

A G E N D A

Central Area Planning Sub-Committee

Date: **Wednesday, 9 July, 2008**

Time: **2.00 p.m.**

Place: **The Council Chamber, Brockington,
35 Hafod Road, Hereford**

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Ben Baugh, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 01432 261882

E-mail: bbaugh@herefordshire.gov.uk

AGENDA

for the Meeting of the Central Area Planning Sub-Committee

To: Councillor JE Pemberton (Chairman)
Councillor GA Powell (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors PA Andrews, WU Attfield, DJ Benjamin, AJM Blackshaw, ACR Chappell, SPA Daniels, H Davies, GFM Dawe, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, MAF Hubbard, TW Hunt (ex-officio), MD Lloyd-Hayes, RI Matthews, AT Oliver, SJ Robertson, RV Stockton (ex-officio), AP Taylor, AM Toon, NL Vaughan, WJ Walling, DB Wilcox and JD Woodward

	Pages
<p>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive apologies for absence.</p>	
<p>2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>GUIDANCE ON DECLARING PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS AT MEETINGS</p> <p>The Council's Members' Code of Conduct requires Councillors to declare against an agenda item(s) the nature of an interest and whether the interest is personal or prejudicial. Councillors have to decide first whether or not they have a personal interest in the matter under discussion. They will then have to decide whether that personal interest is also prejudicial.</p> <p>A personal interest is an interest that affects the Councillor more than most other people in the area. People in the area include those who live, work or have property in the area of the Council. Councillors will also have a personal interest if their partner, relative or a close friend, or an organisation that they or the member works for, is affected more than other people in the area. If they do have a personal interest, they must declare it but can stay and take part and vote in the meeting.</p> <p>Whether an interest is prejudicial is a matter of judgement for each Councillor. What Councillors have to do is ask themselves whether a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – would think that the Councillor's interest was so important that their decision would be affected by it. If a Councillor has a prejudicial interest then they must declare what that interest is and leave the meeting room.</p>	
<p>3. MINUTES</p> <p>To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting.</p>	1 - 8
<p>4. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS</p> <p>To note the Council's current position in respect of planning appeals for the central area.</p>	9 - 12

Planning Applications

To consider and take any appropriate action in respect of the planning applications received for the central area and to authorise the Head of Planning and Transportation to impose any additional and varied conditions and reasons considered to be necessary. Plans relating to planning applications on this agenda will be available for inspection in the Council Chamber 30 minutes before the start of the meeting.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 5. DCCE2007/1655/O - HOLMER TRADING ESTATE, COLLEGE ROAD, HEREFORD, HR1 1JS | 13 - 44 |
| <p>Mixed Use development comprising residential (115 units), employment (office, industrial and warehousing), retail and supporting infrastructure including new access off College Road, roads, footpaths, open spaces, landscaping, parking and re-opening of part of canal.</p> | |
| 6. DCCE2008/0552/F - BUILDING AT MILL FARM, FOWNHOPE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4NT | 45 - 50 |
| <p>Proposed change of use from agricultural storage to storage of non agricultural products.</p> | |
| 7. DCCE2008/1019/F - 57 PORTFIELD STREET, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 2SE | 51 - 56 |
| <p>Proposed two storey extension and refurbishment of existing property.</p> | |
| 8. DCCE2008/1360/F - 255 ROSS ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 7QJ | 57 - 62 |
| <p>Side and rear extensions.</p> | |
| 9. DCCE2008/0626/F - HEREFORD SIXTH FORM COLLEGE, FOLLY LANE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1LU | 63 - 70 |
| <p>Proposed new 3 storey detached classroom block adjacent to sports field towards east of campus (rear).</p> | |
| 10. DCCE2008/1321/F - 7 AYLESTONE HILL, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1HR | 71 - 76 |
| <p>Change of use under current planning consent approval (ref: DCCE2007/1763/F) of landlords office/store into a studio apartment (apartment 7).</p> | |
| 11. DCCW2008/0925/F - ROSEBANK, MUNSTONE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3AD | 77 - 82 |
| <p>Change of use of storage building to form 3 no. holiday letting units.</p> | |
| 12. DCCE2008/1413/F - 56 FREDERICK AVENUE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1HL | 83 - 88 |
| <p>Convert residential house into two flats, with separate access.</p> | |
| 13. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS | |
| <p>6 August 2008
3 September 2008
1 October 2008</p> | |

The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

Please Note:

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The meeting venue is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

Public Transport Links

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service runs approximately every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning the officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.

COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point J which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 11 June 2008 at 2.00 p.m.

Present: Councillor JE Pemberton (Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, DJ Benjamin, AJM Blackshaw, SPA Daniels, H Davies, GFM Dawe, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, MAF Hubbard, RI Matthews, AT Oliver, SJ Robertson, AP Taylor, AM Toon, WJ Walling and JD Woodward

In attendance: Councillors TW Hunt (ex-officio) and RV Stockton (ex-officio)

Election of Chairman and Appointment of Vice-Chairman

It was noted that, at the Annual Council meeting on 16 May 2008, Councillor JE Pemberton was re-elected Chairman and Councillor GA Powell was re-appointed Vice-Chairman of the Central Area Planning Sub-Committee.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors WU Attfield, ACR Chappell, MD Lloyd-Hayes, GA Powell, NL Vaughan and DB Wilcox.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

5. DCCW2008/0292/F - St. Nicholas Rectory, 76 Breinton Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0JY

Councillor PA Andrews; Personal and Prejudicial; lives nearby. Left the meeting for the duration of the item.

6. DCCE2007/1655/O - Holmer Trading Estate, College Road, Hereford, HR1 1JS.

Councillor MAF Hubbard; Personal.

9. DCCW2008/0302/F - Brook Farm, Marden, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 3ET.

Councillor AJM Blackshaw; Personal.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2008 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS

The Sub-Committee received an information report about the Council's position in relation to planning appeals for the central area.

5. DCCW2008/0292/F - ST. NICHOLAS RECTORY, 76 BREINTON ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 0JY [AGENDA ITEM 5]

Demolish existing rectory and erect 9 no. residential dwellings.

The following update was reported:

- The applicant's agent had confirmed that his client was a Registered Charity. It was reported that the Diocesan Board would not consider the matter of increased contributions until 1 July 2008.

Councillor JD Woodward, a Local Ward Member, was disappointed that no further progress had been made in respect of the proposed level of contributions, following the deferral of this application for further discussions at the last meeting, particularly given the need to improve community infrastructure and education facilities in the locality. Consequently, it was proposed that consideration of the application be deferred.

Councillor PJ Edwards noted the significant amount of work already undertaken in respect of this proposal and suggested that delegated authority could be given to officers to resolve the outstanding issues, in consultation with the Local Ward Members. However, this motion failed and consideration of the application was then deferred.

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred for further information and negotiations.

6. DCCE2007/1655/O - HOLMER TRADING ESTATE, COLLEGE ROAD, HEREFORD, HR1 1JS [AGENDA ITEM 6]

Mixed use development comprising residential (115 units), employment (office, industrial and warehousing), retail and supporting infrastructure including new access off College Road, roads, footpaths, open spaces, landscaping, parking and re-opening of part of canal.

The following updates were reported:

- A further letter had been received from the Canal Trust requesting that the Section 106 Heads of Terms include the de-silting of the existing canal tunnel before transfer to the Trust and a requirement for all properties and businesses on site to pay towards the cost of restoring, maintaining and managing the canal in line with other similar agreements across the country. It was reported that the applicants had agreed to the Canal Trust requests and it was recommended that these be included within the Section 106. The requirement for the affordable housing element to contribute towards the restoration of the canal would be subject to the agreement of the Registered Social Landlord and the Council's Strategic Housing Team.
- A further comment had been received from the applicant requesting that the total number of residential units be retained at 125 in order to fully re-examine the capacity in light of late changes to the proposal. However, officers considered that, based on the masterplan, the capacity of the site was maximised. Therefore, it was not considered there was scope to accommodate the ten residential units elsewhere in the site that had been lost as a result of the late change to increase the amount of employment floorspace.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Stannard and Ms. Fincham spoke in objection to the application and Mr. Preston spoke in support of the

application; as a major application and in accordance with Constitution SO 5.11.2, the public speaking time limit had been extended to six minutes in total per side.

The Chairman advised the Sub-Committee that Councillor DB Wilcox, a Local Ward Member, had sent his apologies for absence as he was representing the authority at a conference. Comments were made about the quality of the officer's report and presentation but the Chairman considered that members would benefit from a site inspection given the scale, complexity and implications of the proposal. A number of members spoke in support of a site inspection.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred for a site inspection for the following reasons:

- **the character or appearance of the development itself is a fundamental planning consideration;**
- **a judgement is required on visual impact;**
- **the setting and surroundings are fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.**

7. DCCE2008/1026/N - THE OLD MUSHROOM FARM, HAYWOOD LANE, CALLOW, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 8BX [AGENDA ITEM 7]

Formation of earth bunds (8000 CU M of imported soil) as screening etc.

The Principal Planning Officer (Minerals and Waste) outlined issues relating to the materials to be imported and the Environmental Permitting regime. It was reported that the applicant had confirmed that there would be a maximum of 4-5 trips in any one day and the Traffic Manager had not raised any objections, subject to a limit on the number of vehicles to access the site.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Hatton spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor GFM Dawe, the Local Ward Member, drew attention to the objections summarised in the representations section of the report and noted that, whilst a number of issues could be addressed through the recommended conditions, there remained substantial concerns about the impact of the proposal on the local highway network and about the future use of the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (Minerals and Waste) advised that the recommended conditions sought to control the development robustly and included: an eighteen-month time limit; the maintenance of a Site Diary for all deliveries of material to the site; a routing scheme; and a restriction on the number of vehicle movements. Members were advised that this application had to be considered on its own merits and the Sub-Committee could not speculate on the future use of the site.

Some members supported the application, comments included:

- there was a need to identify sustainable means of disposing of inert construction waste locally and to reduce landfilling
- the screening and monitoring requirements would ensure that no unsuitable materials were imported
- the earth bunds would not detract from the landscape and could provide good

security for landowners and habitat potential for local wildlife

- the recommended conditions were considered thorough and reasonable

Councillor PJ Edwards, a member for the adjoining Belmont Ward, noted that the proposal would involve importing some 16,000 tonnes of material and he considered that the HGV movements associated with this activity would have an unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety. He commented on the narrowness of the carriageway and speed of traffic using Haywood Lane and the potential for congestion and accidents arising from the proposal. If planning permission was granted, he suggested that a contribution towards highway improvements should be sought from the developer and further consideration given to routing, in consultation with the local and adjoining ward members.

The Principal Planning Officer (Minerals and Waste) advised that the temporary nature of the application meant that it would be unreasonable to require a contribution towards highway improvements. However, the Highways Section could inspect Haywood Lane prior to the start date and the costs of any subsequent repair work required, as a result of damage directly attributable to the development, could be recovered from the developer.

A number of members expressed concerns about the application, including:

- the purpose of the bunds as 'screening' was questioned, especially as the site was not directly overlooked and given the adjoining land uses
- concerns were expressed about speeding traffic, despite the recent introduction of a 40mph speed limit
- questions were asked about the extent of the landscaping scheme
- comments were made about the need to protect rural lanes from heavy traffic

Councillor Dawe challenged assertions about the environmental benefits and limited impact of the proposal. He commented that there should be more rigorous waste management plans for new developments in order to reduce the need to dispose of construction related materials. Given that the applicant had indicated that no further waste material would be brought to the site once completed, Councillor Dawe asked whether a condition could be imposed to restrict the future use of the site.

In response, the Central Team Leader advised that any further activities at the site would require another planning application and any such application would need to be considered on its own merits at that time. He noted that large developments regularly re-used inert materials as sub-soil or back-fill for other construction projects but even small-scale domestic developments resulted in waste materials and, therefore, alternatives to landfilling needed to be identified. He also reminded the Sub-Committee that the Traffic Manager had not raised any objections, subject to conditions.

A motion to approve the application failed and the resolution below was then agreed.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) **The Central Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application subject to the reason for refusal set out below (and any further reasons for refusal felt to be necessary by the Head of Planning and Transportation) provided that the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the applications to the Planning Committee:**

The local planning authority consider that there is insufficient justification for the development in this location and consequently the increased use of the local road network by heavy goods vehicles would not be in the interests of highway safety

- (ii) **If the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be instructed to refuse the application, subject to such reasons for refusal referred to above.**

[Note:

Following the vote on this application, the Development Control Manager advised that, as the resolution was contrary to the officers' recommendation and the Sub-Committee's view might not be defensible if challenged, he was minded to refer the matter to the Head of Planning and Transportation.

Councillor PJ Edwards asked that the local and adjoining ward members be consulted on the routing of vehicles in the intervening period, should the application be referred to the Planning Committee.]

8. DCCE2008/0959/F - FIELD AT COMMON HILL LANE (OPPOSITE THE LITTLE HOUSE), FOWNHOPE, HEREFORD, HR1 4QA [AGENDA ITEM 8]

Proposed field shelter.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Hardwick spoke on behalf of Fownhope Parish Council.

The Chairman, speaking in her capacity as the Local Ward Member, commented on her knowledge of the site and outlined its planning history. Attention was drawn to the comments of Fownhope Parish Council, particularly that 'the existing stable block is sufficient for the size of paddock'. Concern was also expressed about the statement in the report that the shelter 'would also occasionally be used for the storage of machinery'.

In response to a question, the Central Team Leader advised that recommended condition FO9 would ensure that the field shelter was for private use only and not for any equestrian enterprise. It was reported that the purpose of the application was to provide a safe and practical access for horses. It was also reported that officers did not consider that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

A number of members considered that the application should be refused, some of the principal points included:

- the existing stable block was considered adequate and could be adapted further to improve access for horses
- the paddock could only support a small number of horses
- there was insufficient justification for another structure in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- the proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the land and the visual impact would be unacceptable

- the need to store machinery was questioned
- the formation of an approach to the field shelter could damage the paddock and result in further visual impact

Other members acknowledged that the Conservation Manager had not raised any objections and noted the comments in the report that the building was 'typical of an agricultural field shelter' and was 'modest in size'.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) **The Central Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application subject to the reasons for refusal set out below (and any further reasons for refusal felt to be necessary by the Head of Planning and Transportation) provided that the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:**

There is considered to be adequate provision for stabling on this site and the construction of an additional building for such use in this open field would be to the detriment of its open and rural character in the Wye Valley AONB. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy LA1 of HUDP.

- (ii) **If the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be instructed to refuse the application, subject to such reasons for refusal referred to above.**

[*Note:*

Following the vote on this application, the Development Control Manager advised that, although the resolution was contrary to the officers' recommendation, he was not minded to refer the matter to the Head of Planning and Transportation given the reasons for refusal identified by the Sub-Committee.]

9. DCCW2008/0302/F - BROOK FARM, MARDEN, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3ET [AGENDA ITEM 9]

Retention of polytunnels.

The applicant withdrew this planning application prior to the meeting.

In response to a question, the Development Control Manager explained that the applicant was developing a master plan for the business which would inform future planning applications.

10. DCCW2008/1134/F - 58 CLEEVE ORCHARD, HEREFORD, HR1 1LF [AGENDA ITEM 10]

Proposed single storey extension to rear, and new porch to front.

Councillor SJ Robertson, the Local Ward Member, noted that no objections had been raised by Holmer Parish Council or by local residents.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **C01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

3. **I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy DR13 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informative(s):

1. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**

2. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission.**

11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next scheduled meetings were given as follows: 9 July, 6 August and 3 September 2008.

The meeting ended at 4.00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS**APPEALS RECEIVED****Application No. DCCW2007/2633/F**

- The appeal was received on 3 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr AJ Chadd.
- The site is located at Warehouse at land adjacent to 47 Barton Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0AY.
- The development proposed is Demolition of existing vacant warehouse for three terraced town houses and associated parking facilities.
- The appeal is to be heard by Written Representations.

Case Officer: Kevin Bishop on 01432 261946

Application No. DCCW2007/2634/C

- The appeal was received on 3 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr AJ Chadd.
- The site is located at Warehouse at land adjacent to 47 Barton Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0AY.
- The development proposed is Demolition of existing vacant warehouse for three terraced town houses and associated parking facilities.
- The appeal is to be heard by Written Representations.

Case Officer: Kevin Bishop on 01432 261946

Application No. DCCW2007/3538/F

- The appeal was received on 10 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr MJ Mohan & Mr NA Beament.
- The site is located at 9-11, Tower Road, Broomy Hill, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0LF.
- The development proposed is Change of use from residential home for elderly to HMO.
- The appeal is to be heard by Hearing.

Case Officer: Kevin Bishop on 01432 261946

Application No. DCCE2007/3542/F

- The appeal was received on 10 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr MJ Mohan & Mr NA Beament.
- The site is located at 16 Aylestone Hill, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1HS.
- The development proposed is Change of use from two flats (residential) to House in Multiple Occupation.
- The appeal is to be heard by Hearing.

Case Officer: Russell Pryce on 01432 261957

Application No. DCCW2007/2784/O

- The appeal was received on 13 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Messrs DJ & IR Powell.
- The site is located at Land adjacent to Parkfield, (Hala Carr) Breinton Lane, Kings Acre Road, Hereford HR4 7PX.
- The development proposed is Proposed residential development of 23 dwellings.
- The appeal is to be heard by Hearing.

Case Officer: Kevin Bishop on 01432 261946

Application No. DCCE2008/0181/F

- The appeal was received on 13 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr C Lewis & Mrs A Owens.
- The site is located at 54 Chestnut Drive, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 6AZ.
- The development proposed is Shipping container in garden – retrospective.
- The appeal is to be heard by Written Representations.

Case Officer: Ed Thomas on 01432 261961

Application No. DCCE2008/0228/F

- The appeal was received on 19 June 2008.
- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is brought by Mr AFH Wood.
- The site is located at Land adjoining Orchard View, Sutton Road, Cross Keys, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 3NL.
- The development proposed is Erection of short-wave amateur radio mast and aerial/s for transmitting and receiving.
- The appeal is to be heard by Written Representations.

Case Officer: Ed Thomas on 01432 261961

APPEALS DETERMINED

Application No. DCCW2007/2037/F

- The appeal was received on 5 March 2008.
- The appeal was made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal was brought by Mr B Lane.
- The site is located at Rose Cottage, 304 Kings Acre Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0SD.
- The application, dated 18 June 2007 was refused on 22 June 2007.
- The development proposed was Proposed detached house with double garage.
- The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Decision: The appeal was DISMISSED on 12 June 2008.

Case Officer: Kevin Bishop on 01432 261946

Application No. DCCE2007/2076/F

- The appeal was received on 13 November 2007.
- The appeal was made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal was brought by Mr P Beale.
- The site is located at Marshfield, Cross Keys, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 3NL.
- The application, dated 29 June 2007, was refused on 6 August 2007.
- The development proposed was a proposed new building to be used for the storage and repair of vintage vehicles household equipment and business.
- The main issues are:
 - i) *The principle of the proposal having regard to policies restricting development in the open countryside*
 - ii) *The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area*
 - iii) *The effect of the proposed development on flood risk in the immediate area*

Decision: The appeal was DISMISSED on 24 June 2008.

An application for the award of costs, made by the Council against the appellant at the Hearing, was UPHELD

Case Officer: Debby Klein on 01432 260136

If members wish to see the full text of decision letters copies can be provided.

5 DCCE2007/1655/O - MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL (115 UNITS), EMPLOYMENT (OFFICE, INDUSTRIAL AND WAREHOUSING), RETAIL AND SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING NEW ACCESS OFF COLLEGE ROAD, ROADS, FOOTPATHS, OPEN SPACES, LANDSCAPING, PARKING AND RE-OPENING OF PART OF CANAL AT HOLMER TRADING ESTATE, COLLEGE ROAD, HEREFORD HR1 1JS

For: Hereford Residential Developments Limited per Bryan Smith Associates, 33 The Dell, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, BS9 3UE

Date Received: 25 May 2007

Ward: Aylestone

Grid Ref: 51704, 41785

Expiry Date: 24 August 2007

Local Members: Councillors NL Vaughan and DB Wilcox

Introduction

The application was deferred at the Central Area Planning Sub-Committee on 11 June 2008 to enable members to undertake a site visit. This report including the Section 106 Heads of Terms has been updated to take account of the changes to the proposals and further information received immediately prior to the June Sub-Committee meeting.

1. Site Description and Proposal

1.1 The site comprises an established and safeguarded employment site known as Holmer Trading Estate located east of College Road. The site originally accommodated a tile manufacturing works, which was subsequently developed and divided up after the war to create the development as it now stands. The site is bounded by the railway line to the north, the former Herefordshire and Gloucester Canal to the south and existing industrial/commercial units to the east. West and opposite the access is the Bridge Inn Public House and south beyond the route of the former canal is Wessington Drive forming part of Victoria Park residential estate.

1.2 The site itself extends to 3.35 hectares of land served by an existing single point of access off College Road. It comprises a mixture of single and two storey buildings of varying ages, designs and materials interwoven with a number of access roads/tracks and areas of hardstanding. There are also two detached dwellings, one now converted to three separate flats and the other having been abandoned some time ago. At the time of submission of the application, a total of 39 businesses had an employment base at the site although this number has subsequently reduced to 23. Ground levels generally fall from north to south and east to west, both within this site and surrounding with College Road to the west being elevated approximately 2.5 metres above the site level.

- 1.3 The entire site is identified within the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan as safeguarded employment land whilst land running along the southern boundary is the safeguarded route of the Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal.
- 1.4 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of all the existing buildings on site facilitating a mixed use redevelopment of the site comprising the following:
- 2,235 sq.m. B1 office/light industrial
 - 2,537 sq.m. B2 general industrial
 - 2,537 sq.m. B8 storage and distribution
 - 660 sq. m. retail comprising 400 sq. m. bulky goods, 200sq. m. convenience store, 60 sq m other retail
 - 70 sq. m. A3 – Café
 - residential units comprising 18 one bedroom flats 68 two bedroom flats, 5 three bedroom duplex apartments and 24 four bedroom town houses, 35% of which would be affordable
- 1.5 The application is submitted in outline form with all matters reserved for future consideration except for means of access. In terms of the access, a traffic assessment has been provided with the final design now proposing a new roundabout to serve the site, minor re-alignment of the adjoining highway with traffic flows controlled by way of traffic lights north of the railway bridge and south of the site junction.
- 1.6 Although only the principle of the development and access is detailed at this stage, a comprehensive master plan has been provided illustrating the likely layout of the site along with the general scales, siting and heights of development. Generally, residential development is located along the southern side of the site with the commercial units and retail adjacent the railway line to the north. The commercial development is generally all two storey height with the residential predominantly three storey with some four storey. The application is also accompanied by detailed reports under the following headings: Transport Assessment, Structural Survey, Economic Development Appraisal, Ecological Survey, Flood Risk Assessment, Contaminated Land Report, Acoustic Report, Financial Appraisal, Design and Access Statement, Affordable Housing Report and Section 106 Heads of Terms.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Guidance:

PPS1	-	Delivering Sustainable Development including the supplement on Climate Change
PPS3	-	Housing
PPG4	-	Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms
PPS4 (draft)	-	Planning for Sustainable Economic Development
PPG13	-	Transport
PPS25	-	Development and Flood Risk

2.2 Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands

2.3 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007:

S1	-	Sustainable Development
S2	-	Development Requirements

S3	-	Housing
S4	-	Employment
S5	-	Town Centres and Retail
S6	-	Transport
S8	-	Recreation, Sport and Tourism
S10	-	Waste
S11	-	Community Facilities and Services
DR1	-	Design
DR2	-	Land Use and Activity
DR3	-	Movement
DR4	-	Environment
DR5	-	Planning Obligations
DR6	-	Water Resources
DR7	-	Flood Risk
DR10	-	Contaminated Land
DR13	-	Noise
DR14	-	Lighting
H1	-	Hereford and the Market Towns: Settlement Boundaries and Established Residential Areas
H2	-	Hereford and the Market Towns: Housing Land Allocations
H9	-	Affordable Housing
H13	-	Sustainable Residential Design
H14	-	Re-using Previously Developed Land and Buildings
H15	-	Density
H16	-	Car Parking
H19	-	Open Space Requirements
E5	-	Safeguarding Employment Land and Buildings
E8	-	Design Standards for Employment Sites
TCR1	-	Central Shopping and Commercial Areas
TCR13	-	Local and Neighbourhood Shopping Centres
T1	-	Public Transport Facilities
T6	-	Walking
T7	-	Cycling
T8	-	Road Hierarchy
T11	-	Parking Provision
T13	-	Traffic Management Schemes
T16	-	Access for All
NC1	-	Biodiversity and Development
NC4	-	Sites of Local Importance
RST3	-	Standards for Outdoor Playing and Public Open Space
RST6	-	Countryside Access
RST7	-	Promoted Recreational Routes
RST9	-	Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal
W11	-	Development – Waste Implications
CF2	-	Foul Drainage

2.4 Other Guidance:

Supplementary Planning Document - Planning Obligations

3. Planning History

- 3.1 Extensive planning history exists for the site as a whole dating back to 1966 when original permissions were granted for the use of what was Holmer Tile Works for general industrial purposes. A summary of the more relevant planning history is detailed below:

HP25367	New replacement workshop units. Approved 14 September 1982.
HP26019	New replacement workshop units. Approved 26 April 1983.
HC870344/PF/E	Non food retail use situated at Unit 5, the former slabbing shop. Approved 21 July 1987.
HC920053/PF/E	Change of use from industrial to use for a taxi business. Approved 15 April 1992.
HC930181/SE	Use as breakers yard and sale of second hand spares. Approved 23 July 1993.
CE1999/1351/F	Continued use of land for scaffold business including retention of existing hard surfaces matching kerbs and barriers. Approved 1 July 1999.
CE1999/3278/F	Proposed industrial units for B2 use. Approved 2 February 2000.
CE2004/0199/F	Proposed conversion of house into three dwellings. Approved 24 February 2004.
CE2004/1110/F	Renewal of permission CE1999/3278/F for a proposed industrial unit for B2 use. Approved 19 May 2004.

- 3.2 Various temporary permissions have also been granted for development along the safeguarded route of the canal for the use of this land for the sale of cars. The most recent approval is CE2004/3311/F - continued use of land for car sales including retention of fences and barriers. Temporary permission approved 9 November 2004. This permission has now expired.
- 3.3 The above is not a comprehensive list of all planning applications submitted on the site but is a summary of the more key decisions over the last 20 years or so.

4. Consultation Summary

The comments detailed below are a summary of the final comments of both Statutory Consultees and Internal Council Advice. The full text of final and original or superseded comments can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency:

Flood Risk: The site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low probability) and a Flood Risk Assessment has been provided to demonstrate there is no potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces. We recommend the use of sustainable open drainage systems with green field run-off restriction on impervious surfaces restricted to 10 litres per second per hectare. Drainage options include provision of porous paving for parking areas, cellular storage under the paving or granular storage and soft landscaping. Ultimately there will be a gain in permeable areas as a result of the development which will decrease the existing run-off from the

site. The comments are also made on the basis that the canal is an isolated section of restoration. Further assessment is required if the canal restoration leads to potential water conveyance between watercourses. Clarification as to potential adoption of such drainage may also be required including investigation of private management company.

Contaminated land: The site is situated on a minor aquifer and thus is a sensitive location with respect to the protection of controlled waters. Based on the information contained in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Assessment, we recommended that further leachate testing is undertaken and other site investigation work which can be satisfactorily dealt with by condition. If contaminated soil is to be re-used on site as part of the soil recovery operation, a Waste Management Licence will be required.

Foul Drainage/Pollution Prevention: An acceptable method of foul drainage disposal will be connection to the foul sewer as proposed (subject to capacity). Further consideration is also required as to how the canal will be filled to maintain the water supply to ensure general water quality is maintained. The site must be drained by separate system of foul and water drainage.

Resource Efficiency: In line with the annexed Planning Policy Statement on Planning and Climate Change, we recommend water efficiency techniques and other measures to reduce energy consumption are incorporated into the development. We recommend that development meets Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and a BREEAM standard of 'Very Good' as a minimum.

4.2 Welsh Water:

No objection subject to condition requiring foul and surface water discharges to drain separately from the site, submission of a comprehensive integrated drainage scheme and the provision of suitable grease traps to prevent entry of any contaminants into the public sewerage system. Also, no development must be sited within 3 metres either side of the public sewer.

Welsh Water also confirm that adequate capacity exists within the waste and water treatment works and adequate water supply exists to serve the development.

4.3 Network Rail:

No objection in principle subject to the following measures being accommodated to ensure the safe operation of the railway line.

- Erection of 1.8 metre high trespass resistant fence along the boundary with the railway line.
- Provision of safety barriers adjacent to roads, turning and parking areas adjoining the railway line.
- No drainage discharge or soakaways within 10 metres of the railway line.
- No excavations near railway embankment.
- Siting of all buildings a minimum of 2 metres from the boundary of the fence with the railway line.
- Design of buildings should take account of possible effect of noise and vibration and the generation of airborne dust from the railway line.
- Any lighting should not conflict with railway signalling.
- No new planting should not encroach onto the railway line.

- All demolition and construction work should be carried out in accordance with agreed Method Statement where they exist close to the railway line.

4.4 National Grid:

A high pressure gas main runs adjacent to the site. The Institute of Gas Engineers recommends that no habitable buildings should be constructed within 14 metres of the pipeline. Further advice should be sought from the Health & Safety Executive who may specify a greater distance than this.

4.5 Advantage West Midlands:

The Agency expresses general support for this comprehensive mixed use scheme which has the potential to deliver a development in accordance with regional economic interest. It offers the opportunity to improve employment levels and regenerate a significant brownfield site that will enhance the Holmer area.

A range of land uses are proposed and the Agency particularly supports the new employment floor space which can boost the local economy through job creation and investment. The business uses will create additional jobs upon completion in addition to a considerable amount of employment during the construction phases. This accords with the fundamental aims of the West Midlands Economic Strategy and particularly Pillar 3 - creating conditions for growth. This pillar supports the degree of good quality sites and buildings to create conditions for economic growth.

The proposal integrates opportunities for local people to have improved accessibility to jobs and the improved access arrangements will enable better transport infrastructure and support the principle of equal access to employment.

It is also noteworthy that the proposal includes the reopening of a section of disused canal to catalyse the regeneration of the area and contribute to creating high quality environment for commercial purposes. Support is primarily focussed on job creation and the investment improvements the development can deliver. Significant merits are identified in the proposed office facilities which can provide new accommodation for displaced businesses from Edgar Street Grid. This is particularly important due to the considerable demand but limited availability for employment land to facilitate re-location. Accordingly, the Agency would wish to see these elements retained and prioritised in subsequent phases of the development.

Given the application is generally regarded as a positive use of the land in economic terms in the context of the West Midlands Economic Strategy, the Agency welcomes the scheme in principle and the associated significant job creation potential.

4.6 Herefordshire Nature Trust: No comments received.

4.7 Midlands Architecture and Designed Environment: No comments received.

Internal Council Advice

4.8 Traffic Manager:

As part of the Transport Assessment the Applicant has modelled the development to copy the existing and proposed traffic movements. The developer has also added the development trips from the permitted developments for 300 houses off the A4103, Roman Road, North West of the site and 80 houses off Venn's Lane to his model. The

Transport Assessment deems the proposal to have minimal impact in terms of extra traffic movements on the network which we accept and also the impact of permitted developments are also considered minimal.

For this development to work, the Traffic Lights at the Venn's Lane / College Road junction, Traffic Lights at the Bridge and the access to the development will need to be managed, to do this the lights will be synchronised together with the Trading Estate exit managed during peak times by Traffic Lights, (part time) this will keep priority with College Road avoid stacking over the mini roundabout. Between the Trading Estate and the traffic lights is the start end of the 30mph speed limit, this will need to be changed to extend the 30mph to beyond the Bridge, to Roman Road, this will require a TRO and consultation with our Transportation Department to be implemented at a budget cost of £6,000 which the developer will fund in addition to the Section 106 contributions.

The site has previous accidents as listed in the Transport Assessment, 2 are at the access to the Trading Estate, one of which involves a cyclist. The proposals will improve the situation by improved signing, a mini roundabout, a new toucan crossing and Traffic Light controls for the bridge. We are also securing contributions from the developer towards improved cycle and pedestrian links. The proposed development would also result in a reduction in the number of HGV's on the network serving the site which would also improve safety.

Detailed design for the lay-out is not part of this application but the design will be to our design guide and the parking ratios will be to Herefordshire Council's parking standards for the proposed employment use and a residential parking ratio of around 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling. The final parking requirements can also be linked into the Travel Plan which has been conditioned. The Travel Plan will promote alternatives to single occupancy car use such as car share and alternative travel modes such as walking, cycling and Public Transport.

The developer is providing footway cycle link to Wessington Drive which will link up to the C1127, a new toucan Crossing on the C1127 is proposed as part of the improved cycle footway.

The internal lay-out has yet to be designed in detail, the link road from the C1127 to the housing will be constructed to adoptable standards and a Section 38 agreement entered into to adopt the road, the spur to the Industrial section of the development will remain unadopted.

No objection subject to conditions and S106 contributions towards localised highway improvements and enhancement of sustainable transport infrastructure. The Section 278 works must be completed prior to occupation of the development site.

4.9 Public Rights of Way Manager:

The development would not appear to affect Public Footpath HER11 which leaves College Road heading west across public open space. However, there appears to be no provision for a safe pedestrian crossing over College Road to access the public footpath and the open space. The visibility for pedestrians to cross safely here is very restricted, especially for people that cannot walk quickly. The nature of the traffic servicing industrial areas means some traffic is proceeding in great haste. Any new pedestrian cycle routes within the site should be brought up to adoptable standards.

4.10 Minerals & Waste Officer:

The application is not affected by any mineral consultation zones and there is therefore no policy objection in this respect.

Other general comments are as follows:

1. The development has potential for significant ground engineering works being required. A written statement is required to identify how waste is to be reused on site or disposed of elsewhere. Policy W11 of the UDP is particularly relevant in this regard.
2. Development should be required to demonstrate how waste reduction/re-use is to be incorporated through the construction and post completion.

4.11 Strategic Housing:

Strategic Housing will be seeking 35% of development to be designated as affordable housing which equates to 44 units.

Strategic Housing have been in negotiations with the developer and are seeking a mix of one and two bedroom apartments and four bedroom houses, exact details of bedroom sizes e.t.c to be decided. We also accept the 50/50 tenure split between rented and shared ownership. All the affordable units must be built to Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards and lifetime homes.

4.12 Children and Young People's Directorate:

The educational facilities provided for this development site are North Hereford City Early Years, Broadlands Primary School, St Xavier's RC Primary School, Aylestone Business and Enterprise College and Hereford City Youth Service.

The Childcare Sufficiency Assessment highlights deficiencies in the North Hereford City area childcare provision.

Broadlands Primary School has a planned admission number of 60. As at the Spring Census 2008 the school had surplus capacity in all year groups.

St Francis Xavier's RC Primary School has a planned admission number of 30. As at the Spring Census 2008, all year groups have 2 or fewer spare places.

Aylestone Business and Enterprise College has a planned admission number of 250. As at the Spring Census 2008 the school surplus capacity in all year groups.

The youth service within Hereford City is based at Close House which is a voluntary sector organisation. It has been identified that they require a new central city property in order to expand the range of activities they can offer.

Approximately 1% of the population are affected by special educational needs and as such the Children and Young People's Directorate will allocate a proportion of the monies received for Primary, Secondary and Post 16 education to schools within the special educational needs sector.

The Children & Young People's Directorate would therefore be looking for a contribution to be made towards Children and Young People in this area that would go

towards provision of new or enhancement of existing educational infrastructure at North Hereford City Early Years, St Xavier's Primary School, Hereford City Youth Service and Special Education Needs in the city. No contribution is sought towards the schools where capacity exists.

4.13 Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager (Pollution & Contamination):

I refer to the Phase I & II Geo-environmental Assessment Report - Holmer Trading Estate, College Road Hereford prepared by Clarkebond, Ref EB00668/1, dated April 2007 and various telephone conversations and emails from the developer and the environmental consultant. I would make the following comments in relation to the above application.

I also refer to my previous comments in my memo to you on the 13th July 2007 in which I outlined a number of concerns. Some of these issues have now been clarified.

The developer has undertaken a Phase 1 and 2 site investigation. The investigation found tile waste associated with the former Victoria Tile Works within the infilled canal. The tile waste has recorded high levels of lead. The development proposal includes opening up the former canal, therefore removing the waste from the canal. The site investigation also identified contamination on the development site including some areas of hydrocarbon contamination. At the moment the developers preferred option is reuse the material from the canal on the development site, therefore a suitable remediation scheme is required to ensure that the site will be made suitable for use.

The report has indicated potential remediation methods for developing the site however at this stage further investigation of the site is still necessary before remediation options can be considered in detail.

Once the investigation work has been completed a detailed feasible remediation option appraisal of remedial methods will need to be undertaken by the developer to identify the "best option" or combination of remediation options in terms of dealing with the contamination and also the practical issues on the site (phasing of remediation and site constraints). Some of this work may include treatability studies on the canal waste if chemical stabilisation of the soils is being considered.

The proposed development is quite complex in terms of contaminated land remediation however it is considered that there is sufficient information to allow the outline permission to be conditioned. It should be noted that a lot more detailed information will be required to be submitted with any reserved matters application.

4.14 Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager (Noise & Odour):

I have had opportunity to consider the supplementary information as regards noise provided in response to the issues I raised about the original noise assessment.

These issues and concerns have generally been addressed. The proposal to have some residential accommodation at 25m from the fans at Cavanaghs is still of some concern. It is proposed that these would be single aspect and that they would provide a noise barrier to the rest of the site, and with appropriate noise insulation measures including acoustically treated ventilation an acceptable level of noise within the dwellings should be achieved. I understand that it is not proposed to provide gardens for these properties. Nevertheless, it would in my opinion be better if all proposed dwellings were located behind this barrier which should be formed by commercial premises only.

As I stated in my initial response I do not have an objection to the principal of this development, however if permission is granted conditions should be attached to reflect those suggested by the noise consultant in paragraph 5 of the supplementary noise information (additional noise survey, restrictions on hours of use, delivery access, and noise exposure restrictions). I would comment that the noise survey proposed by condition 1 would have to be undertaken on more than one 24hr period and would have to be done when the noise from Cavanaghs fans was not present. To achieve the rating level proposed by condition 2 individual levels for every industrial/commercial unit will need to be set, and if the dwellings forming part of the noise barrier are included in the final plan, the scheme proposed by condition 3 should include noise from Cavanaghs. In addition conditions restricting hours of work and deliveries should also be included.

The proposals have subsequently been amended to address the above concerns regarding the proximity of residential to existing employment uses.

4.15 Drainage Engineer:

No adverse comments regarding land drainage.

4.16 Parks, Countryside & Leisure Development Manager:

These comments have been revised to take account the revised master plan and mix of residential development.

Based on the 2001 Census and average occupancy rates for house sizes the population for this development is 235.3 persons. Using existing UDP policy RST3 and 2.8 ha per 1000 population, this development would be required to provide 0.65 ha of open space. This equates to 0.38 ha Outdoor sport, 0.18 ha children's play area and 0.09 ha public open space.

The 0.8433 ha provided on site equates to 0.699 ha of canal, 0.047 Green space and 0.097 of "highways" verge open space at the entrance. The entrance open space is not considered "usable" amenity space, therefore its contribution is taken out of the overall amount. The canal restoration is seen as a beneficial contribution towards amenity green space and in particular natural and semi natural green space which is seen as a shortfall in the city. Therefore the total area of "usable" open space is 0.74 ha. This meets the public open space requirements of policy H19. A more detailed landscaping scheme should be provided in order to calculate any future maintenance contributions should the on site open space be adopted by the Council.

However, to fully meet the criteria of policy H19 a formal outdoor sports area and a NEAP standard play area are required from developments of 60+ dwellings. A formal outdoor sports area cannot practically be provided on site and as agreed previously, an off-site contribution is sought to be used at Aylestone Park. A development of this size would normally be expected to provide play areas for young children and teenagers and outdoor sports facilities for adults. Evidence from the emerging audit undertaken for PPG17 open space assessment has identified that in this part of the city, there are deficiencies in the amount of community accessible outdoor sports provision. An off-site contribution is therefore also sought to address this deficiency.

4.17 Economic Regeneration Manager:

Background Points

1. The application site is clearly an established Employment site with somewhere between 20 and 25 businesses operating from the estate. The business uses within the site are varied with elements of B1, B2 and B8 uses.
2. The estate is well located for the trunk road network being approx 300 metres from the A4103 Hereford to Worcester Road although it is noted that access onto the A4103 is via a skew bridge over the railway.
3. The site infrastructure is of variable quality with poorly maintained internal service roads being a feature of the estate. Build quality is also varied, with units generally of average to poor quality and I would agree with the applicants structural engineering consultant that "few appear to have useful or reasonable improvement potential".
4. It is also noted that the structural engineering consultant advises, "many of the buildings are on the point or beyond the point of becoming uninsurable because of their condition and history".

Relocation of Existing Businesses

5. Despite the above points the site is currently a viable business location for those businesses on the estate, and contributes to meeting the demand in the north of the city for lower quality employment units. It is noted that this situation may change over time with the further deterioration of the estate buildings.
6. Additionally it appears that 11 businesses, employing a total of 25 people, will have to relocate from the site prior to redevelopment taking place. Whilst it is realized that the current owner of the site has no obligation to assist businesses to relocate off the site, redevelopment of the estate will displace some currently successful businesses, with resulting uncertainty over future location and viability.
7. This is a regrettable situation and one that will be the cause of great concern and stress to the affected businesses, but the applicant has assured officers that they and their agent have entered into negotiations with other landowners across the city in an effort to secure alternative sites for some of the businesses not being offered a unit within the redevelopment.
8. I would ideally like to see written evidence from all businesses whom the applicant states are staying on site confirming that they are indeed staying on site and have provisionally agreed a unit location and Heads of Terms.

ESG Business Relocations

9. It is noted that a number of the employment units within the development (amounting to approximately 3,000 sqm) have been provisionally offered to businesses already located within the site with the possibility of some bespoke units being created for specific businesses.
10. Following on from the above point, it is noted that the applicant has formally offered ESG Herefordshire Ltd the first right of refusal for the remaining circa 4,000 sq m of employment units, and have indicated a willingness to include this

as a part of the Heads of Terms for the site S106. Providing a sensible solution can be negotiated through this S106 this may assist in the meeting of demand for employment space created by the ESG redevelopment.

11. In terms of obtaining some certainty for businesses within the ESG area moving onto the application site, I would expect, within the S106, that ESG businesses are offered competitive rental levels and that these are fixed for 3 years, in line with the terms offered to existing site businesses.
12. I believe that negotiations within the S106 should cover the award of an exclusivity period to ESG for the facilitation of agreements for ESG businesses to lease premises within the development. The length and terms of this exclusivity award should be considered within the S106 negotiations.

Hereford to Gloucester Canal

13. From a wider regeneration point of view, it is noted that as a part of the development the Hereford to Gloucester canal will be reinstated within the site boundaries. This will directly assist in the restoration of the canal within Hereford and will link into the reinstatement by Herefordshire Council of the canal at Aylestone Park and may provide further momentum for the reinstatement of the canal into the ESG site and any basin subsequently constructed on the site.
14. The reinstatement of the Hereford to Gloucester canal will provide a regeneration benefit to the towns and villages along its length through tourism and leisure activities. The ESG Masterplan states that a canal basin will be constructed within the ESG site providing a focal point to the Urban Village development and uplifting value along the waterfront. It is understood that the canal trust has already secured S106 contributions and ownerships between the ESG site and the application site. Should the application be approved this will provide a substantial element of reinstated canal within Hereford city.

Draft PPS4

15. The submitted application is for a mixed-use development with Housing, a small element of retail, and employment uses within the development. It should be borne in mind that Draft PPS4 advocates a flexible approach in planning for sustainable economic development, which monitors and responds to changing economic trends and market signals. For example, the draft guidance recommends setting criteria-based policy, and promoting mixed-use developments.
16. Additionally Draft PPS4 encourages local planning authorities to adopt a constructive but balanced approach to proposals for economic development, taking account of longer-term benefits to local and regional economies.

Employment Land Provision

17. Pressure on existing employment land will increase with the likely relocation of businesses from the Edgar Street Grid site. Currently (26 March 2008) there exists 161,833 sq ft of Industrial Units and 62,454 sq ft of office space vacant within Hereford City located north of the River Wye. This amounts to 2.083 ha of vacant units and office space.

18. It is estimated that the total requirement is for 4 hectares of employment land for the relocation of businesses from the Edgar Street Grid. (Figure taken from a Private and confidential report undertaken by DTZ Pleda for AWM and Herefordshire Council, titled Relocation of Businesses within the Edgar Street Grid, May 2005.)
19. Additionally it is understood that the majority of occupiers being relocated will want to remain close to the city centre, or to be relocated to established employment sites north of the River Wye.
20. It is understood that this application will decrease the overall amount of employment land within the City in terms of actual land area and employment land allocations. As demonstrated above this reduction comes at a time when employment land allocations and development opportunities are undersupplied in Hereford north of the River Wye.
21. The applicant states that the actual level of employment floorspace within the development site will remain approximately the same, due to the construction of the new units and revised layout. It is noted that in part this is due to the construction of mezzanine floors. In practical terms this may work for some businesses but it is considered that it is highly unlikely that all mezzanine floorspace will be taken up.
22. As a consequence it is felt that the full amount of floorspace as indicated within the application is unlikely to be developed out and that, to get an amount of floorspace equal to that currently in existence, more employment floorspace may need to be included within the application.
23. Balanced against the above, the site, although an employment land allocation, is not in one of the best locations within the city to attract new, higher value employment uses as access to the trunk road network is via a skew bridge, it does not have a large and visible frontage, and is located off a secondary road. Whilst this site may suit local businesses currently in similar locations, such as Station Trading Estate, that need to relocate due to the ESG development, it is not anticipated that it will be attractive to businesses relocating off very active frontages, such as Widemarsh Street or Edgar Street.

Concluding Remarks

24. It is considered that should this application not be approved then the existing estate will function similar to current use, with little or no investment into the employment unit provision. The site will continue in the short term to provide a supply of poorer quality units in a poor quality landscape. Whilst there is a need for this type of unit there is little doubt that a more efficient use of the site could be implemented should the necessary investment be made.
25. It is considered that there is little prospect of this investment being generated for a solely employment land development due to the investment needed in the site clearance, infrastructure and remediation. It is also considered that should the site be redeveloped solely for employment purposes a contribution to the reinstatement of the Hereford to Gloucester canal would be unlikely.

26. Therefore it is my opinion that the potential relocation of approximately 10 businesses and the protection of the employment land that would be lost to the housing and retail elements of this development is outweighed by the following:

- Construction of circa 7,000 sq m of new employment units across the B1, B2, and B8 categories complete with new infrastructure and potential for bespoke units to be created.
- The offering of approx 4,000 sq m of these units (for a period to be determined through S106) to the ESG Herefordshire Ltd to be offered to businesses needed to relocate off the ESG site.
- The reinstatement of an element of the Hereford to Gloucester canal possibly facilitating the future enhancement of further elements of the canal especially in linking into the ESG site.

As a consequence I support the application subject to further negotiation within the S106 regarding the offering of units to ESG Herefordshire Ltd, and subject to a review of employment floorspace requirements and the use of mezzanines.

Subsequent to these comments, the proposals have been further amended to increase the employment floorspace by another 800 sq metres at the expense of ten residential units.

4.18 Conservation Manager (Ecology):

I have received a summary report of the latest ecological surveys (April/May 2008) and visited the site again. A single full ecological report should be submitted as there are currently three separate reports.

It would appear that the weather conditions during the first survey this year (on 30/04/2008) were too cold for bat activity. I note that common pipistrelle bats were recorded emerging from the canal tunnel during the second survey and that there is also potential for roosting in the adjacent trees. Pipistrelle bats were also recorded roosting in the building in the NE of the site during the previous survey season. Mitigation measures for loss of roosting sites will need to be submitted prior to development.

I am concerned about the impact upon the canal tunnel entrance as a result of the new road layout. There is an oak tree in this wooded area that should be retained. Any trees that are to be felled, in particular those that are covered in ivy, will need to be inspected and surveyed immediately prior to felling, as there are opportunities for occasional roosting by bats. The canal tunnel should not be made accessible until measures to avoid impact upon bats have been submitted and implemented as approved.

As this is an outline application, I recommend the inclusion of conditions requiring the submission of a full working method statement regarding the nature conservation interest of the site and a scheme of habitat management and enhancement to be submitted prior to the commencement of any development.

4.19 Forward Planning Manager:

After reviewing our comments and in light of changes to the application additional comments should be noted. The application is still contrary to policy E5 where it stipulates that the loss of employment land and premises to non-employment uses will

generally be resisted. However, it is shown that there could be wider regeneration benefits to the area in terms of restoration of the canal and subsequent linkages that could be formed between this site and ESG through the development of canal basin. Within this current application it is shown that there is an increase in employment floorspace to that which is currently available on the site, however there are still concerns that some of this floorspace is on a mezzanine level and the practicality issues in industrial units. There would be improvements to the quality of the employment land and the current proposal has reduced the number of houses in the scheme. It has also been noted that the applicant has now included 35% affordable housing units in the scheme, as requested in policy H9, which was a concern raised in our previous comments last year. I also note that there is an improvement to the retail provision, raised in the previous comments, and that the scheme now shows to accommodate the existing retail businesses that are currently on site and there will be a considerable reduction in the overall retail floorspace on the site.

If planning permission is granted we would have concerns that they would develop the housing element of the scheme prior to the employment units and therefore suggest that a planning condition would be incorporated to ensure that the employment floorspace element is developed at an early stage of the proposal.

5. Representations

5.1 Hereford City Council:

The City Council does not endorse the plan as it stands and has a number of concerns that need further enquiry. Members would like to know more about proposed alterations to the highway and any impact on Roman Road. The loss of employment land is a concern coming as it does with the proposed reduction of employment land on the nearby Edgar Street Grid. Possible loss of starter units for local businesses is a serious concern with impact beyond this site. In the event of housing being approved then affordable housing is essential especially three and four bedroom family accommodation.

5.2 Edgar Street Grid Herefordshire Limited:

Further to recent discussions in respect of the evolution of the mixed use scheme at the Holmer Trading Estate, ESG's formal position with the benefit of the more up to date information now available is as follows:

ESG, as a matter of principle, is supportive of imaginative, comprehensive redevelopment proposals in the city which contribute positively to its future prosperity but in this case, the fundamental issue relates to the potentially adverse impact on employment land supply inherent within this scheme. As you are aware ESG, in partnership with Herefordshire Council and Advantage West Midlands, is committed to, and working hard to secure opportunities for businesses affected by the regeneration of ESG and as such is always extremely concerned to ensure that currently safeguarded employment land is not lost to other uses.

This said, it is fully appreciated that this is a mixed use scheme that seeks to deliver an equivalent amount of B1, B2 and B8 floor space as is currently provided in outdated units on the existing site and as such does present a potentially beneficial redevelopment so far as the relocation of ESG businesses is concerned.

However in order to be entirely satisfied of the benefits the following matters would need to be addressed by the applicant:-

- (a) it would need to be proven that the applicant had undertaken an analysis of ESG businesses and their suitability for the format of units being delivered at the Holmer site. We are currently experiencing major difficulties with relocation because of the retail orientated/sui-generis nature of many of the businesses and it has not been demonstrated how these might be accommodated at Holmer.
- (b) Furthermore there does not appear to be any evidence of interest from existing ESG businesses keen to relocate to Holmer and it would be of some comfort to see such evidence.
- (c) Finally on this issue, it is understood that the surplus floor space not taken up by existing businesses at Holmer Trading Estate would be made available to ESG businesses. This offer is welcomed but with the caveat that to consider withdrawing our objection we would need to be assured of how much floor space would be available, the mechanism for restricting occupation to ESG businesses and a timescale for the delivery of suitable available units from Summer 2010 onwards when the construction of the Link Road is programmed to start. On this latter issue how long would the applicant be prepared to commit to in order to secure a relocation?

At this stage, whilst ESG appreciates the other benefits accruing from this proposal, not least the restoration of a significant length of the canal alongside the site, it remains cautious in respect of the broader strategic impact associated with the development of this safeguarded employment site and in the absence of assurances in respect of the comments set out above, we are not in a position to retract our objection but would welcome deliverable assurances in the areas highlighted above with a view to possibly doing so.

5.3 Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Trust:

We cannot stress enough how critical this application is for the future restoration of the canal. From the very beginning, landowners and their team have sought to work closely with the Canal Trust to deliver restoration of the canal and produce an acceptably high quality development to make this stretch a showpiece from the regeneration of the canal within the City of Hereford. Without this development the restoration of the canal within the city will be severely delayed as it is unlikely that the Council will fund the necessary 1.2 million to secure the restoration of the site. The development will also provide for long term maintenance and management income to ensure the Canal Trust can maintain and manage the canal within this site, the section within Aylestone Park and the tunnel adjoining the site.

The applicants have made a clear attempt to retain existing businesses on site through offering an option lease agreement for new units. The square footage for employment space remains the same in the new development as the existing with a considerable reduction in retail space compared to that applying to existing consents. It is only with the residential element that the redevelopment of the canal is viable. The scheme makes the most of the canal corridor and seeks to fully integrate the restored canal into the scheme. The residential element provides clear overlooking of the canal corridor achieving an element of security and self policing to ensure a high quality built environment is maintained.

The canal will provide a significant drainage resource for the ESG site and this development will see a significant section of the required canal restored and made available for drainage at no cost to ESG or the Council. In addition, the new employment space on the site that has not been taken by existing tenants has been offered to ESG for their use in the relocation of tenants.

In conclusion, we must strongly support the application subject to completion of a tripartite Section 106 Agreement. This will be a showpiece of what can be achieved when public, private and voluntary sectors work together to create an economic tourism and leisure resource for the whole county. The Agreement should clearly outline the specification for the restoration to include stone facing to the retaining walls and appropriate lighting, annual index linked payments from all proposed residential and business units towards the future maintenance and management of the canal and the de-silting of the canal tunnel along with its freehold transfer to the Trust. The Trust cannot accept the canal without these works being undertaken.

5.4 Sixteen letters of objection have been received largely from existing businesses on site. The main points raised are:

- Approval of the development will lead to closure of our business and subsequent loss of jobs also affecting other businesses in the supply chain.
- Cannot afford the likely rent in the new business units.
- There is already a lack of suitable business units and sites north of the river within the city. It will be difficult to find another appropriate site to relocate if we are displaced from the site at significant financial costs and with no compensation paid.
- The proposed business units all being two storey are totally unsuitable for many of the business needs of existing businesses on site.
- Although the estate is lacking in investment in recent years, businesses operate as a consortium and help provide small business unit which are the life blood of the county's economy.
- The three storey town houses will directly overlook neighbouring properties and their gardens, particularly now existing vegetation and trees have been removed alongside the route of the canal.
- The location of the proposed footbridge may result in the congregation of antisocial behaviour.
- One of Herefordshire Council's statements is "Putting People First Providing For the Communities". However this application will not take account of this statement.
- A number of businesses have recently expanded to larger units on the site at considerable expense.
- Adequate parking for staff and customers is currently available and this will not be the case with the proposed development.
- The site has been designated as an employment site since the Victoria Tile Works manufactured there in 1878.
- The mixed use redevelopment will further reduce employment land north of the river which will be at a premium with the Edgar Street Grid plans.
- The proposed development site will largely be catering for bigger business with more capital to spend pushing small family run businesses out of the county.
- The proposed development will lead to an overall increase in traffic which is already a problem in the locality.
- The site is heavily contaminated from historic and more recent uses including cement asbestos, radio active material, oils, battery acid and remnants of the tile works.

- The introduction of housing next to the established and proposed industrial units which operate 24 hours a day could generate noise complaints for employers.

Subsequent to negotiations between the applicants and the businesses, four businesses have now formally withdrawn their objections as they have been offered units as part of the redevelopment. These being Franks Luxury Biscuits, J. Mayo-Evans & Son, The Patio Centre and Herico Art and Office Supplies.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 The proposal is for mixed-use redevelopment of this brownfield employment site to create new B1, B2 and B8 floor space, new retail units and 115 residential units along with the construction of a new vehicular access and restoration of the section of the canal adjoining the site. The proposed development is complex, both in terms of constraints arising from the existing site and the nature and mix of uses comprising the proposed development. The following issues are considered to be the key considerations in the assessment of the application.

1. Economic Development Considerations
2. Highway Issues
3. Environmental Considerations (Contamination and Noise)
4. Illustrative Layout and amenity
5. Restoration of Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal
6. Other Matters including S106
7. Conclusion

Economic Development Considerations

6.2 The site is identified within the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007 (UDP) as a safeguarded employment site. Policy E5 of the UDP states that proposals which result in the loss of existing, permitted or proposed employment land and buildings to non-employment uses will only be permitted where:

- i. There will be substantial benefits to residential or other amenity in allowing alternative forms of development, and the site or premises concerned can be shown to be unsuitable for other employment uses including consideration of mitigation measures. Where such proposals are permitted, an alternative site should be found for the relocation of any existing businesses, or
- ii. In the case of proposals incorporating elements of retail use, this is restricted to a minor or incidental activity associated with an otherwise acceptable Part B or other employment generating use.

6.3 Excluding the land occupied by the canal, 40% of the site is proposed to be redeveloped with non-employment uses, namely residential. Therefore, as a matter of fact the development will lead to the loss of safeguarded employment land. There may be minor benefits for the amenity of local residents arising from the removal of existing industrial activities away from localised housing although the existing activities on the site have not historically caused complaints to be made to the extent that any statutory nuisance has been demonstrated. In terms of other amenity considerations, there will

clearly be a visual enhancement of the site with the restoration of the canal and construction of a high quality mixed use development. However, it is not considered that the proposed mixed use development would provide sufficient benefits to residential or other amenity justifying the non employment development of the site.

- 6.4 The site is also not considered unsuitable for employment purposes. A number of the existing buildings on site whilst remaining structurally sound, are in relatively poor condition and are coming to the end of their useful commercial life. The application is accompanied by a structural engineer's report, which provides an overview of the condition of the buildings. The conclusion of the report is that "all the buildings are well beyond their economic useful life, with the exception of two modern buildings, few appear to have useful or reasonable improvement potential." The conclusions of this report are not disputed although the fact that the buildings are all still used for employment purposes would suggest that a viable employment use can be maintained providing they remain structural. However, the applicant also advises that they are now experiencing increasing difficulties gaining insurance for the buildings and site as a whole due to the quality, condition and security of the buildings. Notwithstanding these issues, it is recognised that the majority of the buildings and site would benefit from investment to create modern, fit for purpose employment units.
- 6.5 The third part of Policy E5 relates to businesses being relocated to alternative sites. This is discussed in more detail at paragraph 6.10-6.12. Therefore, the site will result in the loss of employment land, there are no significant benefits to residential or other amenity arising from the proposal and the site is not unsuitable for employment purposes either in its present or redeveloped form. The proposed development does not therefore accord with the requirements of Policy E5, which seeks to safeguard established employment sites. It now falls to consider the other employment considerations.
- 6.6 In terms of employment land supply, the Inspector's report following the UDP Inquiry identified that there was an over supply of employment land across the city and county as a whole. Therefore in purely quantitative terms, taken across the county and based on figures contained in the Council's annual economic monitoring report, there is no need to safeguard the site in its entirety for employment purposes. However, whilst there may be adequate provision of land over the lifetime of the UDP, there are issues in the city regarding the quality and deliverability of some of the employment land. For example, much of the largest allocation in the city within the Rotherwas area is currently restricted by flooding and therefore until the flood risk is removed or mitigated, much of the land in Rotherwas cannot be developed. Furthermore, there is a general shortage of accessible employment land north of the river within the city although if the search area is extended, Moreton-on-Lugg Business Park contains large areas of undeveloped safeguarded employment land albeit restricted to light industrial and storage (B1 and B8).
- 6.7 The development plan including the Regional Spatial Strategy seeks to ensure that sufficient employment land and buildings are available to meet differing employment needs in location, size, quality and ownership. As of May 2008, there exists 133,559 sq ft (12,407 sq M) of Industrial Units and 67,314 sq ft (6253 sq M) of office space vacant within Hereford City located north of the River Wye. This amounts to 1.866 ha of vacant units and office space. In addition, a further 1.74 ha of vacant employment land at Faraday Road. These figures may appear reasonably high and ordinarily, this amount of floorspace/land is likely to be adequate for the lifetime of the UDP. However, it is estimated that around 4 hectares of employment land will be required for

re-location of businesses from the Edgar Street Grid (ESG). The majority of these business wish to remain as close as possible to the city centre and their existing sites, i.e. north of the river but within the city. Notwithstanding the over supply of employment land generally, there is still therefore a need for employment land and floorspace within this part of the city. This conclusion was also reinforced by an appeal on Faraday Road in May 2007 where the Inspector concluded that the undeveloped employment land should be safeguarded, notwithstanding that adequate supply of land existed overall, and its development would be contrary to Policy E5 of the UDP. Notably, however, the Inspector did not consider that site was essential to the deliverability of ESG.

- 6.8 The development is therefore contrary to policy E5 of the UDP and additional employment land/floorspace is/will be required over the next five years or so. Therefore to enable the principle of a mixed use development to be established, the viability of the site being developed entirely for employment purposes must firstly be considered. The applicants have provided information including details of construction costs prepared by a quantity surveyor to demonstrate that the development of the site for a mixed use incorporating residential is the only viable option. Figures have been provided for the costs associated with the development of the site entirely for employment purposes and the associated likely profit margins. It is accepted based on the information provided that the site is subject to a number of development constraints which will significantly increase the construction costs, namely high levels of contamination, the works associated to renovate the canal, new access arrangements and poor ground stability necessitating piling works throughout the site.
- 6.9 The likely rental yields from the employment floor space have been confirmed as being accurate but the construction cost figures have not been independently scrutinised. Based on the information provided, the re-development of the site for employment including the canal and new access works would make a loss of 3.8 million. However, figures have been provided on the basis that the restoration of the canal is undertaken with both options. It is questionable whether the canal would be an essential element of the development if the site were redeveloped entirely for employment purposes. This may well affect the viability of an alternative proposal particularly if there were a further increase in the B1 floorspace. Even revising the figures in this manner, the re-development for employment purposes is likely to be at best, marginally profitable and more realistically, still make a loss. Therefore, on the basis of the information provided, the full re-development of the site for employment purposes is unlikely to be viable and therefore the need for residential development, in viability terms is accepted.
- 6.10 In terms of the impact on existing businesses, at the time of the submission of the application, the site accommodated 39 businesses covering a multitude of uses and services including those associated with the vehicle trade (car sales, dismantling, scrap, repair, tyre sales, MoT centres, taxi services), food operations (biscuit manufacturing, site café and food distribution), general storage uses, general manufacturing including carpentry and steel fabrication and retail sales such as sofas, kitchen and bathroom equipment and office supplies. As of April 2008, of the 39 businesses, 16 have found alternative premises and have now vacated the site, 7 have confirmed a commitment to remain on site in the new units and 3 others have been offered new units but have not taken up the offer to date. This leaves up to 13 businesses that would be forced to relocate as a result of the development. Some of these business have been offered new units on site but have expressed a desire to relocate elsewhere and the applicants have sourced possible sites at Rotherwas for two

other businesses and two are even considering retiring. All existing tenants are on six or twelve month rolling tenancies and most are paying considerably below current market rates.

- 6.11 Since the submission of the application, the applicants have taken significant steps to try and accommodate as many businesses as possible within the redeveloped units. Of the 10 businesses (equating to 47 jobs) that have expressed a wish to remain on site, 7 have now signed formal tenancy agreements with rents frozen at the current low rates for 3 years and bespoke designed units to accommodate their specific business requirements. Similar offers have been made to other businesses but not all have chosen to sign the agreements as yet. This is a clear and legally binding commitment by the applicants to accommodate as many existing businesses as possible on the new development and negotiations are ongoing to accommodate the needs of other existing businesses.
- 6.12 Notwithstanding the efforts made by the applicants, there are still businesses that would be displaced by the proposal with the potential for a loss of jobs. However, this situation would obviously exist regardless of the format of any re-development. The purpose of the employment policies within the UDP is ultimately to safeguard but also create new employment opportunities. The new floorspace to be created would create more jobs due partly to the increase in B1 floorspace and the more efficient use of the. In quantum terms, based upon local employment densities, it is estimated that between 200 and 210 jobs will be retained and created on site. This is a significant increase over the existing and historical situation on site.
- 6.13 As it currently stands based on the number of business presently to be accommodated within the new units if permission is approved, around 4,000 sq. metres (43,000 sq. ft) of new employment floor space would be available for rent or purchase. To assist in the pressures arising from business displaced from ESG the applicants are also offering as much of the surplus floor space as is required to ESG. This would be incorporated into a Section 106 Agreement including a period of exclusivity for ESG business, the phasing of construction and fixed rental levels for up to three years. This is a significant contribution and would assist in the deliverability of the elements of ESG.
- 6.14 There is an increase in the overall floor space proposed compared with the existing situation. This is largely achieved by a higher density of development with all the new buildings being in two storey form. A number of objectors have expressed concerns regarding the format of the new floor space with it all proposed to be in two storey form. To address the concerns of business to be retained on site, units are being designed to their specific needs including the provision of lift access where necessary. The proposed units will also be of varying sizes and available for lease or freehold purchase providing flexibility in terms of their format, tenure and affordability to meet the needs of a diverse economy.
- 6.15 In terms of the retail provision, planning permission was granted in the mid 80's for unrestricted A1 floor space and the retail provision now proposed as part of this development is considerably less than currently exists or is permitted. A reduction in the retail floor space on site is welcomed as the Council would generally be seeking the site to be safeguarded for B1, B2 and B8 uses with any retail being directed to city centre or other allocated bulky goods out of centre locations.

- 6.16 More specifically, the retail provision proposed as part of the development is essentially to accommodate two existing retail businesses on site, one being a cafe. In addition, a local convenience store is proposed to serve the site and the wider community (200 sq.m.). A brief retail assessment has been provided to establish the need and impact of providing a convenience store on site. Whilst the northern part of Hereford City is generally well provided for with local shopping centres and convenience stores, no such provision exists in the locality and therefore there is considered to be scope for a small convenience store, particularly given the increase in localised population arising from this development, developments at the Blind College and the development to the north of Roman Road. As such the principle of the convenience store of the size proposed is also accepted.
- 6.17 Overall the employment considerations are finely balanced. The conclusions on which are detailed at para 6.38.

Highway Issues

- 6.18 The highway network in the immediate locality of the site is generally substandard both in terms of the access into the site and restrictions arising from the nearby bridge over the railway line. A detailed Traffic Assessment has been provided to look at a number of options and the final access design has now been agreed with the Traffic Manager. The final design proposes the construction a new vehicular access into the site via a new roundabout on College Road. To facilitate this, a section of College Road between the bridge and south of the site is to be straightened and widened to create clear visibility for the roundabout. In addition, traffic signals are proposed on College Road and into the site to assist in the operation of the roundabout and to restrict vehicular traffic over the bridge to one way. This then enables the construction of a new footway from the site over the bridge to connect to the existing footways to the north. A new pedestrian/cycle toucan crossing will also be provided on College Road south of the new roundabout. This will address the concerns of the Public Rights of Way Officer and ensure a safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclist travelling to and from Aylestone Park. A footbridge across the canal is also proposed to link the site with the wider cycle network. New traffic lights would be programmed into existing traffic lights on the College Road/Venns Lane junction to ensure there is no backup of traffic.
- 6.19 The final design is considered to be the safest option for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists to facilitate not only the provision of safe access into the site but significant highway improvements along College Road. Section 106 contributions towards additional highway works including possible improvements to the College Road/Venns Lane junction have also been agreed.
- 6.20 The traffic assessment provided also examines capacity of the local highway network to accommodate the likely increase in vehicular movements associated with the development. The development being an established employment site already generates a high level of vehicle movements and the additional development will inevitably increase trip rates to and from the site. The traffic assessment looks at the impact of the development alongside other permitted or proposed developments including 300 houses north of Roman Road and developments at the Blind College and the Traffic Manager is satisfied that the local highway network has capacity with the improvements proposed to accommodate the development.

6.21 Parking provision to serve both the residential and the employment has been increased to achieve an average of 1.4 spaces for the residential element, some of which will be provided through under ground parking. This is considered acceptable, particularly given the majority of the units are two bedroom properties and is in line with Policy H16 of the Unitary Development Plan which sets a maximum provision of 1.5 spaces per dwelling with no minimum provision. Secure cycle and mobility buggy parking could also be achieved by condition. Additional Section 106 contributions will be sought to facilitate further off-site pedestrian and cycle links in the locality to increase the accessibility and sustainability of the site. The Traffic Manager is also satisfied that the parking provision associated with employment units is acceptable and in line with the guidance in Herefordshire Council's Highway Design Guide. If permission is approved, the applicants are also proposing two travel plans associated with the business and residential elements to further encourage alternative modes of transport and minimise general vehicular use. In general, the access design and other highway issues are now considered acceptable.

Environmental Considerations (Contamination & Noise)

6.22 A Geo-technical Survey has been carried out which has revealed that parts of the site are highly contaminated. In particular, the canal itself contains high levels of lead and high levels of hydrocarbons have been found elsewhere. Further survey work has been undertaken and the Environmental Health (Pollution) Officer is now satisfied that any risks can be mitigated through appropriate conditions. In the interests of waste minimisation, the applicants are proposing to utilise some of the less hazardous material in the construction process under the less sensitive areas such as roads and parking areas. Overall, the risk from contaminants within the site has been satisfactorily evaluated and is considered acceptable.

6.23 A detailed acoustic report has also been carried out to establish the potential impact of existing sources of noise arising from the railway line, localised businesses adjoining the site and road traffic noise on the proposed new development. Predicated noise levels have also been provided for the proposed business units along with the likely impact of existing and proposed noise sources on the amenity of future occupants of the proposed residential development.

6.24 Based on the illustrative masterplan, the noisier activities are all located adjacent to the railway line with the residential element located along the southern boundary closest to existing residential development at Wessington Drive. The plans have been further amended to remove all proposed residential development away from the existing business (Cavanaghs) in favour of further B1 floorspace. The proximity of the residential development to commercial uses as identified on the illustrative masterplan is a minor concern but the format of the proposed development and mix of uses is not uncommon with modern mixed use developments. Furthermore, it is possible to attenuate against noise in the design and construction of the buildings and impose enforceable conditions given the proposal is for a complete re-development. The Environmental Health Manager is satisfied that subject to conditions regarding the appropriate design of residential and business units and controls over hours of operation, noise emissions delivery times etc. the impact of any noise can be satisfactorily mitigated and controlled.

Illustrative Layout and Amenity.

- 6.25 A masterplan has been provided which illustrates the possible layout of the site. Whilst this is for illustrative purposes only, it gives a relatively clear indication as to how the site could be developed and compatibility of the different land uses. The development proposes a single point of access off College Road serving employment and retail units along the northern boundary adjoining the railway line leading through to existing industrial units beyond (Cavanaghs) with residential to the south adjoining the canal. A relatively strong frontage is proposed along the canal with a mixture of three and four storey height and varying massing and designs. Parking is generally in the form of parking courts or undercroft parking with some on plot parking to serve the four bedroom units. No residential is proposed adjoining existing employment sites and the noisier B2 uses are located in the northeast corner of the site furthest away from proposed residential development. With the exception of the canal, little public open space and no play or sports provision is proposed within the development. This is acceptable in principle subject to appropriate off-site provision secured through a Section 106 Agreement particularly as the site adjoins Aylestone Park where such facilities will be available. Scope nevertheless exists for some soft landscaping and this is also illustrated on the masterplan.
- 6.26 The principal elevations of the proposed high density residential along the southern boundary with the canal will have an outlook in a southerly direction across to Wessington Drive. This will inevitably increase the extent of overlooking of existing properties and their gardens. This impact was minimal until recently when all of the existing trees and vegetation adjoining the southern boundary of the site were removed/cut back. The result of which is that the site is now more exposed than previously was the case. It is therefore understandable that local residents have concerns about the development and the resultant loss of privacy. However, based on the illustrative masterplan, a distance of 46 metres exists between the proposed development and existing dwellings, which significantly exceeds the generally accepted minimum property-to-property standards of 21 metres. The proposed three/four storey height of the development will clearly exacerbate the degree of overlooking but it is not considered that the impact is sufficient to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds.
- 6.27 Although the development is high density, the layout illustrated on the masterplan would result in a high quality environment facilitating both the residential and commercial uses to coincide and achieve a successful mixed use development. This is subject to a high quality design being achieved as advocated by Planning Policy Statements one and three.

Restoration of the Canal

- 6.28 Running along the entire southern boundary of the site is the former Herefordshire and Gloucester Canal which is safeguarded by virtue of Policy RST9 of the Unitary Development Plan. The proposal includes the restoration of the canal including removal of the contaminated waste which has been deposited within the canal and its full restoration to enable its future use possibly even as a navigatable resource in the future. The applicant will also undertake ancillary works including a canal towpath both sides and natural stone faced retaining walls. This would then be transferred freehold to the canal trust upon completion of the works. The applicants also own the adjoining section of the canal tunnel running from under College Road through to Old School Lane and this also is proposed to be transferred freehold to Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Trust if the development is permitted. There are considerable costs associated with the restoration of the canal due to the quantity of material that

will need to be removed and the fact that much of it is contaminated. Financial information has been provided which identifies the cost of excavation and restoration of the canal including construction of a new footbridge across the canal is around £1.4 million.

- 6.29 The strategic aim for the canal trust is to restore the entire section from Hereford to Gloucester. Some sections have already been restored. This is undoubtedly a significant recreation, tourism and economic asset for the city creating wider regeneration benefits for the county as whole. The canal basin is also an integral part of the ESG providing a focal point for the development of the urban village. This development will facilitate the restoration of possibly the most costly section of the canal throughout the whole city creating the catalyst for the restoration for remaining sections. It is unlikely that this section of canal will be restored unless funded on the back of a development incorporating an element of residential. The canal will also provide an attractive waterside feature for occupants of future properties and generally enhance the local environment. The section of canal will also link into the recently excavated section within Aylestone Park immediately east of the site with proposed new pedestrian and cycle links to run alongside and linking to Aylestone Park.
- 6.30 The canal is considered to be an essential component of a mixed-use development of the site. The canal may also be required as part of the wider drainage strategy for the development of the Edgar Street Grid to enable sufficient sustainable urban drainage discharge capacity. However, the development of this drainage strategy is in its infancy and it is not clear to what extent the canal will be required for this purpose therefore it cannot be stated that this is essential. The restoration of the canal is nevertheless a positive outcome of the development to which appropriate weight must be attributed when determining this proposal.

Other Matters including S106

- 6.31 The proposal comprises 115 residential units comprising 18 one beds, 68 two beds, 5 three bed duplex apartments, 16 four bed town houses and 8 four bed town houses with garages. The mix of house sizes reflects the high density nature of the development but the mix is considered acceptable, particularly as the majority are two bedroom or larger thereby meeting the needs of couples or small families as well as single people.
- 6.32 35% of the total number of residential units will be affordable with a tenure mix of 50% rented and 50% shared ownership. Strategic Housing would normally seek a higher percentage of rented accommodation and this was the original request. However, due to the high development costs, it is considered that a 50/50 split is a reasonable mix and will achieve a sustainable residential community whilst also meeting an identified need for affordable housing. The development will also make a significant contribution to the brownfield windfall housing targets within the UDP over the Plan period up until 2011.
- 6.33 The site falls within Flood Zone 1, this being the lowest category of risk. The Environment Agency raises no objection and is furthermore satisfied that conditions can be imposed to ensure the development does not increase flood risk elsewhere due to surface water discharge. Welsh Water have confirmed that foul drainage capacity exists.

- 6.34 An Ecological Survey has been undertaken to establish the biodiversity interest on site. Surveys for protected species, in particular reptiles and bats have also been undertaken last year with refresher surveys April and May this year. The outcome of the further survey work has been evaluated by the Councils ecologist who is satisfied that the ecological interest of the site can be satisfactorily mitigated. There is also scope for biodiversity enhancement through the restored section of canal and within adjoining land at Aylestone Park and the Section 106 Heads of Terms includes a contribution towards such works and planting to compensate for any loss of biodiversity as a result of the development.
- 6.35 Although the application was submitted in May 2007, given the passage of time since submission and the recent adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Planning Obligations, it is now considered appropriate to re-evaluate the impact of the development against the SPD. The S106 Heads of Terms appended to this report reflects the requirements of the SPD and the applicants have now agreed to the Heads of Terms.
- 6.36 The transportation contribution is based on the increase in trip rates arising when compared to the existing situation, the education contribution is based on an evaluation of capacity in the various categories of education from pre-school through to youth provision and the contribution towards off site play and sports facilities is assessed against the requirements of policy H19 of the UDP. Other contributions are in line with the requirements of the SPD or have been negotiated with the developer.
- 6.37 The applicants have also confirmed that the housing development will meet a minimum of Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. In addition, it is considered appropriate that the employment development achieves a higher environmental standard and therefore, this also will be required to satisfy a BREEAM standard of 'Very Good'. These measures will significantly increase the energy efficiency of the houses and employment units and assist in reducing the overall carbon footprint of the development. In terms of waste, the applicants are also to investigate measures to minimise waste both during construction and after occupation including on site recycling facilities to serve the residential and employment units. A site Waste Management Plan will also be required.

Conclusion

- 6.38 The development achieves a number of positive economic, residential, social and environmental benefits in line with the policies and objectives of the Unitary Development Plan and regional guidance within the Regional Spatial Strategy. The applicants have also gone to some lengths to address the key concerns from consultees with nearly all now having been resolved.
- 6.39 The proposal is nevertheless contrary to policy E5 of the UDP in that there would be a loss of safeguarded employment land north of the River Wye within the city where there is an increasing demand. This demand being further exacerbated over the next 3 years by displaced businesses from ESG. The development may also lead to a loss of some jobs as a result of existing businesses having to be relocated. The various components of this application must therefore be evaluated individually and collectively to assess whether, in this particular instance, there is justification to recommend approval of an application which is contrary to a specific adopted policy.

- 6.40 In this regard, the comments of the Economic Development Manager are particularly relevant. The conclusion being that the impact on existing business and loss of employment land is outweighed by the new employment floorspace that is created and resultant jobs including that which will be made available for displaced business off ESG and the benefits in restoring the canal.
- 6.41 Beyond this it is considered the needs of existing business have been accommodated by the applicants as far as possible through offering new units with rents frozen for three years at current rates. There would inevitably be some displacement of business with the consequential risk of a loss of jobs whether the site is developed entirely or in part for employment purposes. It is considered that this impact has been minimised subject to the re-location process within the site being appropriately phased and managed. The proposal will also create high quality business units of a bespoke design where required and modern flexible business units elsewhere. The provision for displaced business from ESG is also a material consideration in favour of the application. The quality and format of units that will be created would be unique to the city and potentially provide new employment opportunities particularly within the B1 use category which includes research, development and other high tech industries. The new floorspace and job creation will therefore offset the impact on existing business not remaining on site.
- 6.42 Alongside this are the wider regeneration benefits of restoring the canal and the subsequent linkages that could be formed between this site and ESG through the development of the canal basin. The abnormally high development costs are also accepted which effectively preclude the viability of developing the site entirely for employment purposes. With this in mind it is considered the right balance is achieved between employment and housing including the mix within each category and will create a mixed sustainable community as advocated by Planning Policy Statement 1.
- 6.43 The proposal will also deliver additional housing in a sustainable location creating additional employment opportunities potentially for occupants of the new development. 40 mixed tenure affordable units will also be created assisting in reducing the significant deficit in affordable housing across the city. There will also be significant localised highway improvements creating a safer environment for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Further transportation, sport and recreation, education and general community infrastructure improvements will be delivered through the S106 contributions.
- 6.44 On balance, considering all the above and the unique constraints and opportunities arising from this site and proposal, notwithstanding the conflict with policy E5 of the UDP, the mixed use re-development of the site is supported.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to complete a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act in accordance with the Heads of Terms appended to this report and any additional matters and terms he considers appropriate.

Conditions

Due to the scale and complexity of the development, the wording of the conditions is yet to be discussed and agreed with the applicants. However, conditions will be included to cover the following:

- Standard outline conditions regarding the commencement and submission of reserved matters details
- Phasing of the development to ensure the majority of the employment floorspace is developed out in the earlier phases
- Access and internal road construction and parking
- A residential and commercial travel plan
- Off site highway works
- Tree surveys and protection
- Hard and soft landscaping including biodiversity enhancement and long term maintenance and management
- Foul and surface water drainage strategy
- Ground decontamination and remediation strategy
- Details of levels, boundary treatments, materials, lighting
- Waste/recycling management
- Restriction on the number of residential units to a maximum of 115 and a requirement for a minimum amount of employment floorspace within each use category
- Restriction on construction times
- Restriction of hours of use and delivery/collection times for new employment floorspace
- Noise attenuation measures within the design and construction of the commercial floorspace
- Environmental and construction standards for the residential (Code for Sustainable Homes assessment) and commercial (BREEAM assessment)
- Removal of permitted development rights for the residential and business units


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2007/1655/O

SCALE : 1 : 2500

SITE ADDRESS : Holmer Trading Estate, College Road, Hereford, HR1 1JS

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

HEADS OF TERMS

Section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Planning Application - DCCE2007/1655/O

This Heads of Terms has been re-assessed against the adopted Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations dated 1 April 2008

Mixed use development comprising 115 residential units incorporating 35% affordable (18 one beds, 68 two beds, 5 three beds apartments & 24 4 bed houses) B1 office 2235 sq. M, B2 general industrial 2538 sq M, B8 Storage units 2538 sq M, comparison and convenience retail 660 sq. M.

At Holmer Trading Estate, College Road, Hereford.

1. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council, in lieu of a deficit in the provision of play, sport and recreation facilities on site to serve the development to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £140,976 (contribution based around the requirements of policy H19 of the UDP). The money shall be used by Herefordshire Council for further play, sport and recreational facilities at Aylestone Park. An additional contribution to cover the 15 year maintenance cost of any on and off site open space, play sport and recreation facilities will be required in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document.
2. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £155,316 to provide enhanced educational infrastructure at North Hereford City Early Years, St Xavier's Primary School, Hereford City Youth Service and Barrs Court Special School (excludes the other local primary and secondary schools at Broadlands and Aylestone where capacity exists)
3. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council, to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £125,695 for off site highway works and improved sustainable transport infrastructure (excluding that required to facilitate the development i.e. new access arrangements, new toucan crossing, new canal bridge).
4. The monies shall be used by Herefordshire Council at its option for any or all of the following purposes:
 - a) Traffic calming and improved signage
 - b) Traffic Regulations Order(s) to reduce speed limits and impose localised parking restrictions
 - c) Localised junction improvements
 - d) North Hereford Park and Ride
 - e) Contribution to improved bus service
 - f) Contribution to Safe Routes for Schools
 - g) Improved bus shelters/stops in the locality of the application site
 - h) Improve lighting to highway routes leading to the site
 - i) Improved pedestrian and cyclist connectivity with the site
 - j) Improved pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities

5. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council 0.1% of the gross development costs (excluding land values) or £20,000, whichever is the greater to enable the provision of public art both on and off site OR the agreement of a strategy to facilitate the delivery of public art on and off site at no cost to the Council including the cost of 15 years maintenance.
6. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council and Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Trust to enable the full de-contamination and restoration of the section of the Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal which adjoins the length of the application site at no cost to the Council or Canal trust in accordance with a specification to agreed with the Council and Canal Trust. The works to be phased in accordance with a phasing programme to be agreed with the Council and transferred at no charge to the Canal Trust following completion of the works. The transfer shall also include the adjoining canal tunnel. In addition, an annual maintenance charge shall be applied to all dwellings (excluding the affordable) and business premises within the site. The charge shall be £250 per dwelling and a contribution per business unit to be agreed with the Council per annum in perpetuity paid to the Canal Trust to be used toward the cost of future maintenance and management of the canal within Hereford City.
7. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £30,000 towards the cost of constructing a new skatepark facility in Hereford City (north).
8. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £15,000 towards the cost of improvements to localised biodiversity to compensate for the loss of biodiversity on site. The money to be used at Aylestone Park in the first instance or other areas in the locality of the application site.
9. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £13,132 towards the enhancement of existing community services in Hereford City.
10. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £9,720 towards the provision of new or the enhancement of existing waste and recycling facilities in Hereford City (if appropriate provision/facilities are not provided on site)
11. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council an additional administration charge of 2% of the total contributions detailed in this Heads of Terms to be used toward the cost of monitoring and enforcing the Section 106 Agreement.
12. In the event that Herefordshire Council does not for any reason use the said sum of Clauses 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 for the purposes specified in the agreement within 10 years of the date of this agreement, and unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council, the Council shall repay to the developer the said sum or such part thereof, which has not been used by Herefordshire Council.
13. A minimum of 35% of the total number of residential units shall be "Affordable Housing" which meets the criteria set out in Section 5.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for Herefordshire (Revised Deposit Draft) and related policy H9 or any statutory replacement of those criteria and that policy including the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations. 50% of the total affordable shall be made available for rent and 50% shall be made available for shared ownership occupation. None of the Affordable Housing shall be occupied unless Herefordshire Council has given its written agreement to the means of securing the status and use of these units as Affordable Housing. All the affordable housing units shall be completed and made available for occupation prior to the occupation of more than 50% of the general market housing or in accordance with a phasing programme to be agreed in writing with Herefordshire Council.
14. All of the financial contributions shall be Index linked and paid on or before commencement of the development or in accordance with the phasing of the development as agreed in writing with Herefordshire Council.

15. The developer shall pay to the Council on or before the completion of the Agreement, the reasonable legal costs incurred by Herefordshire Council in connection with the preparation and completion of the Agreement.
16. The Section 106 Agreement shall also safeguard the existing business that are to remain on site to include the approximate location of the units, the phasing of their construction, the size and format of the units and the tenure and rents where applicable. The agreed rents shall be fixed for a period of 3 years from the date of the Agreement.
17. A proportion or all of the approved surplus commercial floorspace shall be made available to business displaced from Edgar Street Grid for a fixed period to be agreed with the Council. The approximate location, quantum of floorspace within each use class, phasing of construction, tenure and rents where applicable shall also be incorporated into the S106 Agreement.

Russell Pryce - Principal Planning Officer
25 June 2008

Russell Pryce
Principal Planning Officer
Development Control (Central East)

Planning Services
PO BOX 230
Blueschool House
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB
Tel - 01432 261957
Fax - 01432 261970

6 DCCE2008/0552/F - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL STORAGE TO STORAGE OF NON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS, BUILDING AT MILL FARM, FOWNHOPE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4NT

For: Mr. D. Watkins per Thompsons, Agriculture House, Tillington Road, Hereford, HR4 9QJ

Date Received: 3 March 2008

Ward: Backbury

Grid Ref: 57481, 34727

Expiry Date: 28 April 2008

Local Member: Councillor JE Pemberton

Introduction

This application was deferred at the Central Area Planning Sub-Committee meeting on 14 May 2008 to enable discussion with the agent regarding the nature of the storage use. A site meeting was carried out on 30 May 2008 with the Local Ward Member and the representatives of Parish Council. This report has been updated to reflect the issues that were raised.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site is located to the south-west of the B4224 in open countryside adjacent to both the settlement boundary and conservation area of Fownhope. It also lies within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 1.2 The site currently consists of a steel framed agricultural building and a surrounding hardcore yard area with an existing access to the road. Residential properties are located to the south-east and north-west of the site. To the south-west is an agricultural field.
- 1.3 This application seeks permission for the change of use of the building from agricultural storage to use for storage of non-agricultural products. The proposal would be change of use only and does not involve any external alterations to the building.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Statement

PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007

Policy S1 - Sustainable Development
 Policy S2 - Development Requirements
 Policy S6 - Transport
 Policy DR2 - Land Use and Activity

Policy DR4	-	Environment
Policy E8	-	Design Standards for Employment Sites
Policy E10	-	Employment Proposals within or adjacent to Main Villages
Policy E12	-	Farm Diversification
Policy T8	-	Road Hierarchy
Policy LA1	-	Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy HBA12	-	Re-use of Rural Buildings

3. Planning History

- 3.1 SH911001SZ Building - general agricultural - Allowed 16.09.91
purposes
- SH930025PF Proposed general purpose steel - Refused 02.03.93
portal framed agricultural
extension to existing building

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 No statutory or non-statutory consultations required.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager - no objection.
- 4.3 Public Rights of Way Manager - no objection.
- 4.4 Conservation Manager - no objection.
- 4.5 Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager comments – “The application site is relatively close to residential properties and whilst I do not have any objection to the proposal I would suggest that a condition restricting hours of work might be considered as safeguard to the future amenity of the neighbours. I would propose that delivery vehicle movements to and from the building, the loading and unloading of delivery vehicles and other work outside the store be prohibited after 6pm and before 8am Monday to Friday, after 1pm and before 8am on Saturdays, with no working on Sunday, Bank and Public Holidays.”

5. Representations

- 5.1 Fownhope Parish Council – “recommends that more information is required prior to a decision being made. It was considered that access is dangerous, proposed change of use may increase traffic movements. Noise pollution increase, insufficient parking and turning area without major resurfacing of area adjacent to storage shed being required. Type of storage not specified or detailed. Lack of screening to adjacent properties.”
- 5.2 Four representations have been received from:

Mrs A Barber-Starkey, York House, Lower House Gardens, Fownhope, HR1 4NN
Mr P Morris, Mill House Farm, Fownhope, HR1 4NT
Mr P F Daines, Mill Farm Barn, Fownhope, HR1 4NT

Mrs B Oakley, Deerfield House, Fownhope, HR1 4NN

which raise concerns about additional traffic movement and noise generating activity on this site as well as the types of products to be stored in the building.

- 5.3 In response to concerns raised by neighbours, the agent supplied the following information:

“We do not anticipate that the premises will be used for the storage of deleterious materials (i.e. non deleterious materials only). It is considered that the type of items which could be stored may range from furniture, previously manufactured goods being stored for onward movement to retail outlets, plant and machinery. It is not anticipated that there would be any storage of hazardous substances and a restriction against that would, I think, be acceptable to our clients. It is not proposed that any manufacturing or further treatment of materials would take place at the property. It is not proposed that any storage would be with a view to retail on site and it is not considered that the property will be accessible to general public passing. It is a discreet storage unit and its position and nature tend towards a storage use.”

- 5.4 The agent has confirmed that his client is willing to provide more soft landscaping along the site boundaries in order to minimise its impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring properties. He also confirms that the existing refrigeration unit would be retained.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

- 6.1 Both PPS7 and Unitary Development Plan Policy HBA12 encourage the re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes subject to meeting the requisite criteria. The main issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposed use on the road network, the amenities of local residents and the landscape.
- 6.2 It is clear from the representations received that noise and disturbance relating to the type of use and the number and type of vehicular movements generated by the proposed use are serious concerns associated with this particular use.
- 6.3 With regard to residential amenity, it is noted that the nearest residential property, Deerfield House, is located approximately 45m away from the proposed building. Due to the close proximity there is some concern that the unspecified B8 use may cause harm to the living conditions of the occupier of the neighbouring property. However, the proposed use is a storage and distribution use (B8) for storage purpose. Whilst the agent is unable to specify the nature of storage use, he indicated that the premises will be likely to be used for the storage of furniture, manufactured products, plant and machinery and will not be used for the storage of deleterious materials. Taking into account the proposal is for general storage use only, it would not have any unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property. The Environmental Health Manager has considered the proposal and raises no objection. Should any noise nuisance or disturbance be identified in the future these issues can be effectively controlled under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

- 6.4 In terms of traffic generation, the existing access from the application site enters on to the B4224 which is a secondary distributor road. The existing access is of appropriate design and construction to satisfy the highway requirement. The building was formerly used as a potato store for agricultural purposes where traffic generation would be significantly greater, particularly during the crop season. The Traffic Manager has no objection to the application. It is considered that subject to conditions restricting the delivery hours, the number of traffic movements generated by the proposed use will not be detrimental to highway safety.
- 6.5 The proposed building is set well back and screened from the main road. At present the building is visible from the adjoining neighbouring properties to the south-east and north-west. The agent has acknowledged the concerns expressed by the neighbour and indicated that some landscaping would be provided along the south-east boundary in order to enhance the visual amenity and minimise the effect on the amenity of the neighbouring property. Notwithstanding this, a condition will also be imposed to restrict any goods, plant, material or machinery to be deposited or stored outside the building on the hardcore yard area in order to preserve the rural character and the wider landscape.
- 6.6 In conclusion, and taking all matters raised, it is considered that the proposed B8 use would not be detrimental to the amenity of the nearby residents or the safety of the highway network. The proposal is in accordance with the relevant planning policies and the objective of Government guidance, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal represents an acceptable development.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **F02 (Restriction on hours of delivery).**

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and to comply with Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

3. **F05 (Restriction on hours of use (industrial)).**

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties and to comply with Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. **F06 (Restriction on use).**

Reason: The local planning authority wish to control the specific use of the land/premises, in the interest of local amenity and to comply with Policy DR2 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

5. **No goods, plant, material or machinery shall be deposited or stored outside the application building edged in red on the plan date stamped 3 March 2008.**

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

6. I33 (External lighting).

Reason: To safeguard the character and amenities of the area and to comply with Policy DR14 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

7. I35 (Time limit on floodlighting/external lighting).

Reason: To minimise the impact of the floodlights and to protect the residential amenity of nearby dwellings so as to comply with Policy DR14 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

8. G10 (Landscaping scheme).

Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

9. G11 (Landscaping scheme – implementation).

Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
- 2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/0552/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : Building at Mill Farm, Fownhope, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 4NT

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

7 DCCE2008/1019/F - PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING PROPERTY AT 57 PORTFIELD STREET, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 2SE

**For: Mr. A. Simmonds per Simmonds Mills Architects,
Greenwood Trust, Station Road, Coalbrookdale,
Telford, TF8 7DR**

Date Received: 4 April 2008

Ward: Tupsley

Grid Ref: 51931, 39593

Expiry Date: 30 May 2008

Local Members: Councillors MD Lloyd-Hayes, AP Taylor and WJ Walling

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of extensions and the undertaking of alterations aimed at improving the energy conservation performance of the existing dwelling at No. 57 Portfield Street, Hereford. The site is within a densely developed residential area, bound to the rear by the railway line.
- 1.2 The dwelling is detached, although the proximity to No. 55 and the presence of a lean-to roof over the side passage on the opposite side gives a terraced effect. The supporting statement confirms that the property has remained largely unaltered and unimproved since the original construction date. The overriding aim of the proposal is described as achieving an increase in the habitable area whilst also improving the carbon efficiency of the dwelling by between 70 and 85%. This is to be achieved, in the main through what are described as 'passive design techniques' without reliance upon other methods, arguably less appropriate in a residential environment.
- 1.3 These techniques will manifest themselves externally through the application of between 200 and 300mm thick insulation, which will increase the scale of the dwelling accordingly. For instance, 300mm will be added to its height and forward projection as a result of the additional 'coat' of insulation, which will be applied and finished with painted render. Elsewhere, opportunities are taken to maximise passive solar gain and take advantage of natural light - reducing electricity consumption. To the roadside elevation one will notice the additional height and forward projection, although these will not perhaps be that obvious to the casual passer by.
- 1.4 Most of the operational development is focussed upon the rear of the dwelling. Here, a new two-storey extension is proposed, together with a single-storey, sedum roofed kitchen. The two-storey element would involve the erection of a hall/utility room and WC/utility area at ground floor, with genuine third bedroom and bathroom over. The footprint of the two-storey element is broadly commensurate with the existing lean-to elements at the rear, although the height will increase.
- 1.5 A single-storey kitchen extension is proposed to run parallel to the common boundary to No. 59 at a distance of 1.5m. A monopitch construction is proposed, 3.9m tall where it is closest to the neighbour, falling towards No. 55. This would have a sedum roof

covering, as would the roof over the third bedroom. A slate roof is proposed over the first floor bathroom.

- 1.6 The kitchen extension has been redesigned to take account of an objection from the neighbours at No. 59. Previously the extension was designed to project 5 metres beyond the back corner of No. 59 with implications for the provision of light to the neighbour's lounge in particular. The plan has now been amended to remove the portion of the extension that would have breached the 45-degree rule.

2. Policies

- 2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan:

Policy S2	-	Sustainable Development
Policy S2	-	Development Requirements
Policy DR1	-	Design
Policy H18	-	Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

- 3.1 None.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Welsh Water: Recommend an informative note bringing the attention of the applicant to the presence of a public sewer across the application site.
- 4.2 Network Rail: No response.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.3 Traffic Manager: No objection.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council: No objection to plans as originally submitted. Response to amended plans not available at the time of writing.
- 5.2 Two letters of objection have been received from the occupants of No. 59, Portfield Street - the nearest neighbours. The letters have been sent in response to the original and amended proposals. The comments are summarised as follows:
- The proposed kitchen extension would overshadow No. 59's kitchen and living room windows, due to its height, length and proximity. No. 59 is particularly narrow and is not well lit at the present time.
 - The presence of high-level windows would affect privacy.
 - The level of development is obtrusive and out of keeping.
 - There is concern that the covered passage roof will be physically attached to the gable end of No. 59.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 The key issues in the determination of this application are as follows:

- The impact of the extensions upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings;
- The design of the extensions

Residential Amenity

6.2 The key policy in respect of extensions and impact upon residential amenity is policy H18 – Alterations and extensions. Amongst other things this policy requires that extensions should not adversely impact on the privacy and amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential property.

6.3 The impact of the kitchen extension, as originally proposed, upon the amenity of No. 59 was deemed unacceptable. The plans have been amended accordingly. The effect has been to cut the corner off the original plan form in order that the extension now accords with the 45-degree rule commonly used as a means of assessing the impact of extensions upon light provision. It should also be noted that the subject property is to the northwest of No. 59 and the extension would not block direct sunlight.

6.4 The large high-level windows referred to by the neighbours have also been removed from the kitchen, although this will decrease the available passive solar gain. Instead a smaller window is proposed in the form of a cantilevered box window, with the side obscured to guard against direct overlooking of the neighbouring garden.

6.5 The two-storey element would not have obvious implications for the neighbours on either side, because it does not project beyond the rear of the neighbours. In fact, No. 55 has a far larger span, with the effect that the rear wall of the original projects well beyond the subject property.

6.6 The amended plans are now considered acceptable in terms of the impact upon residential amenity.

Design

6.7 As referred to above, the design of the extension has been driven by the desire to make substantial gains in terms of the energy efficiency of the dwelling. The energy performance of the house will be improved by the proposed extensions, but also by the addition of high-levels of insulation to existing external walls and roof, combined with reduced air leakage. New high performance windows are proposed.

6.8 The fundamental appearance of the existing dwelling within the street will not change markedly, other than for a slight projection forward and increase in height where insulation is applied and finished with render. To the rear, away from public vantage points, the new extensions will appear in stark contrast to the traditional frontage. However, as they are to the rear, they will not challenge the overall character of the dwelling when viewed within the street. The juxtaposition of traditional and

contemporary design can often work well and this development is considered to be a case in point and an example of how passive design techniques can be employed in the refurbishment of old properties and in new extensions, simultaneously.

Conclusion

- 6.9 The amended plans demonstrate a significant improvement in terms of the impact upon neighbouring residential property and the proposal is now considered to accord with policies H18 and DR1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **B03 (Amended plans).**

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans and to comply with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

3. **C01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

4. **I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy DR13 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

5. **F15 (No windows in side elevation of extension).**

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

1. **N16 - Welsh Water Informative.**
2. **W02 - Welsh Water rights of access.**
3. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
4. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/1019/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : 57 Portfield Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 2SE

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Mr. E. Thomas on 01432 261961

8 DCCE2008/1360/F - SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS AT 255 ROSS ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 7QJ

**For: Mr. & Mrs. Turner per John Parry Design Limited,
Broadheath, Moreton on Lugg, Hereford,
Herefordshire, HR4 8DQ**

Date Received: 22 May 2008

**Ward: St. Martins &
Hinton**

Grid Ref: 50642, 37996

Expiry Date: 17 July 2008

Local Members: Councillors WU Attfield, ACR Chappell and AT Oliver

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of two-storey side and rear extensions at No. 255 Ross Road, Hereford. The dwelling is a 1930s semi-detached property typical of the wider established residential area. The proposal involves erecting a two-storey extension over the existing driveway to the side of the dwelling, which would extend to the rear to tie in with the line of the existing single-storey kitchen extension. Also proposed is a sunroom extension attached to the rear of the proposed two-storey element. The proposal is a resubmission of application DCCE2007/3228/F, refused owing to design detail and the cumulative impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbour at No. 257.
- 1.2 The proposed two-storey extension would come to within 200mm of the common boundary at the side of the property and measure 10.15 metres from front to back. The extension would incorporate a garage, shower room and utility at ground floor with an enlarged front bedroom, bathroom and dressing room at first floor.
- 1.3 In its basic form the extension is as per that previously refused. The difference is in the detailed design at the front of the dwelling and the boundary treatment at the rear. The extension is now set back from the front of the existing dwelling, fenestration simplified and relief provided within the roofscape. Owing to the narrow span of the extension, the height of the two-storey element is 1.5 metres lower than that over the main body of the original house. The design of the sunroom has also been amended.

2. Policies

2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan:

Policy DR1	-	Design
Policy H18	-	Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

- 3.1 DCCE2007/3228/F Proposed two storey extension to side with sun room to rear. Refused 26 November 2007.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager: Recommends the provision of two parking off-road parking spaces.

5. Representations

5.1 Two letters of objection have been received from the residents of Nos. 253 and 257 Ross Road. The content can be summarised as follows:

- The extensions will cause overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring dwellings.
- The extensions will affect privacy and outlook from adjoining dwellings.
- The noise from construction will be a continuation of the existing situation.
- The extension will not be appropriate in terms of the impact upon the appearance of this traditional 1930s dwelling.
- The extension is not necessary or justifiable.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 The key issues arising from this application are as follows:

- The design of the extensions relative to the existing dwelling and the wider area.
- The impact of the extensions upon the residential amenity of the adjoining dwellings.

Design

6.2 The design of the extension has been altered significantly following refusal of the previous submission. The proposed garage now sits in line with the existing dwelling rather than forward of it. The first floor element is then set back 600mm from the front of the dwelling, with the effect that the ridge height over the extension is lower than that over the main body of the house. Fenestration detail has also been simplified. The combined effect when view from the front of the property, is to reduce the visual impact of the extension and preserve the dominance of the original dwelling in accordance with Policy H18.

6.3 There are examples of two-storey side extensions elsewhere in the vicinity, but these do not display the characteristics referred to above and are not, in the officer's opinion, as appropriate or successful as the current proposal.

6.4 Under the refused application, it was the intention to completely shield the proposed sunroom extension from the neighbour's view. This involved the erection of a wall, 3.5 metres tall at its highest point, reduced in stages further into the garden. The effect of this boundary treatment, allied to the mass of the two-storey extension was considered

to create an unacceptable impact upon the neighbour. This element of the design has been completely reviewed. A flat roof sunroom is proposed, with lantern light. It would be sited away from the common boundary and some form of intervening boundary treatment would be possible. The resultant wall would be 2.65 metres tall and extend 3.3 metres from the rear of the two-storey element. The comparative massing is thus substantially reduced.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

- 6.5 The previous application was refused, in part, for its impact upon the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 257 Ross Road. As referred to above, the key component of this i.e. the wall to shield the sunroom has been removed and the impact upon the neighbour improved as a consequence.
- 6.6 There are existing windows in the flank (north-facing) elevation of No. 257 at ground and first floor. These serve the kitchen, a pantry, a bedroom and upstairs WC. All are frosted. The two-storey side extension will bring the subject property 2.6 metres closer to these windows and the two-storey element projects further to the rear than is currently the case. There will be an undeniable change in the relationship between the two dwellings. However, these windows are north facing, obscure glazed and not the sole providers of light to habitable rooms. The proposed extension will not have any direct consequence for the provision of daylight to these windows. Given the orientation of the dwellings, shadow cast over the drive to the north-side of No. 257 is in fact already caused by No. 257 itself and not attributable to the proposed extensions at No. 255. The impact of the proposal upon the outlook from these windows is immaterial.
- 6.7 No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the extensions proposed and a condition is recommended to ensure that this remains the case. Given the proximity to neighbours, a further condition restricting hours of construction is considered appropriate.

Conclusion

- 6.8 The proposal is now considered to successfully address the previous concerns over the design. Principally, the original building will now be more identifiable as the dominant feature. The revisions to the sunroom and omission of the previously proposed rear boundary wall improve the impact upon the neighbour to the extent that the application is now recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. C01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 3. **I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy DR13 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 4. **F16 (No new windows in specified elevation) (south).**

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 5. **H10 (Parking - single house).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. **N03 - Adjoining property rights.**
- 2. **HN05 - Works within the highway.**
- 3. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
- 4. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/1360/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : 255 Ross Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 7QJ

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

9 DCCE2008/0626/F - PROPOSED NEW 3 STOREY DETACHED CLASSROOM BLOCK ADJACENT TO SPORTS FIELD TOWARDS EAST OF CAMPUS (REAR) AT HEREFORD SIXTH FORM COLLEGE, FOLLY LANE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1LU

For: Hereford Sixth Form College per James Morris Associates, 23 Bridge Street, Leominster, HR6 8DU

Date Received: 6 March 2008 Ward: Aylestone Grid Ref: 52240, 40707
Expiry Date: 1 May 2008

Local Members: Councillors NL Vaughan and DB Wilcox

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a three-storey classroom block on land at the eastern edge of the Sixth Form College site, where the existing car park meets the playing fields. The classroom accommodation would partly be in replacement of the four existing mobile units stationed both within the car park and upon the playing fields.
- 1.2 The proposal would also see alterations to the existing car park configuration, with the result that the new layout would provide an additional 16 parking spaces for staff (78 to 94).
- 1.3 To the rear of the proposed classroom building it is proposed to locate 3 tennis courts in substitution for those existing to the rear of the Tupsley Youth Centre.
- 1.4 The classroom building would accommodate a total of 6 classrooms over the ground and first floors, with an open plan layout at 2nd floor giving a larger space for examination purposes.

2. Policies

2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007:

Policy S2	-	Development Requirements
Policy S7	-	Natural and Historic Heritage
Policy DR1	-	Design
Policy DR2	-	Land Use and Activity
Policy DR3	-	Movement
Policy H16	-	Car Parking
Policy T7	-	Cycling
Policy T11	-	Parking Provision
Policy T12	-	Existing Parking Areas
Policy T14	-	School Travel
Policy NC5	-	European and Nationally Protected Species

3. Planning History

- 3.1 DCCE2004/0475/O: Partial redevelopment of College Campus to provide new learning village (application for outline permission including master plan). Approved 12 August 2005.
- 3.2 DCCE2005/0507/F: Redevelopment of learning resource block with a new workshop building and seminar block with associated landscaping and car parking, Herefordshire College of Technology. Approved 17 May 2005.
- 3.3 DCCE2005/3360/RM: Demolition of existing teaching blocks and redevelopment of college campus to provide new learning village (Phase 2) at Hereford College of Technology. Approved 17 January 2006.
- 3.4 DCCE2006/1604/RM: Redevelopment of existing HCT campus to provide refurbished learning centre, new build workshop and skills centre, new build teaching block, additional car parking and enhanced public realm (Amendments to DCCE2005/0507/F & DCCE2005/3360/RM). Approved 15 August 2006
- 3.5 DCCE2007/0684/RM: Proposed pedestrian cycle and highways access to new college facilities and associated highway works at Herefordshire College of Technology. Approved 30 July 2007.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Sport England: No objection

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Conservation Manger: No objection
- 4.3 Parks, Countryside and Leisure Development Manager: No objection, although the future of the existing tennis courts is queried.
- 4.4 Traffic Manager: "The original combined application for the 3 colleges as a learning village had an overall parking assessment as part of the submission, but now the colleges have split the assessment is different. A combined travel plan as part of the original consent is still to be signed off."

5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council: No objection.
- 5.2 An objection has been received from North Tupsley Action Group (N-TAG). The objection is based upon the displacement of vehicles during the construction associated with the completion of the learning village and the alternative provision as indicated on the block plan. N-TAG understands parking to be prohibited on this area with the effect that additional pressure will be brought to bear on parking provision within Whittern Way. N-TAG resolves to object to any future college development until

the colleges consult with the local community and build the requisite number of spaces into their plans.

5.3 One letter of objection has been received from Mr RA Creswell, 'Strathmoor', 2 Aylestone Grange, Hereford, HR1 1GZ. The content can be summarised as follows:

- A wildlife pool adjacent to the site hosts the Great Crested Newt. Building works may affect the breeding program of this protected species.
- The water supply to the pool is unknown, but could be affected by the proposal, with ramifications for the well being of the newts.
- Increased surface water will have difficulty in draining due to the local clay soil, as evidenced by problems within the objector's garden after heavy rainfall.
- The scale of building will be very prominent in its context.
- There is a potential threat to trees and the playing fields.

5.4 A letter of support and clarification has been received from the Sixth Form College Principal. The content is summarised as follows:

- The proposed new building is not intended to accommodate an increase in student numbers, but to replaces inadequate, temporary accommodation;
- Studies demonstrate that the Sixth Form 'cohort' will fall by at least 16% by 2013. The new building is intended to improve facilities and is not predicated on future growth nor will it attract additional students;
- The College provides transport for students and discourages driving. £250,000 is spent each year on providing bus/rail travel and parking is for staff only;
- The College was recently inspected and graded 'Outstanding' in all aspects. The report did, however, comment upon the poor temporary accommodation and recommended its urgent replacement.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 The key issues in the determination of this application are as follows:

- The impact of the proposal upon the current level of parking provision at the college;
- The scale, design and appearance of the building in its context.

Parking Provision

6.2 The original 'learning village' master plan referred to the three college campuses as a single entity. Subsequent to the grant of outline planning permission the Technical College has chosen to progress to the Reserved Matters stage and redevelopment is now ongoing. The master plan resulted in an increase in parking numbers across the

campuses to 650 spaces. The vast majority of this provision was intended on Technical College land and is unaffected by the proposal at the Sixth Form.

- 6.3 The main Sixth Form car park to the east of the campus accommodates 78 spaces. It is College policy to prohibit on site parking for students. The existing and proposed parking is for staff only and a permit scheme is in operation. Although the proposed building occupies a proportion of the existing spaces, the proposed rationalisation, including the removal of two of the existing mobile classrooms, would result in an increase in parking within this car park from 78 to 94 spaces.
- 6.4 Against this, Policy T11 (Parking provision) of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007 states that parking provision will be "restricted as a maximum to that which is justifiably required". Regard should be had to the proximity to alternative provision, availability of alternative modes of transport, the type and design of the development and any agreement to provide alternative arrangements for travel within the context of developing a workplace travel plan.
- 6.5 The College, in partnership with the local authority, provides financial incentive for students to use bus and rail. As described above, students are not permitted to park on the Sixth Form campus. There exists good access to alternative modes of transport – both bus and railway stations are within walking distance. It should also be borne in mind that a proportion of the Sixth Form students are not old enough to drive. However, and despite this, there is an evident problem with college commuter demand for parking in nearby residential areas. The combined colleges are still working together on a travel plan. This will outline additional measures to promote alternatives to private car use.
- 6.6 The College asserts that the development is not linked to or dependent upon an increase in student numbers and it is described that roll numbers are in fact in decline. It is predicted that the 'cohort' will fall by 16% in the next 5 years, which should in turn alleviate the parking problems in the wider area. Whether or not this transpires, the development proposed increases staff parking by a further 16 spaces.
- 6.7 In view of the declining role numbers and the fact that the development increases parking on site it is concluded that the development proposed would not add to the existing parking problems identified by the local residents' group. Against the policy context, which speaks of setting maximum rather than minimum parking provision, it would be unreasonable to withhold permission on the grounds of inadequate parking provision being made.

Design and scale

- 6.8 The proposed building would be located a short distance to the southeast of the existing sports hall. It is three-storey with a curved roof intended to maximise northern light, but reduce solar gain through south facing windows. In plan form it is significantly smaller than the sports hall and the workshop buildings at the College of Technology. It will not be dominant in terms of height when viewed against recent developments at the adjoining campus and I consider the design appropriate.
- 6.9 The building would be over 90 metres from the nearest dwelling in Aylestone Grange and would not adversely affect residential amenity.

Other issues

- 6.10 Concern has been expressed at the potential impact of development upon the habitat of Great Crested Newts. The Council's ecologist has confirmed that the threat to the habitat is negligible, largely due to the type and characteristics of the intervening area - a car park.

Conclusion

- 6.11 The development would improve the standard of classroom provision at the Sixth Form by allowing removal of the existing sub-standard provision, identified as an area for improvement in the recently published Ofsted report.
- 6.12 The development would not increase the propensity for student parking within nearby residential areas and would in fact increase the existing parking provision for staff from 78 to 94 spaces.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **C01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

3. **G10 (Landscaping scheme).**

Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. **H13 (Access, turning area and parking).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

5. **H27 (Parking for site operatives).**

Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

6. **H29 (Secure covered cycle parking provision).**

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for secure cycle accommodation within the application site, encouraging alternative modes of

transport in accordance with both local and national planning policy and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

7. H30 (Travel plans).

Reason: In order to ensure that the development is carried out in combination with a scheme aimed at promoting the use of a range of sustainable transport initiatives and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.
- 2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/0626/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : Hereford Sixth Form College, Folly Lane, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1LU

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

10 DCCE2008/1321/F - CHANGE OF USE UNDER CURRENT PLANNING CONSENT APPROVAL (REF: DCCE2007/1763/F) OF LANDLORDS OFFICE/STORE INTO A STUDIO APARTMENT (APARTMENT 7) AT 7 AYLESTONE HILL, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1HR

For: Dr. D. Loraine per Mr. A.W. Morris, BSc, ARICS, ACIOB, 20 Ferndale Road, Kings Acre Road, Hereford, HR4 0RW

Date Received: 19 May 2008

Ward: Aylestone

Grid Ref: 51748, 40470

Expiry Date: 14 July 2008

Local Members: Councillors NL Vaughan and DB Wilcox

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application relates to No. 7 Aylestone Hill, one of a row of eight late Victorian villas located at the foot of Aylestone Hill between the junctions with Barrs Court and Penn Grove Road. The site lies within the Aylestone Hill Conservation Area.
- 1.2 Permission was granted under reference DCCE2007/1763/F for the subdivision of the ground and first floors, which together with the basement creates 6 self-contained apartments. A condition was imposed to prevent the residential use of the landlord's office/store, located at the rear of the first floor. The application seeks to remove this condition and allow the landlord's office/store to become the 7th self contained apartment.
- 1.3 As per the existing approval, it is intended that future occupants would not be eligible for residents' parking permits.

2. Policies

2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007:

Policy S1	-	Sustainable Development
Policy S2	-	Development Requirements
Policy S3	-	Housing
Policy S6	-	Transport
Policy DR2	-	Land Use and Activity
Policy DR3	-	Movement
Policy DR5	-	Planning Obligations
Policy H1	-	Hereford and the Market Towns: Settlement Boundaries and the Established Residential Areas
Policy H13	-	Sustainable Residential Design
Policy H16	-	Car Parking
Policy H17	-	Sub-division of Existing Housing

Policy HBA6 - New Development Within Conservation Areas

3. Planning History

- 3.1 DCCE2007/1763/F: Extension and conversion of three existing apartments into 6 self contained studio apartments: Approved at Central Area Planning Sub-Committee 1 August 2007.
- 3.2 DCCE2008/1312/F: Installation of 2 high level windows to right hand elevation ground floor: Undetermined at time of writing.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None required

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Private Sector Housing Manager: No objection, but would query the proximity of the kitchen to the means of escape.
- 4.3 Building Control Manager: No objection.
- 4.4 Conservation Manager: No objection
- 4.5 Traffic Manager: No objection subject to the completion of a legal agreement removing the entitlement to residents' parking permits and a s.106 contribution in line with the Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council: "(Recommend) that the application be refused as the development is too small to be a viable living area."
- 5.2 One letter of representation has been received from Mrs R.D. Chesson, 9 Aylestone Hill, Hereford. The content is summarised as follows:
1. Concern is expressed at potential parking problems.
 2. Concern is expressed that the development is over-intensive and that the property will be over-populated.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

- 6.1 The key considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:
1. The principle of an additional self-contained apartment in this location;
 2. An assessment of the standard of accommodation provided having due regard to Policy H17.

- 6.2 Policy H17 of the Unitary Development Plan promotes the sub-division of existing housing subject to a number of factors. These include appropriate car parking, a satisfactory level of accommodation and no undue adverse impact upon the property and its curtilage, the amenity and privacy of neighbouring dwellings and the amenity and general character of the area.
- 6.3 The landlord's office/store was originally proposed as a self-contained apartment under the former application, but was withdrawn from consideration owing to concern at its suitability.
- 6.4 The unit is modest in terms of the habitable space it affords and would realistically only support a single occupant. It provides open plan living, dining and sleeping accommodation with separate bathroom/WC and kitchenette. The gross internal floor area is 17m². The Housing Act requires a minimum floor area of 13m² (140 square feet) for single room apartments with cooking facilities. The unit satisfies this requirement. Accordingly, there would appear to be no basis upon which to question the adequacy of the internal layout and standard of accommodation and the Private Sector Housing and Building Control Managers have no objection. In addition, this unit benefits from two large windows and is thus better ventilated and lit than some of the units already approved.
- 6.5 The Traffic Manager advises that the location is appropriate for a car-free development as already established by the previous approval. This assessment is based on the proximity to the city centre and the type of accommodation proposed – one-bed apartments are less likely to attract car owners. £1,465 is sought towards sustainable transport initiatives in line with the Supplementary Planning Document.
- 6.6 The legal agreement acting to prevent future occupants from becoming eligible for local residents' parking permits is still being worked upon, but would become effective against the proposed seventh apartment too.
- 6.7 It is concluded that the accommodation, albeit small, is not markedly different to that already approved and in some respects would prove superior. The proposal is thus considered to accord with Policy H17 and is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **B07 (Section 106 Agreement) (£1,465 towards sustainable transport initiatives).**

Reason: In order to provide [enhanced sustainable transport infrastructure, educational facilities, improved play space, public art, waste recycling and affordable housing] in accordance with Policy DR5 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007.

3. **H29 (Secure covered cycle parking provision).**

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for secure cycle accommodation within the application site, encouraging alternative modes of transport in accordance with both local and national planning policy and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

1. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
2. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/1321/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : 7 Aylestone Hill, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1HR

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

DRAFT HEADS OF TERMS
Proposed planning obligation agreement
S106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Planning Application – DCCE2008/1312/F: Change of use of landlord’s office/store to self contained residential apartment, 7 Aylestone Hill, Hereford, HR1 1HR

1. The developer covenants with Herefordshire Council to pay Herefordshire Council the sum of £1,465 towards the delivery of sustainable transport initiatives within the locality.
2. The developer shall enter into a legal agreement worded so as to prevent future occupants of the development from becoming eligible for residents’ parking permits.
3. In the event that Herefordshire Council does not for any reason use the sum referred to in Clause 1 (above) for the purposes specified within 10 years of the date of the agreement, the Council shall repay to the developer the said sum or such part thereof, which has not been used by Herefordshire Council.
4. The developer shall pay to the Council on or before completion of the agreement, the reasonable legal costs incurred by Herefordshire Council in connection with the preparation and completion of the agreement.

11 DCCW2008/0925/F - CHANGE OF USE OF STORAGE BUILDING TO FORM 3 NO. HOLIDAY LETTING UNITS AT ROSEBANK, MUNSTONE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3AD

For: Mr. & Mrs. J. Turlej per Mr. J. Scriven, Long Orchard, 5 Overbury Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1JE

Date Received: 2 April 2008

**Ward: Burghill,
Holmer & Lyde**

Grid Ref: 51541, 43357

Expiry Date: 28 May 2008

Local Member: Councillor SJ Robertson

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Rosebank is located on the eastern side of the Class III Pipe & Lyde to Hereford road at Munstone. Lyle Three Cross Farm is sited opposite with private dwellings to the north, Spring Cottage, and south, Woodrise. Open fields adjoin the eastern boundary. The proposal is to convert a range of outbuildings between Rosebank and Spring Cottage into three holiday lets.
- 1.2 The building sits on the northern boundary of the site, two storey, of brick construction under a tiled roof. The conversion will utilise all existing openings and comprise living/dining room with kitchen and w.c. on the ground floor with two bedrooms and bathroom on the first floor.
- 1.3 Six car parking spaces located to the east of the barns are proposed.

2. Policies

2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007:

Policy DR1	-	Design
Policy HBA12	-	Re-use of Rural Buildings
Policy RST12	-	Visitor Accommodation
Policy RST13	-	Rural and Farm Tourism Development
Policy T11	-	Parking Provision

2.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings

3. Planning History

- 3.1 SH940627PF Conversion of storage building to elderly persons residence. Refused 22 June 1994.

- 3.2 SC980351/PF Extensions to existing building. Approved 29 October 1998.
- 3.3 DCCW2006/2768/F Change of use of storage building into additional accommodation for Rosebank to form 3 no. holiday letting units for long term winter lets and short term summer lets. Withdrawn 18 October 2006.
- 3.4 DCCW2007/2560/F Change of use of storage building into additional accommodation for Rosebank to form 3 no. holiday letting units for long term winter lets and short term summer lets. Refused 5 October 2007.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager: Recommends conditions which will require improvements to the visibility north of the access.
- 4.3 Conservation Manager: Recommends conditions to ensure the recommendations of the ecological report are followed.
- 4.4 Public Rights of Way Manager: Raise no objection.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Holmer Parish Council: No objection.
- 5.2 Pipe & Lyde Parish Council: No objection subject to condition limiting use to holiday lets.
- 5.3 One letter of objection has been received from Mr. & Mrs. Borthwick, Woodrise, Munstone, Hereford, HR1 3AD. The main points raised are:-
- 1) Given the number of potential new residents their arrival is undoubtedly bound to involve an increase of noise pollution from them, vehicles of the residents and visitors of the residents.
 - 2) The entrance to 'Rosebank' is situated on the crown of a very sharp double bend bordered on one side by chevron boards. It is clear entering and leaving the access point is dangerous and requires more than normal care. Additional traffic from residents, potentially up to six vehicles and visitors could well have a significant impact for all highway users.
 - 3) It would be difficult to control occupancy and potentially sold off as separate dwellings.
 - 4) This is a sparsely populated area.

5) The building is approximately 40 yards from Woodrise.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 This proposal seeks to convert a two storey rural building into three 2-x bedroom holiday lets. The main issues are considered to be

1. The Principle of Development
2. Highway Safety
3. Impact on Adjoining Residents

Principle of Development

6.2 The conversion of rural buildings to visitor accommodation is fully supported by Policy RST12 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and Government Guidance contained in PPS7. The site is located close to Hereford City and within a small group of dwellings at Lyde Cross, Munstone where the principle of this form of development is considered acceptable. In addition planning permission has also been previously granted (SH94627PF) on appeal for conversion of the building to an elderly person residence, the permission for which has expired. However this permission confirmed the acceptability of the site to cater for increased usage. Therefore the proposal for three holiday lets in principle is considered acceptable.

Highway Safety

6.3 The access is located near a double bend at Lyde Cross, Munstone. The Traffic Manager has fully assessed the application and recommends conditions which will improve the visibility to the north. This will entail the removal of some of the planting. Adequate parking and turning facilities are available on site.

Impact on Adjoining Residents

6.4 The concerns of the local residents have been assessed and whilst there would be an increase in general activities and movement, it is not considered that there would be significant noise disturbance or inconvenience for neighbouring residents.

6.5 There is room on site for vehicles to park and amenity use without demonstrable harm to local residents. In addition a condition will be recommended that prevents the holiday units being sold off from Rosebank. Finally the juxtaposition of the building together with its proposed means of conversion further mitigates harm to adjoining residents.

Conclusion

6.6 The conversion of the building to holiday lets retained with Rosebank is considered to fully accord with the Development Plan and guiding principles under PPS7.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. **F13 (Restriction on separate sale) (Rosebank).**

Reason: It would be contrary to the policy of the local planning authority to grant permission for a separate dwelling in this location having regard to Policy H7 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 3. **F30 (Use as holiday accommodation).**

Reason: Having regard to Policy H7 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan the local planning authority are not prepared to allow the introduction of a separate unit of residential accommodation due to the relationship and close proximity of the building to the property known as Rosebank in this rural location.

- 4. **H03 (Visibility splays) (2 x 4 x 30).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 5. **H13 (Access, turning area and parking).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 6. **I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy DR13 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. **HN5 (Works within the highway).**
- 2. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
- 3. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCW2008/0925/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : Storage building at Rosebank, Munstone, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 3AD

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

12 DCCE2008/1413/F - CONVERT RESIDENTIAL HOUSE INTO TWO FLATS, WITH SEPARATE ACCESS AT 56 FREDERICK AVENUE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1HL

For: Mr. F.T. Webb, 15 Nimrod Drive, Hampton Dene, Hereford, HR1 1HQ

Date Received: 30 May 2008

Ward: Aylestone

Grid Ref: 51266, 41463

Expiry Date: 25 July 2008

Local Members: Councillors NL Vaughan and DB Wilcox

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 No. 56 is located on the western side of Frederick Avenue, accessed off College Green and forming part of the College Estate. The existing dwelling is an end of terrace brick and tiled hipped roof four bedroom property with garden to the front and rear and pedestrian access only off Frederick Avenue.
- 1.2 Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the existing four bedroom dwelling into two one bedroom flats. The accommodation would be split between ground and first floor with lounge, kitchen, bedroom and bathroom on each. The only external alteration is the creation of a new pedestrian access on the side elevation to provide each flat with its own front door.

2. Policies

- 2.1 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007:

Policy S2	-	Development Requirements
Policy DR1	-	Design
Policy DR2	-	Land Use and Activity
Policy DR3	-	Movement
Policy DR13	-	Noise
Policy H17	-	Sub-division of Existing Housing

3. Planning History

- 3.1 None.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager: No objection subject to a condition requiring the creation of two parking spaces.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council: No objection subject to there being sufficient on street parking available.
- 5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Mr. & Mrs. Parry, 58 Frederick Avenue. The main points raised are:
- Insufficient parking for two flats.
 - Out of character with Frederick Avenue which is a family street.
 - Impact on amenity through increased transmission of noise from proposed living rooms to neighbouring bedrooms particularly at first floor.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Central Planning Services, Garrick House, Widemarsh Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officer's Appraisal

- 6.1 The site falls within an established residential area as identified in the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan where additional residential development in the form of new build or sub-division as in this instance is acceptable in principle. The relevant development policy in the determination of this application is Policy H17.
- 6.2 Minimal internal alterations are required to accommodate the subdivision to two one-bedroom flats and no extensions are proposed or required. The only external alteration will be the creation of a second entrance on the side elevation thereby providing each flat with its own entrance. A satisfactory standard of accommodation will be created in terms of room size, facilities and amenity space.
- 6.3 In terms of parking, no off-street car parking currently exists although the kerb along the site frontage has been lowered. The Traffic Manager recommends the creation of two parking spaces, which will relieve the pressure for on street parking and address the objectors concerns.
- 6.4 The objectors also raise concerns regarding the impact on their amenity as a result of noise. The proposed subdivision will have to satisfy Building Regulations standards in terms of the transmission of noise between flats and neighbouring properties and therefore it is considered that adequate control exists under this legislation to safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring property.
- 6.5 No Section 106 contributions are required, as based upon the thresholds and formulae within the adopted Supplementary Planning document on Planning Obligations, the proposal does not result in the intensification in the use of the site over and above the existing situation.

6.6 The proposed conversion will have no adverse impact on the character and amenity of the area and will create two well-proportioned one bedroomed flats in accordance with Policy H17 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. **H29 (Secure covered cycle parking provision).**

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for secure cycle accommodation within the application site, encouraging alternative modes of transport in accordance with both local and national planning policy and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

- 3. **I42 (Scheme of refuse storage (residential)).**

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to comply with Policy DR4 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 4. **H10 (Parking - single house).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 5. **H09 (Driveway gradient).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. **HN05 - Works within the highway.**
- 2. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
- 3. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**


Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.



This copy has been produced specifically for Planning purposes. No further copies may be made.

APPLICATION NO: DCCE2008/1413/F

SCALE : 1 : 1250

SITE ADDRESS : 56 Frederick Avenue, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1HL

Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Herefordshire Council. Licence No: 100024168/2005

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Mr. R. Pryce on 01432 261957

