the ideas for the Aubrey Street Quarter (within part E of the Design Guide)?**

awful

Seems a good thinking a lot of time and thought has been put through this.

Attractive but I understand the land ownership would make this type of development difficult

Looks good

## What do you think of the ideas for the Aubrey Street Quarter (within part E of the Design Guide)?

No lorries. ? Pavement/cars balance. ? Parking/no parking.

Investors do not want to build commercial properties as the city is dying. Lack of parking for visitors to the Cathedral and surrounding area.

AWLFUL

The Design Guide sets out a well considered approach to improving movement and dwell time in this part of the city centre.

fine

Liked it

No comment

Aubrey Street and its environs, also known as the Berrington St quarter has been earmarked as a vibrant eating/social/cultural/retail destination for decades. It has, as you argue, fine buildings, which must be respected. West St needs upgrading to a pedestrian /shared space street for this to happen though, not the rat run it currently is.

it is positive that the old buildings are being retained. I hope the ugly buildings like the old job centre will be demolished. At the moment this area is a mess, like most of Hereford dominated by gaps where buildings have been demolished to create parking. It would make a good area for the university. It could become an extension of the independent quarter. Make old buildings conservation places so that the out of town owners cant put in inappropriate new features. Keep business rates low if you want to retain these businesses. Dont allow back of shops to dominate eg. Iceland back creates an ugly dead space. Let this area have lots of independent businesses and cafes plus university spaces in warehouses. Exhibition spaces for the artists. There are So many artists in Herefordshire. Capitalise on them.

Safe.

The area guidance for Aubrey Street Quarter, St Peter's Square Area, Widemarsh to Station and Bus Station & Tesco Car Park Area is useful but highlights a need for a city masterplan.

The Section E, Area proposals is interesting and the best bit of the draft.

Many opportunities have been missed in the past to make this area an attractive area for dining/tourism, and to make much better links to the River Wye. Can land ownership constraints be removed to improve this now?

## What do you think of the ideas for the St Peter's Square area (within part E of the Design Guide)?

awful

Good

Figure 1.65 is labelled Shire Hall but it is Berrington Street. Figure 1.67 'urban blocks with planning permission' - see answer to C above - illustrate these blocks please. What are the other 'urban blocks' on this Figure? Housing or light industrial or office use (e.g. the University?)

Looks good

? Taxi rank. No blocking Shire Hall. No parking. Outdoor cafes.

The plan for St peter's and Aubrey street and lovely and again car parking will be lost.

AWLFUL

Again, the Design Guide sets out a well considered approach to maximising the use of the existing assets in this part of the city for wider community benefit.

fine

Liked it



## What do you think of the ideas for the St Peter's Square area (within part E of the Design Guide)?

The present design plans are wholly unacceptable as far as the area outside St. Peter's Church and the neighbouring St. Peter's Church House (the Church Hall) is concerned. Vehicular access is required at all times for Weddings (somewhat ironic that the sketch shows a wedding party being photographed outside a church with no vehicular access!), Funerals and for the frequent unloading of (sometimes large and heavy) equipment and other items (including catering goods) to cater for the various events that go on in the Church and Church House on a regular basis. The Church also needs permanent vehicular access to enable elderly and disabled visitors to be dropped off for worship and the many other events. Creating a pedestrian area outside the Church and Church Hall will make the buildings almost unserviceable because of these difficulties and severely restricting its future use, which surely cannot be the intention of the plan. The Vicar of St. Peter's is to provide chaplaincy service to students and staff of the new university, and it is expected therefore that there will be even greater use of the buildings in future, requiring vehicular access. There are already access problems which create difficulties enough, but are just about manageable with goodwill on the part of all concerned. Having a grassed area outside St. Peter's with no provision for uninterrupted vehicular access, without being dramatic, could lead to decreasing use of the Church building and the Church Hall (for both church and community purposes), probably leading to eventual closure. It should be added that St. Peter's Church is also the civic Church of our City and it is certain that the Mayor and City Council would not wish to see the use of the building restricted in this way. This part of the plan is not something that will enhance our City! See also the response to Question 8 below.

St P square, as the space that 'shows off' the Shire Hall, should, I agree, be an open plaza with this prime building brought back into social/cultural public use used as an upgraded concert hall- its the only one in the city.

Its not practical to remove the vehicle access to gthe church. Loading/unloading bays needed for the church, parking needed for wedding cars, hearses and access to Church House. Taxi stand is well used and needed. People get in/out of taxis so can access High Town. Tanners and nearby shops need loading bays. This area seems to work well for pedestrians and traffic as it is. The road is wide and not busy so easy to cross. Easy to cross to buses. The barriers of Shitre Hall could be removed and seats put in the area in front of Shire Hall. But parking is important for the people coming to church services and is often a problem so do consider needs of congregation. Its a busy church. When will the council remove the hoarding at the town Hall. That can certainly be improved. I

The logical thing to do. However what is the core driving force that will allow future designers and the council to take this SPG and make a long term impact. Push the green infrastructure and rural qualities of herefordshire. Where are the apples? Look how Adelaide for example uses its wine culture and draws this into its fabric. Grape vines are grown throughout the city and it becomes a part of its cultural landscape. Bristol aims as Green Capital manifest itself in all sorts of ways. Lanes become green with pot plants, bikes become increasingly present, based around infrastructure that supports it, the city generates a mind set.

I like this. Maybe a couple more trees if it's possible?

See Q5

See Q5

I welcome slowing traffic through St. Peter's Square. More trees and bushes, especially to frame and enhance the Shire Hall would be good. The illustration shows a large expanse of cobbles, but modern cobbles do not seem to wear well, and ruts from heavy vehicles seem to appear quite quickly, leaving large inconvenient puddles.

## What do you think of the ideas for the Widemarsh to Station area (within part E of the Design Guide)?

awful

Good

I don't understand where the new bus station will be sited. Is it on New Market Street?

A large area in front of the station would be good, as in Exeter. The route to the station is not very green - the green part seems to be to the Health Centre

Walking route need benches. ? dog walkers (regulations) No cyclists - sep route.

If the cars and buses are all at the hub near to the train station then it's a long way for people to walk to the shops. Will there be another multi-storey or will David Garrick be the only council car park nearby?

AWLFUL

Our comments to other sections of this response cover our views on grain and building heights. We welcome the approach to improving connectivity as projects are developed in this part of the city.

fine

Too vague. The City Link Road was a great opportunity to show a more human centric entrance to Hereford, but this has not been realised. The cycleways are not signed and are inconsistently lined with the advance stop box at the junction with Commercial Road. The pedestrian crossings have very short crossing times and are not easy to understand and navigate. Unless these basics are sorted out, there is little point in talking about a new road and environmental improvements which look good on paper.

No comment

We note that this section of the SPD has identified three areas of Hereford City for 'further guidance and help to illustrate how the principles set out within this document could be applied'. With reference to my previous comments the 'Widemarsh Station' Area falls within a part of the City impacted by flood risk. Whilst we have worked with your Council, and continue to do so, on the redevelopment of the Edgar Street Grid there remains flood risk in the area which would require considered design, both for new development plots and change of use. Whilst this will link to the allocation within the HAP, and the associated Level 2 SFRA Evidence Base, cross referencing design considerations in relation to flood risk would be welcome in this section. With regards the 'blue network' consideration should be given to the Widemarsh Brook, including the forthcoming channel diversion, as shown on figure 1.73. The associated 'new development' adjacent to the brook on the figure will, again, require flood risk considerations in the design.

The principle route into the heart of the city should remain Commercial Road, upgraded, heavily tree lined, traffic calmed and with an Oxford St multi-crossing junction at the Kerry Arms end.

The problem of the station is that everything seems to be being put there. Will the bus station shelters obscure the view of the station? The city link road is so hard to cross.

More trees. Structural trees to create a backbone to the vision for a Green Hereford. The SPG needs to look at 25 years down the road, and get the green infrastructure in place.

See Q5

See Q5

See comments about the Station and City Link Road above. On p118 we read that any new interchange should celebrate the setting and quality of the Victorian Station building. This has not happened with either the proposed health centre, or the proposed student accommodation block approved recently. So what use is this Design Guide if keeping costs low is trumping design in practice?

**If you have any other comments, please explain below:**

---

I confess not to have studied the whole document but would urge that as over-riding requirements the plan should adopt high standards of design, use sensitive materials, include more street trees wherever feasible, and promote non-vehicular spaces/movement.

---

There is no evidence that the new proposed Hereford bypass (if built, and then not until 2029) will reduce traffic congestion in Hereford city. There should be an aggressive policy by the Council to reduce car dependency by introducing sustainable transport measures, light rail and integrated low cost bus services. If this policy is implemented (and it can be speedily and at far lower cost than a 'bypass') then the Hereford Design Guide proposed here will have every chance of success.

---

I seem to have lost it all. The main problem will be to get people out of their cars, and as you say, have several story car park away from the centre. More buses are needed from all areas in the county. and in the town. Many people only go to supermarkets, I suspect, park there and do not see the rest of the town. This is bad for small traders. I agree with the pedestrianisation, green spaces, trees etc., pocket parks, cycle ways. Need more encouragement to cycle, bicycle hire etc. I think there is teaching, and cycle hire but I do not know about the uptake.. There was an idea of light rail which would be good and could run at night, not taking up much space. What has happened to it I wonder

---

Make area round station more architecturally inspiring - blend with station. Entry to station. Gardens in front - Cafe.

---

The document is simply far too long. There is a large and prolix recitation of Hereford's historic development running on for many pages and we feel this could actually deter the general public from reading through to get to the meat of the document. It is not necessary for a document of this kind to say much more than that Hereford is a historic city with traces of Saxon street patterns, many buildings from the Middle Ages and others from Tudor and Stuart times, Georgian and Victorian development and a good deal of twentieth century development both in its suburbs and the commercial core. The important points are what should the design standards be in the historic core, and how should regeneration and economic development be facilitated whilst protecting it. There is little about redrawing the boundaries of the Conservation Area and it is intensely frustrating that having raised this at the very first meeting about the HAP it is an issue that never seems to make it onto an agenda and this was an opportunity missed.

---

AWLFUL

---

We consider the Design Guide to be a positive step forward, providing a starting point for further design development on individual sites. It also concentrates on the quality of spaces between buildings as much as the buildings themselves and is a welcome move away from an approach dominated by cars to alternative forms of transport. This is a very walkable city and creating quality public realm around key heritage assets is welcomed. On the whole we consider that the document has struck the right balance between preserving and enhancing the assets contained in the historic core whilst creating a starting point for consideration of a new urban quarter in the urban village.

---

The most important things for this Guide to be adopted ASAP and the Council themselves to be guided by it particularly with reference to the redevelopment of the land around the Railway Station as a result of the inner link road. The danger is by the time the Guide is implemented most of the sites in the vicinity will have planning permission for fairly mundane buildings. GP Surgery Halls of Residence. What a wasted opportunity.

---

Would like to see some of the ideas in the movement section of the design guide incorporated in HCC transport policy. Need a far more holistic approach.

---

Disappointed that this document and the HTP are inconsistent with each other. Good in theory but high risk that it will be ignored - as in the Medical Centre. In addition, not mention of County Bus Station - is that staying? Perhaps a better site for the Student accommodation block?

---

**If you have any other comments, please explain below:**

In 2012, nearly £600,000 was spent on St. Peter's Church, to make it fit for purpose for the 21st century. This involved, among many other things, providing a building with flexible space providing use for both Church and community events with excellent access for both the able bodied and those with physical disabilities. The church was encouraged to create a facility that could be widely used for community events, as well as continuing to be a "working church". So currently, in addition to the normal pattern of Sunday worship, there is a regular community lunch, a twice weekly drop in centre for the hard of hearing, and there are concerts, presentations, conferences and exhibitions throughout the year, all requiring the loading and unloading of equipment and displays etc. All these activities would be severely restricted, if not made impossible if there was no vehicular access to the Church and Church Hall. All who use the building are enthusiastic about the facility, one of the reasons being that loading and unloading can take place outside the Church. The PCC is faced with the prospect of large expenditure on the north aisle roof, as currently the church is on the "at risk" register with English Heritage. The PCC would have to think very carefully about committing to that expenditure if activities were restricted and the management of the building became non-viable. If you would like to discuss this important matter further, the Vicar and Churchwardens would be pleased to meet with you and explain our position in more detail.

We would strongly recommend that in considering the Draft Design Guide consultation document, that Herefordshire Council will have considered the security principles with regards to protecting the crowded public places intended by them, and have documented the rationale for implementing the permanent or temporary security measures where appropriate. If it is decided not to do so, then the reasons should also be recorded. The fact of the matter is that any crowd formed as a result of developments made by Herefordshire Council should be protected from vehicles in motion (and not just a sign). This is regardless of the motivation of the driver, who may be having a medical emergency or just be a poor driver. With over 30% of the population in the county being over 65 they provide a contributory factor to both the vulnerability (they can't move out of the way quick enough) and the threat (they may be the poor driver or the one having the medical emergency).

We would like to express our support for the developments to increase active travel and active leisure. Separated cycle lanes will help to reduce barriers to this in the city. We are supportive of the shift in focus from the predominance of road users to a more equal consideration of walking, cycling and road users. I am encouraged by the inclusion of safe resting places, this is particularly important for people that made need to rest during active travel and those with mental ill health. I would also like to include that green walls could be included if tree canopy is not suitable this would help to reduce air pollution. The carbon dioxide absorption capacity of planted greenery should be considered.

The draft Design Guide appears to be very comprehensive in providing guidance upon the City Centre. It is noted that Herefordshire Green Infrastructure Strategy indicates that 'The future development of the (GI) strategy should be illustrated with examples of green infrastructure, graphic representations of design principles and exemplary projects and initiatives from outside and within the county.' In this regard the design guide complements that Strategy. It is however noted that areas outside of the City Centre have yet to be covered through such guidance and it is hoped that some form of guidance might come forward in the future, in the form of more general design guidance for residential development and/or highlighting opportunities for green infrastructure enhancements through joint work with developers in the production of masterplans that integrate with the current Green Infrastructure Strategy.

I also applaud your designing in of trees and other GI through the city centre and connecting roads into it. Hereford only has approx 15% tree cover, and should have 25-30% so much new planting needs to be designed into new and existing developments. GI mitigates flash flooding and pollution levels which are well above appropriate levels along the A49 corridor; improves mental health; creates a considerably more aesthetic and attractive environment for walking and cycling; slows traffic speeds, raises retail and residential values etc etc, rest my case.

**If you have any other comments, please explain below:**

I'm glad that the dereliction and eye sores of the car parks in central Hereford are being attended to (eg on behind Shire Hall and Gaol St) Do list and conserve important buildings eg. the buildings associated with John Venn, baths, mill, school etc (why not capitalise on them by creating a John Venn walk with brochure). Glad you're dealing with Bewell St which has been so spoilt by new development, backs of shop, Tesco, bus staion yet it has such a beautiful old church as its feature which is spoilt by this mess of develoment. Likewise Eign Gate. Glad you're enhancing the city walls. They are overgrown with ivy. A city wall walk would be an asset if it could be created. Do make sure that new buildings enhance the old. Keep shop fronts in keeping. Some of the shop frontts are too modern - like the phone shops. Enforce controls. East St is a mess. There are historic buildings that are falling down but should be preserved. There are not enough shop fronts and the pavement is too narrow. put speed bumps especially where joins Church St. Its dangerous for pedestrians . Marks and Spencer loading bay is a mess. Also keep street furniture attractive. In Eign Gate the seats are ghastly. Prune and choose trees carefully, with expertise. eg the birches on Bath St are spoilt and the trees on Eign Gate. DONT encase trees in concrete. Also paving gets hacked up by contractors and filled with tarmac. Dont let them do that but make them have to relay the blocks expertly or becomes a mess quickly

The SPG needs to be provide a backbone, for future designers and the council to input into that creates a big impression. The two ring 'Continuous Green Network' is a superb goal, but it needs to be expressed in a very big way to make it stick. One of those ways is to plant as many tree at every opportunity. The next step is just that. A tree strategy for Hereford. The next step is to map every piece of left over, unused and not required piece of hard space and find ways to link these will greenery. This will create a layer of connected pieces of green infrastructure that taps into larger pieces of already established green infrastructure. Hereford needs many small interventions to run alongside the big moves.

I like the emphasis on green infrastructure and would encourage as much of that as possible please. Trees especially. There is a lot of support for planting nut and fruit trees as climate change may affect our food sources. Also roof gardens.

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is a neurobehavioral condition. Individuals with this condition may experience hypersensitivity of the senses, difficulty understanding what others are thinking and feeling, and cognitive delays. The Board believes that design of open space and public building can be improved by better understanding of how individuals with autism view the world. 1. Acoustics. Individuals on the autism spectrum are extremely, and at times, painfully sensitive to sounds. Providing better insulated spaces and allowing for manipulation of sound pressure levels would be beneficial. An example of acoustic manipulation would be adding pink sound. (for more information on pink sound see <https://www.livescience.com/38464-what-is-pink-noise.html>) 2. Lighting. Light and colour affect mood, behavior and cognitive behavior. Most autism friendly designs have small areas of bright colour and light unsaturated earth tones. 3. Spatial configuration. Spaces that are orderly and d efinied are easier for the autistic mind to process. The use of sub-dividing rooms within buildings which make spaces reconfigurable can help individuals with autism to better focus. 4. Materials. Furniture, including street furniture, has the potential to influence the function, privacy and size of a space. Many people with ASD have a poor sense of their own safety and carefully designed spaces are needed especially where a mixing of people and vehicles is being considered (for example as shown within the proposals for St Peters Square) The Board believes that designing for ASD does not just benefit those who have autism. By considering these design focuses we can help create enjoyable and multifunctional spaces for all. You can access more information on designing better buildings and space in this article "Why Buildings for Autistic People Are Better for Everyone," - <https://network.aia.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=3fff74f0-6418-8e5f-00ed-4eb eb38eabd8&forceDialog=0>

**If you have any other comments, please explain below:**

The 8 'strategic moves' (pp.98-99) are welcomed as opportunities to strengthen existing city centre retail use, the concept of university infused within the city centre, bridging the gap between the city centre and the station, and emphasis on retaining the fine grain and irregular grain of the historic core. Care should be taken that integrity of the City Walls is not compromised due to development. Consideration should also be paid to suggested block form and whether it delivers the intended pedestrian movement and direction to city centre. Pedestrian access from station to the city is also of concern.(Refer to original for full version)

The draft is poor, is far too long and not the practical document that is needed. It is too full of architectural and planning jargon and verbiage. There few specific recommendations (eg on p.60 on roofs) and it is difficult to follow and understand so will be difficult to use. We need a Design Guide for the whole city not just the centre. Good examples that might have been followed are the guides for Cornwall and Essex. The Cornwall guide is comprehensive, covers the whole county and at the same time each subject contains appropriate information and questions which a developer should be asking himself about what is, and is not recommended. The draft does not. The introductory section on evolution and context is not needed. Some of the photos dropped in are irrelevant and too small to be useful. Some of the figures (eg 1.6) are unreadable. Conclusion. There is much else wrong with the draft and it should be completely rewritten.

Sport England would encourage the development of checklist criteria/questions that could prompt designers and decision makers to think about how proposals instil good urban design principles in line with this Design Guide. (Refer to original for examples of this given from Sport England's perspective)

Concerns relating to suggestions within the guide and how they relate to each other; whether it addresses the needs of different groups, such as the disabled; whether the correct stakeholders have been identified; whether there is a reliable basis for suggested next steps; priorities for funding and lack of timeline; how it supports the Hereford Area Plan and Transport Package; approach mto cycling opportunities and the role that NMiTE should take in the planning of central Hereford. (Refer to original for full version)

**Name**

Gr aham PERKINS	Mo Burns
Steve Betts	elaine underwood
Beth Haivh & Zinedine Griffiths	Nigel Koch
Victoria Wegg-Prosser	B Thomas
anne Adams	John Gorman - M
Hilary Baker - M	Hazel McDowall - M
Jacky Thomas - M	Rosamund Worrall - M
Steve Kerry - M	Adrian Chadha - M
Patrice Roberts - M	John Faulkner - M
Gwenda Lee	Stuart Morgans - M
David Walker	Dr Nicky Geeson - M
Dean Benbow	
Sue Young	
Huw Rees	
Peter STREVENS (Churchwarden)	
Charles Naylor - M	
Graeme Irwin - M	
Rebecca Pickup on behalf of Public Health	
Bill Bloxsome - M	



