

DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR WHITECROSS HIGH SCHOOL, HEREFORD

Report By: Forward Planning Manager

1. Wards Affected

Three Elms

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To consider and agree the development brief for the Whitecross High School site in Hereford, as amended, for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document. The brief has been amended following an extensive consultation exercise, including two public meetings. Whitecross High School is proposed for redevelopment in Policy H2 of the Revised Deposit Draft Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

3. Background

- 3.1 Planning Committee will be aware that Whitecross School is being relocated to a new site at Three Elms Road, Hereford – to be completed in June 2006. Members will also recall a report to them on the 30th September 2005 regarding the current school site, requesting the brief be agreed for public consultation purposes.
- 3.2 The six-week consultation period took place between 27 October and 8 December 2005 when all relevant statutory bodies and local residents were invited to make comment. A total of 19 responses were received.
- 3.3 In addition, a public meeting was held at the existing school on the 21 November 2005, at which the proposals for the site were highlighted. Approximately 50 people attended that meeting. Many concerns were raised regarding the proposals and these as well as the responses to the written consultation, are summarised in Appendix 1. From this summary it can be seen that whilst there was some support for new housing and an educational establishment at the site, there was also considerable concern at the traffic implications of the proposals on the local environment of Baggallay Street.
- 3.4 Prior to the meeting, the traffic aspects of the proposals had already been addressed by your officers with the commissioning of a Scoping Transport Assessment. Consultants were asked to consider the traffic implications of five different options at the site. These options were: -
- 60 dwellings (of which 21 affordable housing)
 - 60 dwellings plus 420 pupil primary school
 - 60 dwellings plus 630 pupil primary school
 - 60 dwellings plus 50 place special school

- 60 dwellings plus a children's centre
- 3.5 The Scoping Transport Assessment concluded that, in principle, all five options could be accommodated at the site using Baggallay Street as the sole access into the site. This was based on an assessment of the different levels of trip generation of the five options and any impact of additional traffic on waiting times at the Baggallay St/Whitecross Rd junction. However, the assessment revealed that the 60 dwellings plus 630-pupil primary school option would result in significantly greater trip generation at the site than the existing situation. It is considered that this greater level of traffic generation would result in an unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance to the residents of Baggallay St and adversely detracts from the character of the area. For these reasons and because of the restricted area that a new educational facility could occupy at the site without encroaching further on existing open space, it is considered appropriate to limit the scale of development proposed in the brief to 60 dwellings plus a **maximum** of a 420-pupil primary school. The Scoping Transport Assessment is available as a Background Paper.
- 3.6 Unfortunately, the results of the Scoping Transport Assessment were not available at the time of the November public meeting. It was therefore agreed that officers would hold a further meeting, in January, to feedback the results of the Transport Assessment.
- 3.7 This second meeting was held at the school on the 26 January 2006. Approximately 18 members of the public attended. The results of the initial public consultation exercise were fed back. Suggested amendments to the brief following the first consultation and the results of the Scoping Transport Assessment were also explained. Comments from this meeting were noted and added to the preceding comments received. All the comments received as a result of the public consultation exercise, as well as your Officer's responses to them and recommendations for changes to the brief are summarised in Appendix 2.
- 4.0 **Main changes**
- 4.1 No major changes to the main thrust of the brief are recommended as a result of the public consultation exercises. There are, however, limited-wording changes suggested for clarification as well as expanding on extra information required of any developer. In summary, these include references to:
- Scoping Transport Assessment carried out and clarification that, in principle, a maximum of a 420 pupil school could be accommodated at the site in addition to the proposed housing;
 - Consideration of any possible alternative or additional vehicular access to the site;
 - Shared pedestrian/cycle spaces and requirement to improve Yazor Brook path;
 - Safer Routes to School, drop-off and pick-up areas, traffic calming;
 - Access for all;
 - Need for changing facilities (integral with any new educational provision) for public use of playing fields;
 - Temporary access via Harrow Rd for construction/demolition traffic;
 - Requirement for Draft Heads of Terms for S106 agreements to be submitted with any application; and

- Requirement for Statement of Community Involvement to be submitted with any application.
- 4.2 In addition, the Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 2 of the brief) has been redrafted to incorporate the Revised Deposit UDP Sustainability Criteria.
- 4.3 It is considered that the brief, as amended, fully describes Herefordshire Council's vision for a sustainable redevelopment of the current Whitecross School site for housing, new educational provision and open space and will help prospective developers achieve a high quality development and maximise the site's contribution to the local area.

5. Process

- 5.1 All the comments received as a result of the extensive consultation on this development brief have been taken into account in the preparation of the final document, which is reproduced in Appendix 3 (proposed alterations are shown as underlined and marked in the margin).
- 5.2 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004, the original Statement of Consultation has been updated to include a summary of the representations received as a result of the consultation exercise and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD (Appendix 4). In addition an Adoption Statement has been drafted (Appendix 5) which will be sent out to all those interested parties who have requested notification of adoption. Both the Consultation Statement and the Adoption Statement will be posted on the Council's web site when the brief has been formally agreed.
- 5.3 When agreed by Committee and Cabinet Member, the brief will form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Whitecross School site and will be a weighted, material consideration in the determination of planning applications for its redevelopment.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Cabinet Member (Environment) be recommended to approve the development brief for Whitecross High School, as amended, for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Background Paper

Revised Deposit Draft Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
Scoping Transport Assessment, Whitecross School, Hereford

Appendix 1

Summary of Comments Received from the Written Consultation and Public Meeting on the Draft Whitecross School Development Brief held on 21 November 2005

- Concern that vehicular access to the proposed site is only from Baggallay St and what implications this has for traffic volumes, noise, pollution, congestion and highway safety – a second vehicular access to the site should be introduced e.g. Harrow Road, Ingestre St, or across Yazor Brook linking to Yazor Rd.
- Percentage of affordable housing should be higher
- Should be no more than 60 houses
- Will there be public toilets at the children's play area including disabled access?
- Concern about access for emergency vehicles
- Need information from Traffic Impact Assessment to comment and this should include possibility of school on site as well as houses
- Tennis courts should be retained in situ for recreational use and not built on
- Plan smacks of opportunity to make money through the UDP
- Unclear how development will facilitate community health
- Should not build on existing orchard
- Site should be used for school or housing, but not both
- Not practical idea to have Lord Scudamore pupils walking to this site to use playing fields
- Lord Scudamore should be relocated at Whitecross with some housing to NW and Scudamore site redeveloped
- New development should not result in further parking in existing streets, ensure sufficient parking provision for new dwellings e.g. 2 spaces per dwelling
- Too much housing proposed
- Existing brick walls to rear of Baggallay St and abutting site should be retained
- Should be residential only parking in Meyrick, Baggallay, Ingestre and Gruneisen Streets.
- One-way system should be introduced to relieve traffic flows
- Yazor Brook is currently a dried up ditch – it should be returned to former flows
- How will Council protect amenities of residential properties?
- Should be new housing for elderly people
- Bike sheds should be removed as are a nuisance
- Could temporary access through Harrow Rd be used for construction traffic?
- Improvements to cycle/pedestrian facilities are needed
- Sewerage system is already overloaded
- Retain NW corner of site as garden land.

Comments from Public Meeting and Individual Letters - Whitecross School - Appendix 2

<i>Contact Name</i>	<i>Organisation/Address</i>	<i>Response to Consultation</i>	<i>Comments from Public</i>	<i>Officer Comments</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
Ms Sam Chapman	Highways Agency	No objections		Noted	No change
Mr. D. Price	Hereford Access Group		Concerned re access - could another option be considered. Concerned re access for emergency vehicles, number of affordable houses and total housing number. Should be children's toilets for play area.	Scoping TA results show housing plus smaller educational provision acceptable in traffic impact terms. Alternative access to the site currently not considered acceptable or necessary, but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations. Brief altered to suggest opportunity. Access for emergency vehicles is considered acceptable. Number of affordable homes proposed complies with UDP policy H9. Children's toilets are not considered necessary for play area given its small size.	Text changes to pages 4, 6 and 7
Chris Watson	Open Spaces Society	Letter should have been sent to a different person who covers the Whitecross Area		Comments noted and relevant databases amended accordingly	No change

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Mark Davies - Planning Liaison	Environment Agency - Upper Severn Area	Parts of the site have flooded historically and may be at risk of future flooding - a flood risk assessment is therefore required. A dry pedestrian access from the properties to land outside of the 1% floodplain is required. A drainage strategy, which details a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management is required. Flood studies on the Widemarsh and Yazor Brook are due out in March 2006. There should be no new buildings within the 1% floodplain or within 7 metres of the Yazor Brook. To prevent pollution, all surface water drainage shall be passed through an oil interceptor.		These issues are considered to be adequately covered in the existing brief.	No change
The Property Manager	National Power Plc	Plant and Equipment not affected		Noted	No change
Francesca Griffith	Herefordshire Nature Trust	Trust welcomes incorporation of wildlife areas to protect SWS and SINC's. New educational provision contradicts RST5 and would have wide implications on road traffic. Recommend a ceiling on the number of houses to stay at 60 be enforced. Would be happy to comment at application stage.		Partial loss of open space considered acceptable given quantity and quality of provision at new school site and dual usage of remaining open space at Whitecross as part of development proposals. Brief refers to approx. 60 dwellings, which is considered adequate and will be restricted by requirements for play area and retention of existing open space.	No change
Martin D. Fellows	Hereford City Council	Reservations about appropriateness of proposed 60 houses as concerned at significant increase in anticipated road traffic pressure on already over-crowded Whitecross Rd.		Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and smaller educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St.	Text change for clarification, page 4.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9TH JUNE 2006

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Tim Ford	Cycle Hereford	Support general promotion of cycling but Brief needs to be more specific about use and size of shared facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Should be cycle stands, new routes, upgrading of width of existing Yazor Brook path, clarity on Home Zones, improved cycle entry into Baggallay from Whitecross Road City end.		Comments noted and brief amended accordingly	Text changes to pages 6 and 7.
Mrs. May Gillespie	5 Baggallay Street		Need a TA to comment on. Baggallay St on own is insufficient access, need alternative through Plough Lane.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St.	Text change for clarification, page 4.
Mr. & Mrs. Walker	7 Baggallay Street		Traffic survey should have been done earlier. Concerned that more than 60 houses would be built. Access should not just be through Baggallay St and construction traffic should go through Plough Lane.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Brief amended re construction traffic. Site considered to accommodate approx 60 dwellings and brief and TA have been based on that amount. Proposals for higher densities would have to be assessed on their merits but would need to comply with all other aspects of the requirements of the brief.	Text change for clarification, pages 4, 6 and 9.
Paul Richards	9 Baggallay Street		Support housing/recreation provided no extra traffic. School and housing would create unsustainable levels of traffic. Small school may be acceptable if accessed through Harrow Rd. Sewerage system in Baggallay St inadequate to accommodate new development.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Text revised to refer to sewerage capacity.	Text change to pages 4 and 9.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9TH JUNE 2006

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Mrs. Hutcheson	11 Baggallay Street		Access to new development should not just be from Baggallay St, as would result in too much extra traffic. Not sufficient capacity in sewerage system for new development.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Brief text revised to refer to sewerage	Text change to pages 4 and 9.
Mr. R.K Sidgwick	23 Baggallay Street	Had difficulty accessing website, queried access to the site. Would prefer access to site from Plough Lane. Baggallay St is very narrow and already congested. What is future of on-road parking on Baggallay St? Should TA be done first and would traffic calming measures extend to streets adjoining Baggallay St? Junction at Whitecross Rd is already grid locked.	Would like to see TA when done. Should use Harrow Rd for construction traffic. Please inform of meeting in January. Need to cap quantity of housing and scale of educational facility. At meeting of 26/1, expressed concern re width of Baggallay St at only 5.5m - too narrow for level of proposed development. Suggest one-way system introduced with entrance through BaggallaySt and exit through Harrow Rd.	Hard copy of brief sent out, access to site explained to be via Baggallay St. Scoping TA suggests housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Spare capacity at junction with Whitecross Rd exists. Full TA would still be required to consider all aspects of traffic management.	Suggest text change for clarification, page 4.
Lady Edwards	Ribwood Hall	Propose a "Care Village" on all or part of the site or a mixed-use scheme.		Proposed brief sets out options for developing site in line with UDP proposal. Whilst a care village scheme may be a possible use of the site, insufficient details have been provided to include such a proposal in the brief at this time.	No change
Mrs. Newton	178 Whitecross Rd		Traffic assessment should look at school and housing. Tennis courts should be retained. Proposal is just money making venture. How will development facilitate community health? From 26/1 meeting - need more feasibility studies of other access points to the development. Tennis courts should stay. Will there be more housing at Bulmers site?	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms. Tennis courts not considered viable to retain, new facilities are provided at new school. Dual use of playing fields will have knock on effects for community health. Any possible development of land at Bulmers is not a consideration for this brief.	Text change to page 4.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Martin Chaddle	15 St James Rd		Consider access from Harrow Rd to alleviate traffic implications. Not realistic to expect children from Lord Scudamore to walk to this site for use of playing fields. Parking for new development should not be expected to happen in existing streets.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms and parking requirements for any development of site will be based on current parking standards, which are considered adequate. Use of playing fields by Lord scudamore is a matter for the Children's Services department and the school governing body.	Text change to page 4.
Richard Brinley	13 Whitehorse St		Marvelous opportunity to solve problems of Lord Scudamore by moving school to Whitecross site. Could still be housing but fewer than planned. Should be access form Plough Lane, less dangerous and polluted than along Whitecross Rd.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. A smaller primary school moving to the site at some point in the future is one option the Children's Services department are considering.	Text change to page 4.
Pc Colin Mears	West Mercia Constabulary		Would like to see Traffic Impact Study.	Scoping TA carried out - is available as a separate document. Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St.	Text change to page 4.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Patricia Fenner	6 Baggallay Street		More constant traffic would result from development. No guarantee that only 60 houses would be built. Need to ensure sufficient capacity in existing sewerage system.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Brief text revised regarding sewerage capacity. Site considered to accommodate approx 60 dwellings and brief and TA based on that amount. Proposals for higher densities would be assessed on their merits but would need to comply with all other requirements of the brief.	Text changes to page 4 and 9.
Robert Walker	8 Baggallay Street		Concerned re more constant and increased traffic levels. Survey should have been done. Concerned that more than 60 houses will be built. Need another access road other than Baggallay St. Need to consider parking for residents and how construction traffic will enter site.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Alternative access to the site not currently considered acceptable or necessary but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity and provision for construction traffic to enter site via Harrow Rd. Parking requirements for any development of site will be based on current parking standards, which are considered adequate.	Text changes to pages 4, 6 and 9.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Ms Laura McCarthy	10 Baggallay Street	Concerned that scale of proposed development will cause detrimental impact on quality of life re noise, safety, pollution and congestion. Suggest alternative vehicular access at least for some of development.		New development at this site will result in changes to traffic usage at Baggallay, but these are not, according to the Scoping TA, likely to result in detriment to the character of the area or the safety of the road/junction. Alternative vehicular access not a current option, but reference in amended brief to future possibility.	Text change for clarification, pages 4 and
Mr. and Mrs. Popp	20 Baggallay Street		Construction and demolition traffic to use Plough Lane. Inadequate sewerage capacity is an issue in the area. TA needs to assess housing and educational facility. From 2 nd meeting, object to more than 60 dwellings, should be no more than 420 pupils at school and reiterate should be temporary access for demolition and construction traffic.	Suggest amendment to brief to include reference to construction traffic using Plough Land entrance. Text revised to refer to sewerage capacity. Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small (420 pupil) education use acceptable in traffic impact terms.	Text changes to pages 4 and 9.
Mr. Richards	22 Baggallay Street		Additional access road is necessity if school and housing on site. Need traffic assessment information.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St.	Text change to page 4.
Ms E Farr	24 Baggallay Street		Concerned that wall at rear of property will be retained.	Wall is shown to be retained on development option drawing, would be a matter for detailed planning application stage.	No change

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Mrs. H Nicholas	4 Gruneisen Street	Could proposed development provide parking for residents of Gruneisen St or even access to rear of properties as parking is a problem in the street. Also unclear if enough space for development behind Gruneisen St, if insufficient, can this block be moved?		Brief includes indicative proposals only, other proposals, which could include parking/access for Gruneisen St. residents, would be considered on their merits, but it is not considered necessary to change the brief in this respect. New housing to the rear of Gruneisen would need to be sited so as to prevent any overlooking or loss of privacy for the residents in that street - a matter for detailed planning stage.	No change
Miss P Pitotti	8 Gruneisen Street		Should retain tennis courts for recreational purposes.	Not considered viable to retain - new facilities to be provided at new school	No change
Mr. Houston	12 Gruneisen Street	Development should be for new housing or school, not both. Residential roads around site are narrow and extra traffic would be unacceptable. Development option diagram shows development encroaching into ancient orchard and tennis court resulting in loss of existing sports facilities - courts should be retained for local community. Orchard needs to be protected and properly maintained. Environment of Yazor Brook needs improving. Site could be accessed from Yazor road to north or Plough Lane.	Concerned re traffic implications for streets around and including Baggallay St. Retain tennis court, limit dwellings to 60. Should have school or housing not both.	Scoping TA results show housing plus smaller educational provision acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Orchard is shown to be retained. Tennis courts are not considered a viable option to retain in that location, new ones are provided at new school. Development proposal will result in new wildlife area. Alternative access to the site not currently considered acceptable or necessary, but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity.	Text change to pages 4 and 6.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Mr. Reed	11 Ingestre Street	Concerned that number of dwellings on site could double when application comes in. Lord Scudamore or Barrs Court special school possibilities should have been mentioned in the Brief. Council should be doing studies for drainage/sewerage and a Traffic Impact Assessment: Baggallay is too narrow, access could be from Harrow Road, car parking in Baggallay St. etc will increase as a result of the development and no car parking is provided for users of the playing fields. Traffic calming should be introduced in all adjoining streets.		Scoping TA suggests housing and smaller educational provision would be acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Considered Brief, as amended, adequately covers issues of density, education provision, sewerage and traffic calming. Separate parking is not considered necessary for the playing fields as this will be provided in conjunction with and on a dual use basis with the educational use.	Text changes to page 4 for clarification.
Angus Smart	14 Ingestre Street		Roads around Baggallay are already congested with on street parking and traffic to the school. Should be no more than 60 houses with 2 parking spaces each.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small primary educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Alternative access to the site is not currently considered necessary or acceptable, but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity. Parking requirements for any development of site will be based on current parking standards, which are considered adequate.	Text changes to page 4.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Michael Esthop	29 Ingestre Street	Would like to secure ownership of small parcel of orchard land to north western corner of site that is already used as garden. In additional comments of 23/11, it is proposed to extend the area of additional garden to encompass the orchard to the west of the tennis courts on the site in order to protect this area of special wildlife value. Also the tennis courts should not be built on as they are an established recreational facility which should be retained for the community e.g. Whitecross Tennis Club.		Transfer of land ownership is not a matter that can be dealt with as part of preparing this planning brief. However, orchard referred to is shown to be retained as wildlife area for the purposes of the brief. Owner of no. 29 will need to liaise with Property Services - some transfer of land may be possible providing that development option proposals and public wildlife area are not jeopardized. It is not considered viable to retain the tennis courts in this location, new courts are being provided at the new school.	Text change for clarification of building area on page 4.
Mrs. Vivian Scott	1a Meyrick Street		Should be sufficient parking for new development so as not to cause further congestion for existing streets, footpaths should be improved, area lacks play areas and green areas for walking, there are no seats either. The site at Whitecross is ideal for a Junior school. A new access via Whitecross Rd and Plough Lane should be possible.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Alternative access to the site is currently unnecessary but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity. Parking requirements for any development of site will be based on current parking standards, which are considered adequate. Provision of suitable wildlife area and play area are requirements of the brief.	Text changes to page 4.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Ms J Griffiths	2 Meyrick Street		Should consider additional feeder roads, residential parking, one way systems. What are plans for protecting amenities of nearby residents? Brook should be restored to its former glory.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Alternative access to the site is currently unnecessary but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity. Impact on amenity is considered in the brief and will be a further consideration at detailed planning application stage. A wildlife area is proposed along the Brook.	Text change to page 4.
Mr. Fincham	3 Meyrick Street		Concerned at density of housing proposed and lack of car parking - will have severe traffic implications for area generally.	Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small educational use acceptable in traffic impact terms via Baggallay St. Alternative access to the site currently unnecessary but may be a future option subject to other planning considerations, brief altered to suggest opportunity. Parking requirements for any development of site will be based on current parking standards, which are considered adequate.	Text change to page 4.
Revd Brian Chave	The Vicarage	Support broad aims, but share concerns re number of houses and educational provision with resulting increase in traffic. Any new footpath next to the Church should take into account that it is also a vehicular access to the nursery.		Scoping TA suggests principle of housing plus smaller educational establishment acceptable via Baggallay St. Pedestrian/cycle access to site adjoining church is proposed in the brief, details of this will be a matter for full planning application stage.	Text changes to pages 4, 6 and 7.

Contact Name	Organisation/Address	Response to Consultation	Comments from Public	Officer Comments	Recommendation
Mr. Bayley	By e-mail	Has the Council considered using all the land at Whitecross for a replacement Lord Scudamore school, or even Lord Scudamore merged with Trinity Primary rather than changing land use?		Site is earmarked for Housing in the Revised Deposit UDP. Use of part of the site for educational use is proposed in the Brief. A new smaller primary school is one option for this use.	Amend Brief to refer to results of Scoping Transport Assessment and refer to possible educational options (page 4).
Mr. Jim Green	18 Cotterell Street	Could be a suitable site for a new Lord Scudamore School, with new homes on existing Scudamore site.		Site is earmarked for Housing in the Revised Deposit UDP. Use of part of the site for educational use is proposed in the Brief. A new smaller primary school is one option for this use.	Amend Brief to refer to results of Scoping Transport Assessment and refer to possible educational options (page 4).
Mr & Mrs Hitchin	13 Baggallay St		Cycle network around site needs improving. How will Bulmers land be accessed? Sewerage already constrained. Primary school would result in increased parking in Baggallay St. and noise disturbance. Need second access to site. Need Assurance that no more than 60 Dwellings. Tennis courts should stay.	Contributions for improvements to the cycle network form part of brief. Sewerage issue covered in amendments. Scoping TA suggests principle of housing and small primary acceptable in traffic impact terms. Alternative access not currently considered necessary or acceptable, but future potential covered in amendments. It is not considered viable to retain the tennis courts in this location new courts are being provided at the new school. Proposals for higher densities would be assessed on their merits but would need to comply with all other requirements of the brief.	Text changes to pages 4 and 6,7 and 9.

Appendix 3

DEVELOPMENT BRIEF LAND AT WHITECROSS SCHOOL, HEREFORD

CONTENTS

Part 1

Introduction

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 Purpose of Brief
- 1.3 Site Description and Analysis
- 1.4 Sustainability Analysis
- 1.5 Planning Policy Context

Part 2

Development requirements

- 2.1 Land Use
- 2.2 Affordable Housing
- 2.3 Building Layout and Form
- 2.4 Access/Movement
- 2.5 Open Space Provision
- 2.6 Nature Conservation
- 2.7 Landscaping and Boundary Treatments
- 2.8 Listed Buildings/Archaeology
- 2.9 Environmental Health
- 2.10 Flooding
- 2.11 Planning Obligations
- 2.12 Planning Application Requirements

Part 3

Design

- 3.1 Design Statement
 - 3.2 Design Principles
 - 3.3 Conclusion
-

List of Figures

- 1 Location Plan
- 2 Site Analysis
- 3 Local Facilities
- 4 Development Option

Appendices

- 1 Contacts List
- 2 Sustainability Analysis
- 3 Standard Requirements for Open Space in New Housing Developments

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This development brief outlines how the existing Whitecross School site at Baggallay Street, Hereford (Figure 1) should be redeveloped for housing, new educational provision and open space. Whitecross School is being relocated to a new site at Three Elms Road, Hereford – to be completed in September 2006. This development brief supports emerging policies in the Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan (UDP) May 2004. When adopted, the brief will form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Whitecross School site and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications for its development. Any enquiries relating to this brief should be directed to:

Chris Botwright,
Planning Services,
Town Hall,
Hereford,
HR1 2PJ
Tel: 01432 260133
Fax: 01432 260289
Email: cmjbotwright@herefordshire.gov.uk

1.2 Purpose of the Brief

The brief's main purpose is to describe Herefordshire Council's vision for a sustainable redevelopment of the Whitecross School site and to help prospective developers achieve a high quality development and maximise the site's contribution to the local area. In doing this the brief will:

- Identify development constraints, requirements and obligations - a development framework - before land values are set to ensure certainty and the delivery of a viable scheme;
- Ensure the development is in accordance with local, regional and national planning policies;
- Describe how a high standard of housing design and layout, new educational provision and open space can be achieved through the provision of planning and urban design guidance; and
- Ensure integration with other initiatives and planning applications.

1.3 Site Description and Constraints

The site is located at the northern end of Baggallay Street, within the Whitecross area of Hereford City, 1 km west of the town centre. The site comprises previously developed land (the existing school) plus adjoining playing fields, and is generally of "L" shaped form, with an area of some 4.8 hectares. Vehicular access to the site is from Baggallay Street, which joins Whitecross Road at its southern end. The northwest of the site currently contains flat-roofed educational buildings, which are in a very poor condition and are unlikely to be able to be re-used. Figure 2 details the constraints and opportunities of the site.

The site's northern boundary abuts the Yazor and Widemarsh Brooks, which are identified as sites of special interest in nature conservation terms (SINC) in the UDP. However, the wildlife interest of the Yazor Brook will need assessment since its recent culverting. The northwestern boundary of the site that adjoins the Widemarsh

Brook (SINC) is also part of the Special Wildlife Site beyond and therefore forms an important wildlife corridor.

In addition, there are a number of mature and semi-mature trees growing along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to the Yazor Brook, which contribute to the character of the area as well as biodiversity interests and these should be retained. There is an existing access into the school site from the **shared pedestrian and cyclist's space** along the north side of Yazor Brook and this should form part of any new scheme.

A public sewer runs along Baggallay Street into and across the middle portion of the site. An easement strip of land between 15 and 25m either side of the sewer exists, limiting building works in this area – see Figure 2.

Residential properties adjoin the western boundary of the site; a children's nursery, the statutorily listed Holy Trinity Church and other residential properties bound the southern limit of the site. A public right of way leading from Baggallay Street crosses the site along its southern boundary and links through an alleyway to Plough Lane. The eastern boundary of the site is entirely contained by industrial buildings in adjoining estates. The character of the immediate area around the site is of generally low-height mixed uses, with built and natural conservation interests enhanced by the presence of the adjoining Victorian/Edwardian townscape to the west and the Yazor Brook with open land beyond to the north.

1.4 Sustainability Analysis

The Whitecross area is well served with existing local neighbourhood facilities as well as by public transport including a frequent bus service into the city centre (Route 72). The site adjoins an existing employment area comprising of small and large businesses to the east, off Plough Lane. Figure 3 details the local facilities currently available in the Whitecross area of the City.

Appendix 2 details how the site meets existing requirements regarding accessibility to services and public transport, proximity to employment etc. It also details opportunities for improvements to any redevelopment of the site with sustainability objectives in mind. It reflects the issues raised in Policy S1 (Sustainable Development) of the Herefordshire UDP.

1.5 Planning Policy Context

At national level, the government gives guidance on development through Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) and Statements (PPS). Those relevant to this site are:

- PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPG3 – Housing
- PPG9 – Nature Conservation
- PPG13 – Transport
- PPG15 – Historic Buildings and Conservation areas
- PPG17 – Open Space and Recreation
- PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
- PPG24 – Planning and Noise
- PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk

At regional level, Regional Planning Guidance for the West Midlands (RPG) identifies Hereford city as a sub-regional foci in its spatial strategy, where most new development is being encouraged, mainly through urban regeneration projects.

At local level, the current development plan for Hereford comprises the adopted Hereford City Local Plan (November 1996) and the Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - May 2004. The adopted Plan does not make any specific land-use allocations for this site, but the Revised Deposit UDP does propose a housing, community facilities and open space allocation in Policy H2. The UDP is the main source of reference for planning policies affecting this development site and relevant policies will be referred to throughout this document.

2. Development Requirements

2.1 Land Use

UDP Policy H2 identifies the site as expected to provide a mix and range of housing types with an estimated capacity of 60 dwellings. Of this total a target of 35% (21 dwellings) is to provide for affordable housing to meet local affordable housing needs. The housing element of the scheme should be confined to the area of the existing school buildings and associated hard surfacing in the northwestern part of the site.

Whitecross School is also identified on the Proposals Map, Paragraph 10.5.17 of the Revised Deposit UDP and Policy RST5 to provide for new recreational, amenity and open space uses/facilities as well as under Policy CF5, to provide for new community facilities. The community facility element of the proposal could comprise a new, smaller educational establishment to be located immediately east of the area of the proposed housing – see Figure 4, Development Option. A Scoping Transport Assessment (TA), carried out for the purposes of assessing the principle of the suggested development options in this brief, determined that a proposal for 60 dwellings at this site on its own, would have less of an impact in traffic terms during the morning peak times than the existing 898 - pupil secondary school at the site. The Scoping Transport Assessment also concluded that a maximum of a 420 pupil educational establishment could be satisfactorily accommodated at this site in addition to the proposed 60 houses referred to above, with no adverse impact on the character of the area in terms of excessive traffic generation or waiting times at the junction of Baggallay St and Whitecross Rd. The TA is available as a separate document.

Whilst a new educational facility would involve the loss of some existing open space, this will be compensated for by new publicly-available facilities at the new Whitecross School site at Three Elms Road, the creation of an equipped children's play area on site, and increased public-usage of the remainder of open space facilities to be provided at the site through dual-use management agreements.

It is envisaged that the new educational provision would act as an "extended school". An extended school is one that provides a range of activities and services, often beyond the school day, to help meet the needs of its pupils, their families and the wider community. These can include adult education, study support, ICT facilities and community sports programmes. A contribution from the development of the site will be sought towards this benefit.

2.2 Affordable Housing

UDP Policy H9 sets a target for affordable housing of 35% of total housing provision to be sought through negotiations with developers. Such housing should be provided

as a mix of affordable house types, having regard to local needs, and contribute to a mixed and balanced scheme overall in terms of dwelling size, type, location and affordability. Whilst the provision of affordable housing is outlined within separate supplementary planning guidance (“Provision of Affordable Housing” March 2001 (updated November 2004)), developers will need to discuss this requirement with the Council’s Strategic Housing Services to help ensure that local needs are best met and provided for. Any provision of affordable housing is likely to involve a partnership with a Council preferred Registered Social Landlord (RSL), the selection of the RSL partner should be discussed and agreed at an early stage in accordance with the SPG above.

Early indications for the affordable housing required suggest that, in addition to a mix of house types to help meet a range of general needs, there is a need for 1 or 2 specially adapted homes for households with physical disabilities.

Worsening affordability ratios of house prices against median earnings in Herefordshire in the last 3 years mean that homes provided at a discount from open market values are unlikely to be affordable to the vast majority of local people unless the discount is upwards of 50%. Instead, rented and shared ownership homes will be sought, with a likely balance between them of around 80% and 20% respectively. However, this is dependent upon the proposed entry prices of the shared ownership homes, where, if the entry price is higher than 30% of the current gross median earnings for Herefordshire, as per the SPG above, then only homes for rent will be sought. No grant funding will be available for the provision of affordable housing as per the SPG.

The sustainability of the affordable homes will, in part, be shown by the EcoHomes rating they achieve when meeting the Housing Corporation’s Scheme Development Standards, for which they will require a minimum rating of “Good”.

2.3 Building Layout and Form

A comprehensive design approach will ensure the full integration of all components of the scheme in a cohesive manner in order to create a sense of place or identity. Policy DR1 of the UDP covers the issue of design generally and more detailed design guidance is provided in the Council’s Design and Development Requirements SPG (July 2004). The following requirements relate to the form and layout of any new development, while general design principles are addressed in Part 3 of this document.

The demolition of the school buildings will create a large open space. In this respect, there are opportunities to structure the internal street layout for the benefit of local residents, cyclists and pedestrians. The new development will also improve the permeability of the local area by creating new pedestrian routes.

It is important that the new structure of the housing and educational establishment layout follows the principle of urban blocks, which is a characteristic feature of this part of Hereford. This requires that all streets should meet with one another where possible (avoiding the creation of cul-de-sacs which deter connections between areas) and that development should provide a continuous built edge to those streets. Dwellings should back on to each other with rear gardens safely enclosed within the urban block. This improves security for properties but also ensures that new development provides overlooking and passive surveillance on to the street. Block design should also seek to minimise the overlooking of existing properties. The new educational building should front onto new housing with access to rear parking along the eastern boundary of the site.

It is essential that new development should harmonise with existing housing adjoining the site. The choice of building material should also complement the locality and build on local distinctiveness to be found in the Victorian/Edwardian properties to the west. Buildings should create a sense of architectural quality and urbanity along the frontages by parallel alignment, respect of building lines, massing and rhythm.

The design of buildings should therefore display a modern, high quality architectural style in order to create a contemporary environment, but one that draws elements from and harmonises with its surroundings. Landmark buildings should be located in prominent locations, at the junctions of roads or to terminate vistas. Strong built edges should be provided. A range of two storey developments is expected although a limited number of three storey dwellings would be permissible particularly along prominent frontages or at the termination of a vista.

Roofs are also an important visual element, which should be pitched and incorporate features to create visual interest. The Development Option plan in Figure 4 is one possible way that an appropriate layout could be achieved. Design options that build upon and improve this layout, or offer appropriate alternatives are encouraged.

2.4 Access/Movement

Vehicular access to the site will be directly off Baggallay Street, to the standards and requirements of the Council as highways authority. Alternative access possibilities to the housing and playing field areas, which include a road to the site from the north and/or via Harrow Road/Plough Lane to the east, have not been considered as part of this brief because of lack of certainty and likelihood in the case of the northern option and current heavy traffic in respect of Plough Lane and its junction with Whitecross Road in respect of the eastern option. This may need to be reviewed in the light of the proposals which may be made for adjacent land following the UDP Inquiry Inspector's recommendation that land to the north should be allocated for housing purposes in a development plan document.

A shared pedestrian and cyclist's crossing point will be required to link to the existing shared pedestrian and cyclist's space on the northern side of the Yazor Brook from the site. This may utilize the existing bridge if possible, but enhancements to the visual appearance of the bridge would be required. Given the potential for increased use generated by the development, applicants will need to consider what improvements are needed in terms of width and overall environment for the upgrading of the existing shared pedestrian and cyclist's space north of the Yazor Brook adjoining the site.

The existing right of way around the edge of the site linking from Baggallay St to Plough Lane should be retained with new shared pedestrian and cyclist's space established through the site to the open space north of Yazor Brook and Baggallay Street. That part of the existing right of way linking the site to Plough Lane should be improved as part of the development. There may be scope for a shared pedestrian and cyclist's access to the site from the lane adjoining Holy Trinity Church which links to Whitecross Road and from Harrow road linking to Plough Lane.

Whilst a Scoping Transport Assessment has been carried out which supports the principle of the development options in this brief, applicants may need to submit a full Transport Assessment to establish the likely impact of their proposals on the local highway network and this must include as a minimum the effect of any change in traffic flows on the following junction:

- Baggallay St/Whitecross Road

Improvements to this junction may be required if significant effects are indicated. Given the mixed-use nature of the scheme, a Travel Plan considering issues such as Safer Routes to School will also be required in the interests of furthering sustainable transport objectives.

Depending on the impacts demonstrated by the transport assessment, developers may also need to provide an air quality assessment, as the site is located nearby the Hereford City Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The location of the AQMA can be viewed on the Council's website <http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/airquality>.

In addition, any design schemes should consider the incorporation of Home Zones concepts in line with Institute of Highway guidelines. A key reference for this is **Home Zones: a planning and design handbook (2001)**, see also www.homezonenews.org.uk. Unrestricted road lengths should not exceed 60m to support the Home Zone concept. Careful alignment of roads with vertical elements, such as buildings and trees, combined with changes in material and road widths will restrict vehicle speeds within the development. Any Transport Assessment will need to consider the issue of traffic calming and cyclist's safety within and around any proposed development as well as the issue of safe drop off and pick up of children to/from any proposed educational facility.

Policy H15 of the UDP requires off-street parking provision for housing at the site to be restricted to a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, calculated as an average over the scheme as a whole. The parking requirement for any new educational establishment will be based on total gross floor area. In addition, there should be adequate, secure cycle parking provided throughout the site.

People are very different in their needs and in the way they use the built environment. An "inclusive environment" recognises and accommodates those differences in a way that is universal. To ensure that access is considered at the earliest possible stage in the development process and to ensure that the facilities are integrated in an inclusive manner, applicants will be required to produce an Access Statement with their applications for planning permission. The statement should be more than just a statement that Part M of the Building Regulations and British Standard BS8300 has been complied with. It should explain how the needs of disabled people and everyone else are incorporated into the general design and arrangements of the scheme. Any applicant would also be advised to consider the implications of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) when designing the scheme.

2.5 Open Space Provision

Open space/landscaped areas that are well related to the development will be required as part of an integral layout and design. Standard requirements for the planning and design for open space within new housing developments is provided at Appendix 3. The minimum provision requires a properly equipped and fenced children's/infant's play area – Policy H19 of the UDP. The provision of a new educational facility would incorporate improvements to the existing playing fields, which would be made available for greater public usage. Changing facilities will need to be developed as an integral part of any new school development at this site to enable public use of the playing fields.

2.6 Nature Conservation

Parts of the Yazor and Widemarsh Brooks and land between them are designated as Special Wildlife Sites (SWS) and Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) because of their importance to the local community and contribution to a wildlife network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of flora and fauna as well as the survival of important species. Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 (PPG9 – Paragraph 15) and UDP Policies NC4 and NC5 support the designation of SINC's and SWS's. Given the above designations, any development of this site would require a statement of intent to evaluate habitats and species with an assessment of impacts using The Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (IEEM) guidelines followed by a comprehensive ecological survey of the site, its environs and a rigorous appraisal of development impacts. A 15m wedge of land along the Yazor Brook should be left undeveloped as a wildlife protection area in order to benefit wildlife, preserve the existing biodiversity corridor and retain the mature trees.

2.7 Landscaping and Boundary Treatments

In terms of existing landscaping at the site, there are a number of important mature and semi-mature trees growing along the northern boundary, adjacent to the Yazor Brook, that must be retained and protected during any development of the site. In addition there are a number of mature trees (including some subject to Tree Preservation Orders) growing on neighbours' land that overhang the boundary of the site that must be protected. Part of a small orchard also exists in the northwestern corner of the site, which should be retained through incorporation into the rear gardens of any redevelopment. A full existing tree/hedgerow survey will be required to accompany any application for development of the site.

In terms of proposed landscaping, the design of the site should address the biodiversity requirements of the wildlife protection area as well as the Public Open Space and internal development layout. This may result in some selective removal of vegetation, tree surgery or bank work as well as additional planting and seeding. New tree/hedgerow planting will be required to enhance existing unattractive boundaries and provide a buffer between incompatible land uses. New post and rail fencing will be required to delineate the existing public right of way around the southern boundary of the site and protect the playing fields.

In terms of hard landscaping, the new design should draw upon elements of the attractive townscape along Baggallay Street e.g. red brick boundary walls and railings, which should continue through the site, but become softer as the brook/wildlife area is approached with the use of more timber features. Landscape furniture should reflect the design of the bridge in order to arrive at a coordinated design. Any proposed lighting should take account of the wildlife requirements – bats for example require unlit corridors of vegetation for foraging.

2.8 Listed Buildings/Archaeology

The site lies in close proximity to Holy Trinity Church and special attention will need to be paid to the setting of that listed building. Policy HBA4 of the UDP, the setting of listed buildings, will apply. There is scope for considerable enhancement of this boundary, which is currently bordered with unattractive high wire fencing.

In order to assess the impact of the development upon archaeology, it will be necessary to undertake a field evaluation (trial trenching), which in turn will allow the Council to assess the importance of any archaeological remains present on the site, and the need for preservation or recording in advance of the development taking place. Policy ARCH1 of the UDP applies.

2.9 Environmental Health

The Whitecross school site is an area that has historically been affected by odours from the Sun Valley rendering plant, which is located about 300m NE of the school. However, odour complaints arising from Sun Valley have reduced over the past few years due to improvements in processing and a new odour abatement plant, making the school site acceptable for housing. However, given the potential for noise issues affecting new housing at this site from the plethora of industrial buildings in the vicinity, any application to develop the site should be accompanied by a detailed noise report addressing the guidance given in PPG24 and the noise assessment criteria for mixed industrial and urban noise, BS4142.

To minimise noise and disturbance to local residents in Baggallay Street from heavy traffic during demolition and construction at the site, a temporary access into the site through Harrow Road may be acceptable and made a condition of any permission.

2.10 Flooding

The northwestern corner of the site abuts a Zone 3 Flood Risk area (Policy DR7 of the UDP applies) and historically the site is known to flood in part. However, recent culverting of the Yazor Brook may have affected this situation. Applicants should refer to the Environment Agency on this issue; a flood risk assessment may be required.

2.11 Sewerage

Herefordshire UDP Para 5.4.15 notes concern from Welsh Water in respect of the capacity of the public sewerage system at this site. Developers will need to clearly demonstrate how their proposals deal with sewerage and waste disposal to the satisfaction of Welsh Water and the Council.

2.12 Planning Obligations

Herefordshire Council will negotiate appropriate planning obligations with the developer that meet the requirements of Circular 05/2005 to ensure that the planning obligations are:

- Relevant to planning;
- Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the proposed development;
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development;
- and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

It is expected that Section 106 and Section 278 agreements for the Whitecross School site will include:

- The provision of an element of affordable housing. The amount sought will be 35% of the total units provided.
- A financial contribution of £1000 per dwelling of 2 or more bedrooms, to provide for educational infrastructure in accordance with Children's Services requirements.
- A landscape scheme for the provision of on-site open space throughout the development, to the standards set out in Appendix 3. This will incorporate an area of active play containing play equipment, to include a toddler's and junior play area. The open space will be adopted by the Council for future maintenance subject to the payment of a one-off commuted sum representing 10 years maintenance of the site.
- Contributions towards the maintenance of any wildlife areas within the site.

- Contributions for sustainable transport measures of £1500 per dwelling towards highway maintenance, public and community transport services and Local Transport Plan integrated transport improvements. (Off site highway works will be at cost).
- The allocation of a minimum of 1% of the construction cost of the development towards the provision of works of art or craft for the benefit of the development and the public in general (Policy DR1 of the UDP).
- Contributions towards infrastructure for community use.
- Potential contribution to off-site drainage improvements.
- Contributions towards upgrading the shared pedestrian/cycle path along the Yazor brook adjoining the development site.

Draft Heads of Terms for any S106 Agreements will be expected to form part of any formal submissions and should incorporate a commitment to completing within government defined timescales.

2.13 Planning Application Requirements

Prospective developers are encouraged to hold early pre-application discussions with the Council. The developer will be responsible for obtaining all necessary planning permissions, Building Regulation Approvals and any other relevant consent. Planning applications should be for full permission.

Planning applications for redevelopment of this site should include the following information as detailed in section 2.1 to 2.10:

Transport Assessment and Travel Plan
 Air Quality Assessment
 Access Statement
 Design Statement (see 3.1 below)
 Noise Assessment
 Tree Survey
 Landscaping and Management Scheme
 Sustainability Appraisal (including approach to sustainable urban drainage)
 Ecological Survey
 Flood Risk Assessment
 Statement of Community Involvement

Significant applications for development will require applicants to have undertaken community involvement at pre-application stage. Applicants will need to:

- Write to local residents, ward members and the Parish or Town Council to inform them of their proposals; and
- Arrange a public meeting or exhibition in the locality at an accessible venue to explain their proposals to the public and to gauge their response; and
- Support their application with their own "Statement of Community Involvement" giving details of the meeting/exhibition and explain how any comments made have been taken into account in the final submission for planning permission.

Applications should be accompanied by coloured plans and illustrative material that is easily understood for the benefit of planners, councillors, residents and amenity groups - three dimensional drawings and architectural models are particularly helpful.

3. DESIGN

3.1 Design Statement

A Design Statement is now a requirement of any planning application where the design of the development proposed needs to be accompanied by a set of design principles – Policy DR1 of the UDP. Its purpose is to illustrate the overall design concept that has been adopted in relation to the application site and its wider context based upon survey and analysis data. It should not just be a descriptive analysis of the proposals however, it should also set out how the designs will satisfy the requirements set out in this brief which are summarised in the following “Design Principles” section.

3.2 Design Principles

In summary, the following principles will need to be addressed within any development proposal:

- Create a land efficient development linking to adjoining uses possibly using Home Zone principles
- Provide a mix of densities and accommodation which reflect the character of the local area and provide for affordable housing
- Set out attractive, active, safe and useable public areas/open space
- Respond to the constraints and opportunities as identified in the site analysis – Figure 2
- Respond to the design advice regarding building layout and form in Section 2.3
- Incorporate soft and hard landscaping in an integrated way which respects the townscape and landscape context of the site and the distinctive character and appearance of the locality
- Mitigate against any adverse effects on the biodiversity and water management of the Yazor Brook from the redevelopment
- Minimise the effects on the site of adjoining non-residential land uses
- Encourage walking and cycling throughout, and into/from, the site
- Integrate with existing infrastructure
- Be easily understood and easy to move through
- Incorporate local distinctiveness
- Use sustainable drainage techniques
- Allow for re-use of materials from existing buildings on site where possible and introduce new materials that are reflective of local distinctiveness
- Introduce new highway infrastructure where deemed necessary
- Incorporate new public art
- New development should be designed with “Secure By Design “ principles in mind
- Address the energy efficiency of new buildings, including energy conservation measures, sustainable energy generation, layout and orientation and
- Incorporate an “inclusive environment” design approach with regards access for all.

3.3 Conclusion

The development of this site offers an opportunity to provide a modern, exciting and vibrant mixed-use development that will:

- Provide greater public access to open space/sports/play facilities
- Facilitate community health and education
- Provide for local needs housing, including affordable housing

- Increase permeability through the site and into the City through access to new pedestrian/cycling routes
- Provide greater access to an area of wildlife interest

APPENDIX 1 - CONTACT LIST**HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL****PARKS/COUNTRYSIDE SERVICES**

Ruth Jackson – Principal Leisure and
Countryside Recreation Officer
Tel: 01568 798328

PLANNING SERVICES

Simon Withers – Team Leader —
Development Control
Tel: 01432 260756

Chris Botwright – Forward Planning
Tel: 01432 260133

Jane Patton - Landscape officer
Tel: 01432 260150

Dr Robert Widdicombe - Ecologist
Tel: 01432 260128

Neil Robertson – Conservation Officer
Tel: 01432 261950

STRATEGIC HOUSING SERVICES

Chris Watson - Senior Enabling Officer
Tel: 01432 261975

TRANSPORTATION

Adrian Smith – Area Engineer
Tel: 01432 260978
Susan White – Asst Public Rights of
Way Officer
Tel: 01432 260572

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Marc Willimont - Senior Environmental
Health Officer
Tel: 01432 261986

ENGINEERING SERVICES

Brian Lee- Drainage Engineer
Tel: 01432 260788

PROPERTY SERVICES

Alison Hext – Estates Section Tel:
01432 261985

EXTERNAL AGENCIES**ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**

Mr Mark Davies
The Environment Agency,
Hafren House,
Welshpool Road,
Shelton,
Shrewsbury.
Tel: 01743 272828

WELSH WATER

Mr Ryan Bowen,
Welsh Water,
Ffynnon Menter,
Phoenix Way,
Enterprise Park,
Llinsamlet,
Swansea
SA7 9HW
Telephone: 01432 357411.

TRANSCO

Mr. A. Read,
Network Assistant,
Transco W. District,
P.O. Box 502,
Malago House,
Bedminster Road,
Bedminster,
Bristol,
BS99 5RS.
Tel: 01199 535444.

NATIONAL POWER

Property Services Manager,
National Power PLC,
Windmill Hill Business Park,
Whitehill Way,
Swindon SN5 6PB.

APPENDIX 2 – SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

SITE SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS			
Strategic Criteria	Criteria	Existing situation	Opportunities
Travel, trips and modes	Is the site well served by existing/potential walking and cycling routes to local facilities?	Yes –	Shared pedestrian/cycle space to Yazor Brook and pedestrian access to Plough Lane need upgrading. Introduce new pedestrian access beside Holy Trinity Church.
	Proximity to major employment sites?	Yes – HP Bulmer and Sun Valley within walking distance, other industrial estates adjoining site	Opportunity for improvement to pedestrian/cycle access to Yazor Brook footway as well as improvements to footway linking to Plough Lane.
	Is there a health centre/doctor within 800m?	Yes - Whitecross Rd, Westfaling St	
	Is there a grocery store/post office/recycling facility within 800m?	Yes – Whitecross Roundabout/Sainsbury's	
	Is there a primary school with capacity within 800m?	Yes – Lord Scudamore Primary – but school has shortage of playing fields.	Opportunity for new educational provision on site and dual usage of facilities.
	Is there reasonable road access to the site without exceeding physical or environmental capacity of the network?	Yes – but capacity will be affected by amount and nature of development. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.	Possible site for “Home Zones” principles? Traffic calming/reduction of traffic speeds along Baggallay St may be necessary.
Resource efficiency and use (including energy)	Is the site flat or sheltered to maximise solar gain and reduce energy loss?	Flat but not well sheltered.	Opportunity for landscaping buffer along eastern edge of site to screen industrial estate and cut down odour/noise emissions as well as reduce wind speeds.
Land-based environmental assets	Are any Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or Areas Least Resilient to Change (ALRC) affected?	No	
	What is the character of the surrounding area (use/heights/building lines)? Any assets/focal points/relationships/ landmark buildings in design terms worth exploiting?	See Figure 2. Mixed-use area but with strong residential element to west incorporating Victorian/Edwardian villas of 2/3 storey with brick detailing.	To link new development with elements of existing scale, form and design of townscape around Baggallay St.
	Can the site integrate well with adjoining development? (Any overlooking issues/block patterns)	Yes – see Development Option – Figure 4.	

<u>Strategic Criteria</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Existing situation</u>	<u>Opportunities</u>
	Are there any views into/out of the site worthy of retention?	Yes – view of church to southeast and hills to northwest.	Suggest low height development to retain open character.
	What is the local vernacular architecture (local distinctiveness)?	Baggallay St – patterned red brick villas with some rendering. Casement/sash windows, double gable fronts and slate pitched roofs. Small front gardens and brick walls with railings are a feature.	Opportunity to create contemporary scheme but drawing upon local vernacular influences.
	Can protected wildlife areas and ecological sites or locally valued habitats or species be enhanced or at least be avoided?	SINC/SWS exists to Yazor Brook and area to northwest of site. Eastern part of Yazor Brook has been culverted and removal of SINC designation along this section accepted by Council at UDP Inquiry.	To link north-western corner of site into new open space associated with the redevelopment plus enhancement of Brook environment generally as recreational route/wildlife area.
	Are there any existing trees/hedgerows worthy of preservation?	Yes – see Figure 2 – along boundaries only.	Improved landscaping across whole site required.
	Is the character of any listed buildings safeguarded?	Would need to address issue of setting of Holy Trinity Church.	Opportunity to improve setting of church with new boundary treatments to southern end of site.
	Impact on Conservation Areas?	None in vicinity	
	Are any archaeological sites safeguarded?	To be determined – field evaluation needed.	
	Quality and proximity of open spaces?	Existing private open space associated with school	Opportunity for more public use and better quality of sports pitch/children’s play area provision
	Is there a children’s playground within 800m?	No	Need for children’s play area on site
Resource impacts	Does the proposal utilise previously developed land/reuse of existing buildings?	Yes – but buildings are in too poor a condition to be re-used (concrete cancer).	Some loss of private playing fields for educational provision but compensated for by on and off-site provision with dual-use arrangements.

<u>Strategic Criteria</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Existing situation</u>	<u>Opportunities</u>
	Does the site avoid best and most versatile agricultural land?	Yes	
	Is contaminated land avoided?	To be determined.	
	Are there any "bad" neighbours?	Sun Valley Rendering Plant – noise and odour emissions. Noise assessment required.	Could affect arrangement of uses – need for soft landscaping treatments to diffuse emissions.
Community needs	Can the site provide for local housing need?	Yes – 35% affordable	
	Could the site provide for or protect educational, health or other local services for all sections of the community?	Yes	Opportunity for community use of playing fields. Need to consider whether any other community uses are required in the area – new school site is providing comprehensive list of new community facilities including sports hall and multi-gym, etc. Site could provide for new extended services educational provision.
	Any areas susceptible to flooding?	Site known to flood historically – check with UDP Policy DR7 and the Environment Agency. FRA required.	
Settlements	Is there spare capacity in the water supply/surface and foul water drainage system?	To be determined.	

APPENDIX 3 - STANDARD REQUIREMENTS FOR OPEN SPACE IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

All public open space located within a new housing development should be in accordance with UDP Policy RST5 and be an integral part of the development. They should be:

- Functional, Usable and Accessible
- Spaces should ideally be of “village green” size and not small areas dotted around, e.g. SLOAP areas - (Space Left Over After Planning).
- It should be located, so as to form an integral feature of the housing development and should not be in a “back-land” situation
- For example, on larger residential development sites or sites in sensitive locations, landscaping may be provided to act as a buffer or screen. These landscape areas could also be suitable for informal recreational uses.

LOCATION:

- Consideration should be given to existing open spaces and networks and in particular for links to be established where appropriate
- The siting of public open spaces on new developments should ensure no damage will be caused to properties by the legitimate use of the open space

MAINTENANCE:

- Design and layout of open spaces should ensure maintenance machinery access and use is considered
- No “steep” grass banks to hinder mowing machinery
- Small sites are often “underused or unusable” and difficult and expensive to maintain

LANDSCAPING/PLANTING:

- Planning conditions will include for a landscaping scheme to be approved by the Council, which should provide details of planting trees, shrubs, grass seed etc. for open space areas.
- Public Open Space will be sown with grass seed mixture suitable for site-use and landscaping (trees and shrubs) will be in accordance with the location and site conditions.
- Public Open Space should have adequate perimeter protection to prevent the unauthorised entry of vehicles on to the area and to ensure the safety of uses of the area to any adjacent roadway
- Public Open Spaces may need to have litterbins and/or seats provided for users of the area.

- Public Open Space may require pathways to be constructed to facilitate access/use of the areas.

ADOPTION/COMMUTED SUMS:

- The acquisition of new public open space areas will engage the Council in increased revenue maintenance funding in future years.
- Any open space within a development intended/agreed for Adoption by the Council will require the developer to pay a Commuted Sum to cover the maintenance costs for 10 years.
- Whilst “left over” areas of amenity areas will not form part of the open space provision, they will be eligible for adoption and future maintenance under the Council’s separate scheme for adoption.

CALCULATING COMMUTED SUMS:

For improvement or provision of Public Open Space, the calculation of the commuted sum is based on actual costs of cutting and maintaining play areas over a 10-year period, together with any remedial works necessary before the adoption of the open space by the Council. The cost is based on year one prices multiplied by 10 and does not account for any element of inflation during that period. The commuted sum calculation also includes for the cost of maintenance of horticultural features, hedges, grassland areas, trees, fences, gates and footpaths in addition to play area costs.

**HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PARKS AND COUNTRYSIDE AND LEISURE
DEVELOPMENT SERVICE**

TARIFF FOR CALCULATION OF COMMUTED SUMS 2005

Grounds Maintenance figures to increase by 3% p.a.		
Fortnightly Grass Cut and Drop – April to September	£18.51 per 100 m ²	X 10 years
Weekly Grass Cut and Drop – April to September	£34.37 per 100 m ²	X 10 years
Bank Cut – May and September	£6.62 per 100 m ²	X 10 years
Hay Cut – August	£3.71 per 100 m ²	X 10 years
Trees, Whips	£0.66/No	X 10 years
Trees, Heavy Standard	£7.93/No	X 10 years
Trees planted less than 5 years	£2.66/No	X 10 years
Trees planted over 5 years	£1.34/No	X 10 years
Trees, Mature	£6.64 per tree	X 10 years
Trees, Heavy Standard – Supply and Replacement of dead tree (incl planting)	£79.26 per tree	
Formal Shrub Bed	£2.32 per m ²	X 10 years
Informal Shrub Beds	£0.67 per m ²	X 10 years
Flower Beds	£10.92 per m ²	X 10 years
Rose Beds	£4.64 per m ²	X 10 years
Hedges, including Laying once within 10 years	£2.73 per linear metre	X 10 years
Fencing, Metal	£0.31 per metre	X 10 years
Fencing, Wood	£1.08 per metre	X 10 years
Play Area figures to increase by 5% p.a. in line with average increases from Suppliers		
Play Area Maintenance Based per £5,000 (or part) combined value of play equipment, safety surfacing and fencing	£136.50	X 10 years
Play Area Inspections Weekly inspections plus annual independent inspection (3% increase)	£391.40 per site	X 10 years
Play Area Re-surfacing (Wet pour or Tiles)	£87.68 per m ²	Once
Play Area Loose Fill Annual Top Up	£13.65 per m ²	X 10 years

NB: In view of current legislation regarding Disabled Access to playgrounds loose fill safety surfacing will not be acceptable for any sites that the Council may adopt in the future.

Appendix 4

Final Statement of Consultation

Development Brief - Whitecross High School, Hereford

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - March 2006

Background

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out the requirements of a Local Development Framework as part of the new planning system. This enables Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to be prepared to further planning policy. This SPD outlines in more detail, through a development brief, the planning requirements for the redevelopment of the Whitecross High School site in Baggallay St, Hereford.

Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 relates to public participation and states that the Local Planning Authority should prepare a consultation statement when preparing planning policy. The requirement is for the consultation statement to set out the standards to be achieved by Herefordshire Council in involving the community in the preparation, alteration and continuing review of planning policy.

This statement shows how and when the community were involved in the preparation and adoption of the brief.

It sets out:

- consultation undertaken in preparing the draft
- public participation undertaken
- who was consulted
- the forms of consultation and where and how the consultation took place; and
- a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed in the final SPD.

Consultation undertaken in preparing the Draft SPD

Extensive public consultation was carried out during the preparation of the Herefordshire Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which highlighted the Whitecross High School site as a proposal site for redevelopment (Policy H2). Whilst there were objections to this proposal at the draft Plan stage, these were not considered to fundamentally affect the principle of developing this brownfield site for housing, community facilities and open space.

Internal consultations between departments of the Council regarding affordable housing, open space and education provision, issues around environmental health, impact on biodiversity and nature conservation as well as impact on the highway network have taken place and were considered in preparation of the draft version

SPD. Sport England was also consulted in the preparation of the draft version and offered no objection in principle.

Public consultation undertaken

In order for Herefordshire Council to adopt the development brief as a supplementary planning document, it had to be subject to a formal six-week public consultation process that enabled all interested parties, including statutory organisations, private developers and the public, to make comments on the proposals.

The six-week formal consultation process on the draft development brief took place between **Thursday 27 October 2005 and Thursday 8 December 2005**.

In addition, two public meetings were held at the school, one on the 21 November 2005 and a second on the 26 January 2006. The initial public meeting was held to outline the key objectives and proposals of the brief and was attended by approximately 50 members of the public. The second meeting was held to present the findings of a Scoping Transport Assessment that had been carried out in response to concerns about the traffic impact of the proposals. Approximately 18 members of the public attended the second meeting.

Who was consulted?

The Council sought to provide opportunities to comment for everyone who lives near, works near or who otherwise has an interest in the current Whitecross High School site.

In addition to the statutory consultees identified in relevant planning legislations and guidance, other key stakeholders, community groups and interest groups that have an interest in the school site were identified by the Council to ensure that the consultation was as inclusive as possible. All are identified in Appendix 1. All those who were written to as part of the original consultation i.e. the entire list in Appendix 1, were invited to the first public meeting in November 2005. A Public Notice was issued in the local Press. Only those who responded to either the written consultation or who attended the first public meeting were invited to attend the second public meeting in January 2006 through additional correspondence.

The public consultation process

The public were invited (through advertisement (see Appendix 2), press release and direct mailing) to comment on the draft brief by submitting written representations to the Council before the closure of the formal consultation period. Copies of the draft brief and the original consultation statement were made available for the public to view in key public buildings within Hereford. These locations were:

Herefordshire Council
Town Hall,
St Owens St,
Hereford
HR1 2PG

Hereford Library
Broad Street,
Hereford. HR4 9AU
Tel : 01432 383600

Herefordshire Council
Blueschool House,
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB

Notice of both public meetings was made on the Council's website and all the documents referred to in consultation letters were also made available via the Internet on the Council's web site: www.herefordshire.gov.uk. Printed copies of the documents were also made available on request.

Herefordshire Council recorded comments received from the Public Meetings and any written representations received before the 9 February 2006 and acknowledged receipt of them, where possible, within 10 days.

Main issues arising as a result of the consultation exercise and how the issues have been addressed in the SPD

Following the closure of the consultation period, all written responses were summarised and recorded in a single document. A statement listing a summary of the representations received and how the issues have been addressed in the SPD is contained in the table below.

Comment received	How addressed in the SPD
Vehicular access to the proposed site is only from Baggallay St, a narrow (5.5m) road, and proposal will result in increased traffic volumes, noise, pollution, congestion and issues of highway safety.	New reference made to Scoping Transport Assessment carried out in Section 2.1, which accepts principle of housing plus maximum of 420-pupil school development using Baggallay St as only vehicular access. Additional references made in Section 2.4 to traffic calming, drop off/pick up area, cycle safety – all linked to requirement for full Transport Assessment at application stage.
Second vehicular access to the site should be introduced e.g. Harrow Road, by Church, or across Yazor Brook linking to Yazor Rd.	Reference made to this issue in Section 2.4
Percentage of affordable housing should be higher	Percentage required in Section 2.2 of 35% accords with Policy H9 of UDP.
Should be no more than 60 houses	Considered restriction of site area to that shown in UDP Policy H2 plus need for play area and wildlife area, will restrict housing capacity on site. Sufficient reference to housing density in Section 2.1.
Should be public toilets at the children's play area including disabled access	New reference made to requirement for changing facilities associated with dual use of playing fields in section 2.5 and additional paragraph referring to general accessibility issues in Section 2.4. Requirement for Access Statement now referred to in Section 2.13. Public toilets at children's play area not considered necessary for this scale of development.
Concerned about access for emergency vehicles	This issue would be addressed at the full planning application stage for any development of this site and is addressed through reference to the need for a full Transport Assessment in Section 2.4.

Comment received	How addressed in the SPD
Need information from Traffic Impact Assessment to comment properly plus Traffic Impact assessment should include possibility of school on site as well as houses	New reference made to Scoping Transport Assessment carried out in Section 2.1, which accepts principle of housing plus maximum of 420-pupil school development using Baggallay St as only vehicular access. Additional references made in Section 2.4 to traffic calming, drop off/pick up area, cycle safety – all linked to requirement for full Transport Assessment at application stage.
Tennis courts should be retained in situ for recreational use and not built on	UDP allocated this part of the site for housing, new school facility has tennis court provision and this brief is promoting dual use of playing fields for increased public usage in Section 2.5. Reference to site area clarified in Section 2.1.
Plan smacks of opportunity to make money through the UDP	As part landowner, the Council will utilise the monies raised through the sale of part of the site for housing towards the cost of the new school at Three Elms, as well as for other educational provision. The purpose of the brief is covered in Section 1.2.
Unclear how development will facilitate community health	The brief is promoting dual use of playing fields for increased public usage in Section 2.5, which will have knock on effects for community health.
Should not build on existing orchard	Issue covered in Section 2.7
Site should be used for school or housing, but not both	Issue addressed in Section 2.1 and reference to Scoping Transport Assessment in 2.4.
Not practical idea to have Lord Scudamore pupils walking to this site to use playing fields	The playing fields are being retained for school and public use – issue covered in Section 2.5. Use of playing fields is a matter for Children's Services.
Lord Scudamore should be relocated at Whitecross with some housing to NW and Scudamore site redeveloped	Brief promotes educational use in Section 2.1. Brief refers to the existing Whitecross school grounds only.
New development should not result in further parking in existing streets, ensure sufficient parking provision for new dwellings e.g. 2 spaces per dwelling	Parking issue is covered in Section 2.4 and proposes 1.5 spaces per dwelling averaged across the site in accordance with national and local standards.
Too much housing proposed	Housing referred to in Section 2.1 is in accordance with UDP Policy H2.
Existing brick walls to rear of Baggallay St and abutting site should be retained	This issue would be a matter for detailed planning application stage. Boundary issues are referred to in section 2.7.
Should be residential only parking in Meyrick, Baggallay, Ingestre and Gruneisen Streets	Additional references made in Section 2.4 to traffic calming, drop off/pick up area, cycle safety – all linked to requirement for full Transport Assessment at application stage.

Comment received	How addressed in the SPD
One-way system should be introduced to relieve traffic flows.	Additional references made in Section 2.4 to traffic calming, drop off/pick up area, cycle safety – all linked to requirement for full Transport Assessment at application stage.
Yazor Brook is currently a dried up ditch – it should be returned to former flows	New wildlife area referred to in Section 2.6 will have knock on benefits for wildlife of Brook itself.
How will Council protect amenities of residential properties?	Principle referred to in Section 2.3, but will be a matter for detailed planning application stage.
Should be new housing for elderly people	Mixed housing proposed in Section 2.1.
Bike sheds should be removed as are a nuisance	Bike sheds are omitted in Figure 4 – but will be matter for detailed planning application stage in reference to cycle parking in Section 2.4.
Could temporary access through Harrow Rd be used for construction traffic?	Reference made to this possibility in Section 2.9.
Improvements to cycle/pedestrian facilities are needed	References made in Section 2.4 and 2.12.
Sewerage system is already overloaded	Issue is now covered in Section 2.11
Retain NW corner of site as garden land.	Issue is covered in Section 2.7, but land ownership issues are not a matter for this brief.

Appendix 1**List of Consultees**

Organisation
Local Members for Three Elms and Central wards
Advantage West Midlands
Highways Agency
Herefordshire Health Authority
West Mercia Constabulary
Hereford and Worcester Chamber of Commerce
Hereford Access For All
Hereford Access Group & Pedestrian Forum
Hereford City Centre Forum/HIA
Open Spaces Society
Age Concern
English Nature
Environment Agency - Upper Severn Area
Sport England
Paul Keetch – Member of Parliament
Government Office for the West Midlands
National Grid Plc
Welsh Water
National Power Plc
Nuclear Electric Plc
Community Council of Hereford and Worcester
Friends of the Earth (Herefordshire)
Herefordshire Nature Trust
British Telecom
Church Commissioners
Commission for Racial Equality
English Heritage
Equal Opportunities Commission
Health and Safety Executive
Midland Red First
Transport 2000 (Hereford and Worcester)
Hereford Civic Trust
Hereford City Cycle Forum
Sustrans
Ramblers Association
Herefordshire Wildlife Trust
House Builders Federation (South West)
RSPB
Herefordshire Sports Council
Hereford and Worcester Fire Brigade

Organisation
Hereford City Council
The Bulmer Foundation
Herefordshire Cycle Forum
Hereford Diocese
Herefordshire Youth Consortium
Hereford & Worcester Ambulance Service
NPFA
Sun Valley Foods Ltd
St Nicholas Community Association
Whitecross Nursery School
Holy Trinity Church
The Vicarage, Holy Trinity
BCD Joinery, Plough Lane
Mercia Mobile Towing Services, Plough Lane
Tudor Outdoor Buildings, Plough Lane
Lovell Construction, Plough Lane
Lord Scudamore School
Whitecross High School
Adjoining Occupiers of Baggallay Street, Gruneisen St, Ingestre Street, Whitecross Road and Meyrick St, Trinity Court, Bricknell Close

Appendix 2**Town and Country Planning (Local Development (England)) Regulations 2004**

Interim Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Draft Development Brief - Land at Whitecross School, Hereford

Public Consultation Exercise – 27 October to 8 December 2005

Notice is hereby given that a 6-week public consultation exercise will be taking place from the **27 October 2005 to 8 December 2005** on the contents of a Draft Development Brief affecting **Land at Whitecross High School, Baggallay St, Hereford**. The draft brief outlines how the existing school site could be redeveloped for **housing, new educational provision and open space**.

The draft brief and associated consultation statement can be viewed on the Council's web-site at www.herefordshire.gov.uk or at the Town Hall, St Owen's Street or Blueschool House, Blueschool Street between the hours of 9a.m and 5p.m (Mon-Fri). Copies of both documents have also been placed at Hereford Library, Broad St, which is open at varying times between Tuesdays and Saturdays (Tel: 01432 383600). Copies of the documents can also be obtained on request.

If you have any comments to make on the development brief, please can you make them in writing to Chris Botwright at the address below **before 5p.m on the 8 December 2005**. All comments received will be acknowledged and reported to a future Planning Committee, but please specify if you would like to be notified of the date of adoption of the brief.

Dr D. Nicholson
Forward Planning Manager

Planning Services,
Town Hall,
Hereford,
HR1 2PJ
Tel: 01432 260133
Fax: 01432 260289
Email: cmjbotwright@herefordshire.gov.uk

Appendix 5

Development Brief for Whitecross High School, Hereford Supplementary Planning Document

Adoption Statement

In accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 notice is given that on xxxxxx Herefordshire Council formally adopted its Whitecross High School, Hereford development brief as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD). The brief sets out the Council's vision for the redevelopment of the site and will be a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications affecting its development.

Copies of the SPD, Final Consultation Statement and all supporting documents are available for public inspection at the following places (please check for opening times):

Herefordshire Council
Town Hall,
St Owens St,
Hereford
HR1 2PG

Herefordshire Council
Blueschool House,
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB

Hereford Library
Broad Street,
Hereford. HR4 9AU
Tel : 01432 383600

Copies of the document and the supporting documents can also be viewed on the Council's website (www.herefordshire.gov.uk). Copies of the document can be downloaded from the website or purchased from the Forward Planning Section, Hereford Town Hall Annexe.

Any person who feels aggrieved by the Council's decision to adopt the Whitecross High School Development Brief SPD may make an application to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of the decision to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document.

Any such application to the High Court must be made promptly and in any event within three months of the date of adoption specified above.

Dr. D. Nicholson
Forward Planning Manager
Planning Services
Town hall,
Hereford,
HR1 2PJ
Tel: 01432 260133
Fax: 01432 260289