

Hereford Open Market – Consultation on relocation

Results/Analysis of replies received from Business/Residents/Organisations

Name	Areas of concern	Against move	Council remedial action, where appropriate
1.	1. Obscuring view of cameras	No	Stalls are not of 'high roof structure'.
2.	1. Competition from 'similar' stock of trader and shop if stall placed too adjacent to shop	No	Location of traders will be considered and where appropriate, regulated.
3.	1. Hindrance on Saturday – prefer Sunday	No	Not a viable market trading day
4.	1. Stalls right outside. Suggest place these stalls further down Commercial Street.	No	Positioned at rear of Old House. No perceived obstruction or detrimental photogenic problem to front. Commercial Street too narrow from half way down.
5.	1. Obscuring visibility to shop front. 2. Competition	Yes	Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides.
6.	1. Requested market to go into Maylords	Yes	N/A. DRE imply a market in Maylords would be beneficial.
7.	1. Impact on Buttermarket. 2. Obstructing existing shops. 3. No added value to the City Centre. 4. Lack of quality stalls. 5. Traffic control. 6. Conflict with other City Centre Markets. 7. Would prefer local traders	Yes	(1) Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides. (2) quality stock control by Council (3) Current Risk Assessment for present High Town markets to be reviewed. (4) No conflict (5) Local traders will be encouraged.
8.	1. Loading/unloading times not sufficient. 2. Traders to leave stock whilst parking/fetching vehicle back.	No	(1) To be monitored to establish if longer time needed. (2) Cover from fellow traders as at present
9.	1. Obscuring visibility to shop front. 2. Stock delivery problems on both days. 3. Image of low quality market not befitting.	Yes	(1) Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides. (2) quality stock control by Council
10.	1. Longer times for traders to unload/load 2. Rental level too high. 3. Duplication of stalls 4. Method of selecting traders	No	(1) To be monitored to establish if longer time needed. (2) Rent level based on research with other Councils (3) Duplication of stock to be considered.

Appendix 1.

			(4) Based on Council criteria
11.	1. Access to passageways. 2. Content/quality of market.	No	N/A. Met consultee on site - resolved both issues.
12.	1. Quality products on stalls	No	Quality stock control by Council
13.	1. Traffic/Pedestrian conflict 2. 2.3 metres constriction not enough 3. Lack of waste disposal 4. Require Planning permission? 5. 2 month probation period of traders too long.	Yes	(1) Current Risk Assessment for present High Town markets to be reviewed. (2) No problems with Ross, Kington and Leominster that have no waste disposal facilities. (3) Planning issue resolved. (4) Probation period works elsewhere.
14.	1. Clear distance between Farmers Market and Retail Market (when clash once a month) to maintain identity of Farmers Market. 2. Traffic control 3. Do not want open market to sell local produce.	No	(1) will be segregated (2) Current Risk Assessment for present High Town markets to be reviewed. (3) Cannot remove competition.
15.	1. Lack of quality products on stalls. 2. Obstructing existing shops 3. Against stalls near Old House 4. Move market to nearer Chadds 5. Revisit proposal in 5 years 6. Market will diminish appeal to tenants. 7. What legislation permits move of market 8. Traffic/pedestrian conflict 9. May compromise space used by HCP 10. Already too many markets in City Centre 11. Relocate after BM refurbishment. 12. Prefer local produce and goods	Yes	(1) quality stock control by Council (2) Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides. (3) Positioned at rear of Old House. No perceived obstruction or detrimental photogenic problem to front. (4) Road too narrow towards ring road (5) Current market dying due to bad site. (6) Could strengthen appeal (7) Hereford Market Act 2003 (8) Current Risk Assessment for present High Town markets to be reviewed. (9) Only one day previous, in 2005. (10) Proposed Market is different type of market that currently operate in City Centre. (11) City Centre needs vitality now. (12) Local traders and stock will be encouraged

Appendix 1.

16.	1. Health & Safety – Pedestrians/traffic 2. Health & Safety – Erection of stalls 3. Questions viability of pedestrian zone	No	(1) & (2) Current Risk Assessment for present High Town markets to be reviewed
17.	1. Competition to shops 2. Would mean too many City Centre Markets 3. Obstruct shop frontage 4. Revisit proposal in 5 years 5. No local produce	Yes	(3) Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides.
18.	1. Her stall hidden by Market Vehicles as they pack up 2. Market stalls to hide her stall from public	No	Email also states looking forward to Victorian Market on 18 th Dec, which is to be placed in same position as proposed OM move.
19.	1. Customer access to shops. 2. Obscuring visibility to shop front. 3. No waste disposal	Yes	(1) stalls placed so that access to shops not affected (2) Minimum of 2.3 metres between stall and shops. Stalls to be open on all sides. (3) No problems with Ross, Kington and Leominster that have no waste disposal facilities.
20.	1. Lack of quality products on stalls 2. Bad state of paving in Com. St.	Yes	(1) quality stock control by Council

Breakdown of figures

Businesses contacted in Commercial Street	32	Number responded	8	For 3 (37.5%)	Against 5 (62.5%)
Businesses contacted in St Peters Street	8	Number responded	0		
Residents contacted	13	Number responded	0		
Other Organisations/Businesses contacted	22	Number responded	12	For 8 (67%)	Against 4 (33%)
Street Traders contacted	4	Number responded	1	For 1 (100%)	
Buttermarket Traders contacted	29	Number responded	0		
Current Retail Market Traders	20	Number responded	0		
Total contacted	128	Total responded	21	For 12 (57%)	Against 9 (43%)

Appendix 1.

There were 107 addresses who did not respond and therefore it can be interpreted that they had no issues with the proposal. If the 107 is taken into account then the For is 119 (93%) Against 9 (7%)

The following 3 'inputs' received were not incorporated within the above returns/figures

Correspondence from tenants of DRE (Maylords)

Not directly approached by the Council as part of consultation as considered not to be directly affected.

Name	Areas of concern	Against move
1.	1. kill off trade in Hereford (due to competition) 2. No Waste disposal – litter 3. 4pm closing of market might kill trade afterwards.	Yes

Correspondence from Businesses not contacted by the Council as part of the consultation

Not directly approached by the Council as part of consultation as considered not to be directly affected.

Name	Areas of concern	Against move
1.	1. Obstructing visibility of shop fronts 2. Lack of quality stock items on stalls	Yes
2.	1. Market will diminish appeal to tenants	Yes