

Minutes of the meeting of Planning and regulatory committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 14 March 2018 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor J Hardwick (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: BA Baker, PJ Edwards, EL Holton, TM James, AW Johnson, JLV Kenyon, MD Lloyd-Hayes, FM Norman, AJW Powers, NE Shaw, EJ Swinglehurst and SD Williams

145. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors CR Butler, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, A Seldon and WC Skelton.

146. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor AW Johnson substituted for Councillor CR Butler, Councillor MD Lloyd Hayes for Councillor A Seldon, Councillor NE Shaw for Councillor KS Guthrie and Councillor SD Williams for Councillor WC Skelton.

147. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

148. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

149. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

150. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

151. 150659 - LAND AT HOLMER TRADING ESTATE, COLLEGE ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Demolition of all existing buildings and hard standings, remediation of the site, including reinstatement or landscaping of the former canal and development of up to 120 homes, landscaping, public open space, new vehicle and pedestrian access and associated works.)

The Acting Development Manager (ADM) gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

He highlighted that the update contained a response recently received from the Herefordshire & Gloucestershire Canal Trust. This replaced the Trust's objection made in 2016 as set out at paragraph 5.4 of the published report. The updated response stated, amongst other things, that the Trust could only concur with the District Valuer and could only support the developer's current position with regard to the canal.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr S Kerry, Clerk to Hereford City Council spoke noting the Canal Trust had now indicated its agreement with the proposal which changed the City Council's response, which had been one of objection, to some degree. However, there should be no further concessions to the developer. Mr A Fieldman, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- There was concern that significant concessions appeared to be being made to the developer with no benefit to the community. The scheme no longer provided any affordable housing. There were no other S106 contributions to be made and the works on the canal were being limited to preparing the canal for future restoration. It was noted that the canal route would be safeguarded and capped to a depth of 2ft.
- The ADM commented that the District Valuer did not include in his appraisal the cost the developer paid for the land at the time of purchase, but assessed the value of the land at current prices. He also commented that whilst the planning permission had included a clawback provision that would have taken effect if the costs of development had proved to be less than estimated, and this could be revisited, the estimated development costs were now such that it was highly unlikely that such a provision would be relevant.
- It was suggested that the housing mix would be important to ensure smaller units were provided to meet housing needs. It was also requested that smaller units should be of high quality with affordable running costs.
- There was a wider issue in that government grants for the remediation of brownfield land had been withdrawn and it was suggested local MPs should be made aware of the importance of government providing financial assistance if the development of brownfield land was to be achieved.
- The site was an eyesore and needed to be developed.
- It was important to safeguard the route of the canal in accordance with the Core Strategy. The restoration of the canal would bring considerable benefits to the City and the County.
- Reference was made to the Canal Trust's statement in its submission, included in the committee update, that a 'non objection' clause on the retained land was required. The ADM clarified that this would be addressed through a legal agreement between the canal trust and the developer as such an agreement was in their mutual interest.

The Chairman agreed to explore a request that information be provided to members on how the District Valuer made his viability assessments, noting what appeared to be a growing number of instances in which developers were claiming that sites had become unviable to develop and the implications this had for the provision of affordable housing.

The ADM commented that the Committee's decision in 2016 had prioritised development of the canal over the provision of affordable housing. The District Valuer had

independently assessed the viability of the site leading to the proposal before the Committee. The Canal Trust had withdrawn its objection to the proposal accepting that assessment of the site's viability. The route of the canal was safeguarded. If the application were to be refused it was likely that the site, a contaminated brownfield site with buildings on it that needed to be demolished, would remain derelict for some time, losing an opportunity to provide 120 homes. He did not consider that there would be grounds to support a refusal of the application if an appeal were to be made.

Councillor Edwards proposed and Councillor Swinglehurst seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation. The motion was carried with 12 votes in favour, 2 against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 obligation requiring the safeguarding of the route of the Canal and transfer of the Canal Land (at nil consideration), officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers are authorised to grant outline planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary by officers.

1. **A02 Time Limit for Submission of Reserved Matters (Outline Permission)**
2. **A03 Time Limit for Commencement (Outline Permission)**
3. **A04 Approval of Reserved Matters**
4. **A05 Plans and Particulars of Reserved Matters**
5. **B03 Amended Plans**
6. **H06 Vehicular Access Construction**
7. **H17 Junction Improvement/Off site Works**
8. **H19 On Site Roads - Phasing**
9. **H20 Road Completion in 2 Years**
10. **H21 Wheel Washing**
11. **H27 Parking for Site Operatives**
12. **H29 Secure Covered Cycle Parking Provision**
13. **H31 Outline Travel Plan**
14. **G19 Details of Play Equipment**
15. **G10 Landscaping Scheme**
16. **G11 Landscaping Scheme - Implementation**
17. **G14 Landscape Management Plan**
18. **L01 Foul/Surface Water Drainage**
19. **L02 No Surface Water to Connect to Public System**

20. **L03 No Drainage Run-Off to Public System**
21. **L04 Comprehensive & Integrated Draining of Site**
22. **The recommendations for species mitigations set out in Section 5 of the ecologist's reports from Ecology Services dated November 2015 and habitat enhancements set out within Section 5 of the ecologist's reports from Ecology Services dated February 2015 should be followed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme shall be carried out as approved. A working method statement for protected species present and habitat enhancement plan should be submitted to the local planning authority in writing. The plan shall be implemented as approved.**

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (with amendments and as supplemented by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (and 2012 amendment).

23. **Development shall not commence until a scheme to safeguard the residential units hereby permitted from road traffic, railway and industrial noise has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before occupation of any dwellings and shall thereafter be retained.**

Reason: To protect the amenities of the residential units hereby approved so as to comply with Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the NPPF.

24. **Prior to the commencement of development, details of a scheme for acoustic attenuation of noise from the extract fans at Cavanaghs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any of the residential units hereby permitted and any works or attenuation measures shall thereafter be retained.**

Reason: To protect the amenities of the residential units hereby approved so as to comply with Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the NPPF.

25. **No development shall take place until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:**
 - a) **A 'desk study' report including previous site and adjacent site uses, potential contaminants arising from those uses, possible sources, pathways, and receptors, a conceptual model and a risk assessment in accordance with current best practice**
 - b) **If the risk assessment in (a) confirms the possibility of a significant pollutant linkage(s), a site investigation should be undertaken to characterise fully the nature and extent and severity of contamination, incorporating a conceptual model of all the potential pollutant linkages and an assessment of risk to identified receptors**
 - c) **If the risk assessment in (b) identifies unacceptable risk(s)**

a detailed scheme specifying remedial works and measures necessary to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed. The Remediation Scheme shall include consideration of and proposals to deal with situations where, during works on site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified. Any further contamination encountered shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the local planning authority for written approval.

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that the proposed development will not cause pollution to controlled waters or the wider environment.

26. The Remediation Scheme, as approved pursuant to condition no. 25 above, shall be fully implemented before the development is first occupied. On completion of the remediation scheme the developer shall provide a validation report to confirm that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details, which must be submitted before the development is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme including the validation reporting shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken.

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that the proposed development will not cause pollution to controlled waters or the wider environment.

27. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the local planning authority for, an amendment to the Method Statement detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that the proposed development will not cause pollution to controlled waters or the wider environment.

28. M17 Water Efficiency – Residential

29. Non-standard – Housing Mix

INFORMATIVES:

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. N02 Section 106 Obligation
3. HN01 Mud on Highway
4. HN04 Private Apparatus within Highway
5. HN05 Works within the Highway
6. HN07 Section 278 Agreement

7. **HN08 Section 38 Agreement & Drainage Details**
8. **HN10 No Drainage to Discharge to Highway**
9. **HN21 Extraordinary Maintenance**

(The meeting adjourned between 11.00 – 11.10 am)

152. 172019 - LAND AT PORTHOUSE FARM, TENBURY ROAD, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Variation of condition 19 (p140285/0 76 dwellings and a business centre) amend to: the b1 commercial unit and its associated infrastructure as shown on approved plan 0609-11/d/3.01 shall be constructed and capable of occupation for employment purposes prior to the final occupation of 35 no. Dwellings.)

(Councillor Shaw fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Principal Planning Officer (PPO) gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mrs G Churchill, of Bromyard and Winslow Town Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor NE Shaw, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- It would be reasonable to expect the developer to have agreed arrangements they considered reasonable prior to signing contracts and beginning works, in particular given the hybrid nature of the scheme and the fact that the associated economic development was a key part of granting permission.
- There was a pattern of developers asking planning committees to relax the terms of agreements they had freely entered into subsequent to commencing development. This raised a question mark over the value of any such agreement made by a developer.
- It was unclear why the developer was seeking a variation to condition 19 which they had freely accepted.
- The developer needed to bring pressure to bear on its development partner.

The Chairman reported that Councillor Seldon, an adjoining ward member had submitted a statement. In summary this referred to how contentious applications on the site had been and whether the request to vary the condition was reasonable.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The PPO commented:

- The planning permission only required the first of the six business units to be constructed and capable of occupation for employment purposes prior to the first occupation of any dwellings. One had been commenced but not completed.
- The two elements of the site were now in separate ownership. He considered the housing developer, who had not been involved at the time of the original application, was doing all it could to seek to encourage the landowner who had retained the business unit element to deliver it.
- If the application were to be refused the developer, with a partially built housing development on its hands, could either proceed and breach the condition leaving the council to decide whether enforcement action was expedient, or they could mothball the site until the business unit was constructed.
- There had not been much housing and in particular affordable housing delivered in Bromyard for some time. Refusal would mean completed houses standing empty.
- The condition only required the business units to be capable of occupation, not actually in operation. There was a view that the unit that was under development could be completed.
- As the two elements had passed into separate ownership it was not clear how the condition could be practical.
- It was regrettable that the wishes of the Town Council to see the linkage between the construction of the business units and the housing development maintained were being undermined.
- The council had sought to prioritise the co-location of housing and employment. In principle the development should have met that aim but in practice it appeared that it would not. That was unfortunate.
- It was to be regretted that the Town Council had decided not to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Acting Development Manager commented he could not countenance the prospect of housing, including affordable housing, standing empty. The proposal to vary the condition was reasonable. Whether the housing developer had erred in not foreseeing this issue and addressing it through a legal agreement at the outset was not relevant to the Committee's consideration.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He considered that the application should be refused and the housing developer should be required to comply with the condition. There appeared to be nothing to prevent a similar request to permit further development in advance of construction of the business unit coming forward.

Councillor Lloyd Hayes proposed and Councillor Baker seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation. The motion was carried with 9 votes in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act 1990 obligation agreement, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers are authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary by officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers:

1. **The permission hereby granted is an amendment to planning permission 140285/O dated 18 August 2014 and, otherwise than is altered by this**

permission, the development shall be carried out in accordance with that planning permission and the conditions attached thereto.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with the requirements of Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. **The B1 commercial unit and its associated infrastructure as shown on approved plan 0609_11/d/3.01 shall be constructed and capable of occupation for employment purposes prior to the occupation of 35no.dwellings.**

Reason: To ensure that the employment use hereby permitted is brought into use and to secure a mixed form of sustainable development in accordance with Policy SS1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.**

153. 174466 - 8 COTTERELL STREET, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 0HQ

(Proposed residential development to provide 4 no flats.)

(Councillor Powers fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr C Powell, an officer of Hereford City Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor AJW Powers, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- There was no local objection to the principle of development and change of use to residential. There was an extant permission for a development of 2 semi-detached dwellings with off-street parking. That represented suitable development in contrast to the application for four flats with no off-street parking.
- There were objections by the City Council and local residents to the new application and an in principle objection from the Transportation Manager.
- The site was big enough to allow for off-street parking for the new application as it had for the earlier application.
- The existing parking problems were an impediment to emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles.

- The proposal would add to highway safety problems and have an adverse effect on the amenity of residents.
- The location was sustainable in that there was good access to the City by means other than a car residents of the new dwellings may well still own cars.
- The proposal was contrary to policy MT1 bullet point one as set out at paragraph 6.11 of the report.
- It could not be assumed, as at paragraph 6.16 of the report, that the likely occupants of the properties would allow for significantly lower levels of off street parking provision as provided for by the car parking standards in the Council's Highways Design Guide for New Developments as referred to at paragraph 6.15 of the report.
- The benefit of 2 additional housing units was outweighed by the adverse amenity impact and highway safety issues.
- There was just as much need for small 2 bed properties as for single bed flats.
- It was contrary to the principle in Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that the proposal did not meet the required standard in terms of overall design or secure a good standard of amenity for residents.
- The application would encourage further conversions of single dwellings in the area into multiple occupancy, a process that had already resulted in a cumulative loss of amenity for neighbours.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The proposal would meet a housing need and represented good use of a brownfield site.
- A number of concerns were expressed about parking provision. There was an extant permission for two dwellings with off-street parking. It was considered that the site could accommodate off street parking for the new proposal. Instead the proposal would lead to anti-social parking issues and issues of highway safety with an adverse impact on the amenity of existing residents.

A question was raised as to whether the parking issue was sufficient to outweigh the other issues to be considered in the planning balance.

- There was concern about the ability of emergency vehicles and other larger vehicles to gain access.
- It was suggested that the proposal represented overdevelopment and was out of character with the area.
- The principle of providing housing without car-parking relied upon pleasant alternative means of accessing facilities. These pleasant means were not present in this case.
- The provision of 2 additional units did not outweigh the adverse impact on the amenity of existing residents.

In reply to a question, the Acting Development Manager commented that a planning inspector would have to have regard to a number of factors in the event of an appeal against refusal of the application including the fact that the site had permission for use as a plumbers yard with B1 use that could move to B8 without planning permission. If this use recommenced this would generate vehicular movements and this had caused issues in the past. In addition, the extant permission would remove two off street parking places. Also, census data indicated that 27.3% of houses in the area did not have access to a car. The data was not broken down to indicate ownership by type of property but it seemed reasonable to assume that car ownership of occupants of 1 bed

apartments, as proposed, would be lower. He was therefore concerned as to the strength of a case for refusal.

The SPO commented that the extant permission had been obtained by a former owner of the site and was nearly 3 years old. The new owner did not consider that proposal to be viable and had therefore submitted the new application. The extant permission would have involved the loss of 2 of the four on street parking spaces in the location with the remaining 2 spaces likely to have been used by the occupants of the two dwellings, meaning no wider benefit to the community. Those on street spaces were also perpendicular to the road presenting a highway safety consideration.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that there was a fine balance to be struck. He remained concerned that approval would set a precedent for similar conversions in other similar parts of the City with close packed Victorian terraces with insufficient parking. A consultation had been undertaken on a strategic residents parking scheme but the conclusion had been that the pressure was too great for a scheme to be operable and residents had not been in favour. He reiterated that there was no local objection to the principle of development and change of use. However, the new application was inferior to the extant permission given the loss of on street parking. In terms of access to the city, cycling on Whitecross Road was dangerous and traffic would, on the evidence of the council's consultants, increase as a result of housing development in the City and a western bypass. It therefore did not meet sustainability policy requirements. The development of four flats could be redesigned to permit off street parking. Any development of flats in the city should include off street parking. Not imposing this requirement in this case would make it harder to impose such a requirement in the case of larger scale developments.

A motion proposed by Councillor Baker and seconded by Councillor Holton that the application be approved was lost 5 votes in favour, 6 against and 2 abstentions.

Councillor Edwards proposed and Councillor Lloyd Hayes seconded a motion that the application be refused based on the grounds that the application was contrary to policy LD1 and relevant design related policies of the NPPF as it would represent overdevelopment with the appearance being out of character with the area, contrary to policies MT1 and SS4 because of the adverse effect on the safe operation of the highway network and the impact on the amenity of existing residents by potentially requiring them to park further away and increased risk of anti-social parking and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to detail these reasons.

The motion was carried with 6 votes in favour, 5 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the application was contrary to policy LD1 and relevant design related policies of the NPPF as it would represent overdevelopment with the appearance being out of character with the area, contrary to policies MT1 and SS4 because of the adverse effect on the safe operation of the highway network and the impact on the amenity of existing residents by potentially requiring them to park further away and increased risk of anti-social parking and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to detail these reasons.

Appendix - Schedule of Updates

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 14 March 2018

MORNING

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

150659 - DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS AND HARD STANDINGS, REMEDIATION OF THE SITE, INCLUDING REINSTATEMENT OR LANDSCAPING OF THE FORMER CANAL AND DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 120 HOMES, LANDSCAPING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, NEW VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND AT HOLMER TRADING ESTATE, COLLEGE ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Codex Land PCC Cell B per Mr Ben Stephenson, Greyfriars House, Greyfriars Road, Cardiff, CF10 3AL

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Herefordshire & Gloucestershire Canal Trust: Updated comment 13.3.2018

An updated response has been received from the Herefordshire & Gloucestershire Canal Trust. This replaces the objection from 2016 at 5.4 of the published report and is recorded in full below:-

Having reviewed the District Valuers position and worked with Codex for several years on this scheme we can only concur with DV and can only support the developer's current position with regard to the canal.

We would be seeking transfer of Ownership of the Canal corridor at the granting of Consent as this site has bounced around for so long and part of this much reduced offer needs to be that the land is definitely secured into 'public' ownership. I am comfortable that Codex will retain reasonable crossover rights for services etc subject to non conflict with the Canal obviously.

We are happy with a clause in the transfer that 'no agreement or transfer to the H&G Canal Trust shall in any way prejudice any subsisting rights of access exercised by Cavanagh'.

As discussed the unrestricted transfer to us needs to include unrestricted rights of access for the length of the common boundary to the retained land. Land Transfer to H&G Canal Trust to be to that common boundary with Highway Land [or if retained un-adopted quasi Highway Land]; and common to Highway Land above tunnel portal. Transfer to be to common boundary with Tunnel land at one end and Canal in Aylestone Park at the other and the publicly owned land of Victoria park on the remaining boundary.

Should the currently defined roadway through the development not be adopted we must reserve a position that the owner will fully co-operate with the reasonable requirements of the Trust within the roadway for the restoration of the Canal. The owner of the retained land to support the Trust in the restoration of the Canal and any applications related thereto. A 'Non objection' clause on the retained land will be required if we are to restore post Housing.

Codex/the landowner to fulfill best endeavours to secure transfer of tunnel to H&G Canal Trust.

Please note that all other terms of the s.106 should remain especially with regard to legal and related fees payable to The Canal Trust [The Wharf House Co. Ltd acting in this role] please.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The Herefordshire & Gloucestershire Canal Trust is the delivery body for the canal and these updated comments assume a very high degree of significance accordingly.

The Canal Trust recognises that the unviability of delivering a restored section of canal as part of this development is unarguable. Support is expressed for the developer's position and the long-standing working relationship between the applicants and the Canal Trust is also highlighted.

These comments give, in the view of officers, further weight in support of the recommendation before Members, which acts to safeguard the canal route and require the transfer of the canal land to the Canal Trust.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

172019 – VARIATION OF CONDITION 19 (P140285/O – 76 DWELLINGS AND A BUSINESS CENTRE) AMENDED TO: THE B1 COMMERCIAL UNIT AND ITS ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AS SHOWN ON APPROVED PLAN 0609-11/D/3.01 SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AND CAPABLE OF OCCUPATION FOR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES PRIOR TO THE FINAL OCCUPATION OF 35 NO. DWELLINGS AT LAND AT PORTHOUSE FARM, TENBURY ROAD, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mr Jones per Miss Hawa Patel, 28 Pickford Street, Digbeth, Birmingham, B5 5QH

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr Hancocks has contacted the Democratic Services Officer to confirm that he wishes to withdraw his objection, which is reported at 4.2 of the Case Officer Report.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

174466 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 4 NO FLATS AT 8 COTTERELL STREET, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 0HQ

For: Mr Gough per Mr T J Ford, 30 Grove Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 2QP

OFFICER COMMENTS

Condition 11 should be replaced with the following condition:

Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved a scheme demonstrating measures for the efficient use of water as per the optional technical standards

contained within Policy SD3 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Policies SD3 and SD4 of the Hereford Local Plan – Core Strategy.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

As per the Officer's Report, subject to amendment to condition 11 as set out above.