

MINUTES OF SHLAA DEVELOPER PANEL MEETING (Hereford)

Location: Kindle Centre, Asda, Hereford

Date: Wednesday 11th March 2009

Time: 10am

Present: Edward Bannister (Herefordshire Council)
Chris Botwright (Herefordshire Council)
Claire Rawlings (Herefordshire Council)
Adrian Smith (Herefordshire Council)
[REDACTED] (Collins Engineering)
[REDACTED] (James Spreckley ARICS FAAV)
[REDACTED] (RRA Architects)
[REDACTED] (Drivers Jonas)
[REDACTED] (Drivers Jonas)
[REDACTED] (Jamieson Associates)
[REDACTED] (FoxleyTagg Planning)
[REDACTED] (Bloor Homes)
[REDACTED] (IE Developments Ltd)

Apologies: [REDACTED] (Bromford Group)

NOTES OF MEETING

1.0 Introduction

CB welcomed everybody, made introductions and thanked panel members for their work in producing site returns. He confirmed that the assessment returns, once agreed, would help the Council with its evidence base which will inform the Core Strategy and the Hereford Area Plan. CB also confirmed that the Council letter dated 12 February contained the amended/agreed methodology for the assessment. CB informed the panel of the approach taken to consider site returns for Kington/Leominster and the need for a consistent approach. This was agreed and each panel member was invited to present their findings. Discussion could then take place on the view taken to enable group debate and a conclusion to be reached. In his absence [REDACTED] returns would be presented by Claire Rawlings.

2.0 Panel Member Presentations

Panel members presented their sites with the aid of a Powerpoint presentation. The agreed conclusions of all sites and a summary of the assessment are attached in Appendix 1. A summary of the comments made on all sites is attached in Appendix 2.

3.0 Conclusions

The panel agreed the conclusions set out in Appendix 1 and agreed that changes should be made to each site schedule to amend where necessary timescale build predictions (achievability) and potential housing capacity based upon site assessment returns.

4.0 Dates of next meeting:

Wednesday 18th March (Ledbury/Bromyard/Ross) - Council's Plough Lane
Offices at 10am

APPENDIX 1 – Viability Assessment Summary (Hereford)

Settlement Name	Site Ref	Viable		Comments	Initials
		Yes	No		
Hereford	O/Her/011	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/197/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/197/002a	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/007	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/048/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/298/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/075/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/050/001	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/076/001	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/196/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/187/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/011/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/053/001	✓			
Hereford	H/F/6	✓		Too small	
Hereford	H/E4/5		✓		
Hereford	H/E4/3	✓		Too small	
Hereford	H/E2/5	✓		Too small	
Hereford	BAPX	✓			
Hereford	H/E2/6	✓		Too small	
Hereford	HLAA/203/001b	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/024	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/197/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/052/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/308/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/308/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/104/001	✓		As per HLAA/308/001 & 308/002 - Overlapping sites	
Hereford	HLAA/309/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/309/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/203/001a	✓			
Hereford	H/C/52	✓		Too small	
Hereford	H/C/53		✓	Existing use value	
Hereford	H/E1/8	✓		Existing use value	
Hereford	H/E1/3	✓			
Hereford	MKC7		✓	Relocation costs	
Hereford	HLAA/116/001	✓		Only viable if integrated with HLAA/103/001	
Hereford	HLAA/048/003	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/103/001	✓			

Hereford	HLAA/110/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/048/004	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/006	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/048/005	✓			
Hereford	P258	✓			Depends on land costs
Hereford	H/D/40		✓		
Hereford	H/D/32-39	✓			Too small
Hereford	HLAA/134/003	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/134/003a	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/071/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/304/001	✓			
Hereford	H/E1/1	✓			Too small
Hereford	FRP6		✓		Site landlocked
Hereford	HLAA/058/003	✓			
Hereford	M9BK	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/090/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/317/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/058/001		✓		
Hereford	HLAA/058/002		✓		
Hereford	HLAA/283/001	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/029	✓			
Hereford	H/F/8		✓		Too small
Hereford	H/F/9		✓		
Hereford	HLAA/317/001		✓		
Hereford	O/Her/030		✓		
Hereford	HLAA/080/001	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/031	✓			
Hereford	H/E4/9	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/173/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/164/001	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/034	✓			
Hereford	O/Her/032	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/087/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/087/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/311/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/120/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/108/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/059/002	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/175/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/174/001	✓			
Hereford	HLAA/096/001	✓			
Hereford	P692_P1102	✓			
Hereford	H/C/2	✓			
Hereford	H/C/18	✓			

Hereford	H/C/16	✓		
Hereford	H/C/15	✓		
Hereford	H/C/10	✓		
Hereford	H/C/13		✓	
Hereford	O/Her/037	✓		
Hereford	H/C/28	✓		
Hereford	H/C/36	✓		
Hereford	H/C/38	✓		
Hereford	H/C/37	✓		
Hereford	H/C/40	✓		
Hereford	H/C/47	✓		
Hereford	O/Her/039	✓		
Hereford	H/A2/2	✓		
Hereford	H/A2/4	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/310/001	✓		
Hereford	O/Her/014	✓		
Hereford	O/Her/015	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/221/001	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/248/001	✓		
Hereford	H/D/25	✓		
Hereford	H/D/3		✓	
Hereford	H/D/6		✓	Too small
Hereford	P1102 - 7499	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/038/001	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/210/001	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/114/001	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/134/001	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/197/004b	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/197/004a	✓		
Hereford	HLAA/197/004	✓		
Hereford	H/F/2	✓		Too small
Hereford	HLAA/255/001	✓		
Hereford	H/D/14	✓		Too small
Hereford	H/D/15	✓		Too small
Hereford	H/D/26		✓	
Hereford	O/Her/041	✓		
Hereford	NAPY	✓		
Hereford	O/Her/036	✓		
Hereford	O/Her/035	✓		

APPENDIX 2 – Comments on viability (Hereford)

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/173/001 – Greenfield site which borders Roman Road to the south. Topography is flat. The site is viable, deliverable and immediately available.

HLAA/164/001 – Site borders HLAA/173/001. The same principles apply, although power lines run through the northern part of the site. The site is viable, deliverable and immediately available.

O/Her/034 – This site is located behind the Hopbine Hotel. Adjacent site has been allocated for housing. The site is viable and potentially deliverable but access is only available through adjacent site or perhaps through the Hotel.

O/Her/032 – Site runs down Munstone Lane which is a single track. As a consequence access is poor. The site is viable subject to resolution of access.

HLAA/087/002 – Site is far removed from Hereford City and access is sub-standard. The site is not suitable, although it is viable.

HLAA/087/001 – Site is far removed from Hereford City and access is sub-standard. The site is not suitable, although it is viable.

HLAA/311/001 – The site is located to the north of HLAA/087/001 and 087/002. The site is viable, although access is poor and it is within open countryside.

HLAA/120/001 – Site is viable but there are issues with the local road network.

HLAA/108/001 – Site is viable despite its open countryside setting and poor local road network

HLAA/059/002 – Site is viable despite poor local road network

HLAA/175/001 – Site is viable despite problems with access

HLAA/174/001 – Site is viable despite poor local road network

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/096/001 – Site is viable despite flood risk

P692_P1102 – Site is sandwiched between Bulmers and Sun Valley. Flood issues are likely to be resolved through the ESG flood alleviation scheme. Site is viable even though it is better suited to commercial use.

H/C/2 – Site occupies a sustainable location and has the potential to deliver a high-density scheme. Site is viable despite access issues.

H/C/18 – Site forms the premises to a joinery workshop. Existing use should be retained but the site is viable for housing.

H/C/16 – Site is viable despite archaeological issues.

H/C/15 – Site is viable for housing but car parking would need to be offset elsewhere.

H/C/10 – Site has the potential to deliver a high-density scheme. Whilst economically viable, the building has been subject to considerable refurbishment and is unlikely to be made available.

H/C/13 – Site would be difficult to progress as it borders the Greyfriars Bridge – multiple ownership, Scheduled Ancient Monument, archaeological issues, service strip for bridge. These factors make the site unviable.

O/Her/037 – Site used to accommodate the local Citroen dealer. Site is viable but there are light pollution issues

H/C/28 – Site is viable despite its existing use (car park).

H/C/36 – If car parking could be offset then the site would be viable.

H/C/38 – Site forms no-mans land between the police station and car parks. The site is viable for housing but would be better suited to other uses.

H/C/37 – Site is viable although other uses could be accommodated. Car parking would need to offset.

H/C/40 – Site is economically viable, car parking needs to be offset, Scheduled Ancient Monument.

H/C/47 – Site is viable

Sites assessed by [REDACTED] (in absentia)

O/Her/039 – School is being redeveloped; land left over could be developed. Site is viable.

H/A2/2 – Site is viable. However, need to check value of open space.

H/A2/4 – Site is viable

HLAA/310/001 – Site is viable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

O/Her/014 – Site is viable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

O/Her/015 – Part of the site is viable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

HLAA/221/001 – Site is viable, although there are issues relating to access. Note change to Summary Form.

HLAA/248/001 – Site is viable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

H/D/25 – Site is viable.

H/D/3 – Site is unviable due to site assembly issues. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

H/D/6 – Site is unviable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form. Site is too small.

P1102 – 7499 – Site is viable.

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

O/Her/011 – Site is located west of the Broomy Hill Waterworks. The northern section of the site is deliverable despite access and flood constraints to the south. The site has potential to join land to the north.

HLAA/197/002 – Interest declared. Site is deliverable and has good frontage onto Kings Acre Road, although there may be some landscape issues on parts of the site and the southern access may be constrained. Site made considerable progress in the UDP.

HLAA/197/002a – Interest declared. Directly adjoins HLAA/197/002. Site included an agricultural building. Site is deliverable in tandem with 197/002 pending consideration of access.

O/Her/007 – Site has no direct frontage off King's Acre Road. The site must therefore be delivered in conjunction with adjoining land. If this can be achieved and access resolved then the site is deliverable.

HLAA/048/002 – This is an isolated site which would only be deliverable in tandem with adjoining land pending resolution of access.

HLAA/298/001 – Site is deliverable subject to resolution of access.

HLAA/075/001 – Site is deliverable subject to resolution of access. Access would need to be obtained off the nearest highway.

HLAA/050/001 – Infill plot off Breinton Lee. Site is deliverable pending resolution of access.

O/Her/002 – Site has good frontage onto the road and is quite elevated to the west. Eastern section is deliverable pending resolution of access.

HLAA/076/001 – Site has good frontage and is deliverable.

O/Her/001 – The site has some minor commercial uses so any housing scheme would need to accommodate and/or relocate these. The site is deliverable but access must be resolved.

HLAA/196/002 – Site has very good frontage onto Roman Road and is deliverable

HLAA/187/001 – Site is partially deliverable pending resolution of access.

HLAA/011/001 – Site has good frontage. Topography rises of west to east. Site is deliverable but some of it may be affected by heritage issues.

HLAA/053/001 – Site adjoins HLAA/011/001. Similar principles apply and consequently the site is deliverable.

H/F/6 – Site is potentially deliverable. Too small – delete.

H/E4/5 – Site forms an infill plot. Access points are totally inadequate and the site is unlikely to be deliverable in isolation. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

H/E4/3 – Site is currently used as a car park for Belgravia Nursing Home. If car parking could be offset then the site could be considered deliverable. Too small – delete.

H/E2/5 – Site is potentially deliverable. Too small – delete.

BAPX – Site is deliverable but there are issues relating to design and access.

H/E2/6 – Site forms part of an existing front garden and is constrained but is deliverable. Too small – delete.

Site assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/038/001 – Site is viable.

HLAA/210/001 – Site is viable despite its existing use (business).

HLAA/114/001 – Site is viable although it ought to be looked at in conjunction with HLAA/134/001 and HLAA/197/004b.

HLAA/134/001 – Site is viable although it ought to be looked at in conjunction with HLAA/114/001 and HLAA/197/004b.

HLAA/197/004b – Site is viable although it ought to be looked at in conjunction with HLAA/114/001 and HLAA/134/001.

HLAA/197/004a – Site is too large to be considered suitable for housing, but the southern portion is deliverable.

HLAA/197/004 – Site is deliverable

H/F/2 – Site should be deleted from the viability assessment as it forms part of a small back garden – too small.

HLAA/255/001 – The eastern portion of the site is deliverable.

H/D/14 – Viable site however too small so delete.

H/D/15 – Viable site however too small so delete.

H/D/26 – Site is unviable due to multiple ownership.

O/Her/041 – ESG site. Site is deliverable despite constraints i.e. flood risk, CPO, access, multiple ownership.

NAPY – Debatable whether site should be included within this study. In any case it would not be deliverable until the middle of the plan period due to current ownership/lease arrangements. However, site is viable.

O/Her/036 – Site is derelict but access is good. Site is therefore deliverable.

O/Her/035 – Access to this site is almost impossible. However, some development would be feasible. Site is deliverable subject to careful planning.

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/203/001b – Majority of the site is in single ownership. There is an area of archaeological interest adjacent. Site is viable.

O/Her/024 – Site is in multiple ownership. Southern portion is probably inappropriate on landscape grounds. However, the top half of the site is viable.

HLAA/197/001 – Site is well contained and access is inadequate. Site is deliverable and could accommodate up to 250 dwellings.

HLAA/052/001 – Comments recorded on the site schedule are acceptable and the site is viable.

HLAA/308/001 – Site is viable pending resolution of access. Noise from the nearby railway line would need to be offset.

HLAA/308/002 – Site is viable.

HLAA/309/001 – Site is viable.

HLAA/309/002 – Site is viable although substantial visual mitigation would be required.

HLAA/203/001a – Site is viable but there are issues relating to flood risk. The site is in single ownership.

H/C/52 – Site forms an area of open space in close proximity to the former scout hut. The site is extremely small and is awkwardly shaped. However, the site is deliverable. Too small – delete.

H/C/53 – Site is not deliverable but it could be delivered in tandem with H/C/52 as part of a comprehensive scheme. Too small – delete.

H/E1/8 – Site forms an attractive piece of landscape. The whole site cannot be delivered therefore, but the site is viable. Too small – delete.

H/E1/8 – Due to flood constraints only part of the site is considered viable.

MKC7 – Site is unviable and the road network is extremely poor.

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/116/001 – Site is viable

HLAA/048/003 – Site is only viable if integrated with adjacent sites.

HLAA/103/001 – Site has existing access onto King's Acre Road and is viable

HLAA/110/001 – Former Hala Carr Nursery site. Although access is poor, there is a covenant on adjoining land that would create good access. Site is viable.

HLAA/048/004 – Site has frontage onto King's Acre Road. This is a level piece of land with good access. Site is viable.

O/Her/006 – Site is adjacent to HLAA/048/004 and is viable.

HLAA/048/005 – Site is viable.

P258 – Site is deliverable although planning permission for housing has twice elapsed.

H/D/40 - Site is unviable.

H/D/32-39 – Sites are viable, however too small so delete.

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/134/003 – Site is currently used as an orchard and is too open and prominent to be considered appropriate for housing development. However, parts of the site are viable.

HLAA/134/003a – Site is viable

HLAA/071/001 – Site is viable subject to resolution of access off Holywell Gutter Lane.

HLAA/304/001 – Site has vehicular access from Corporation Farm and is viable.

H/E1/1 – Site is viable subject to resolution of access. Too small – delete.

FRP6 – Site is unviable as it is land locked.

HLAA/058/003 – Site is clearly visible, although access is constrained. However, site is viable pending resolution of access.

M9BK – Site is viable subject to compensatory provision of recreational facility.

HLAA/090/001 – Site is viable.

HLAA/317/002 – Site is viable.

HLAA/058/001 – Site is viable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

HLAA/058/002 – Site is unviable as there are too many constraints. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

Sites assessed by [REDACTED]

HLAA/283/001 – Site is deliverable subject to resolution of access.

O/Her/029 – Large portion of this site floods but it is viable in part.

H/F/8 – Site is unviable and should be deleted from the viability assessment. Note change to Panel Assessment Form. Too small – delete from study.

H/F/9 – Poor access renders this site unviable. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

HLAA/317/001 – Site is unviable due to flooding, access and nature conservation and the site is awkwardly shaped. Note change to Panel Assessment Form.

O/Her/030 – The majority of this site floods and it is therefore unviable.

HLAA/080/001 – Site has good access and is viable despite its open countryside setting.

O/Her/031 – Site is deliverable, viable and achievable. Noise from the nearby railway line could be mitigated and there is already good access.

H/E4/9 – Site is viable.