

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 7 December 2016

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

161859 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING AT LAND WEST OF LARKSMEAD, BRAMPTON ABBOTTS, ROSS-ON-WYE, HR9 7JE

For: Mr Fraser per Mr David Kirk, 100 Chase Road, Ross-On-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5JH

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Three further letters of support, all from residents of Brampton Abbots, have been received. Comments are summarised as –

- agree with the recommendation of the Officer Report to grant permission
- The building is an excellent example of what can be achieved with forethought and sympathetic design
- The proposal can only benefit the village and its environs.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

161522 - PROPOSED 6 NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS AND 4 NO. GARAGES AT LAND AT YARPOLE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0BA

For: Mr F Price per John Needham Associates, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The Parish Council has submitted a traffic speed survey. An explanation/comment on this data received 5/12/16 is awaited from the Transportation Manager.

The following letter was also received from the Parish Council dated 5/12/16

I write with regard to John Needham's letter to you of 8th November, which is published on the planning portal for 161522 application site, Yarpole HR6.

This application will be decided upon at council on Wednesday 7th December. I would be very grateful if you would make the planning committee aware of our below comments regarding the points Mr Needham makes in his letter. I would also be grateful if you would publish this letter on the portal alongside Mr Needham's letter.

Mr Needham's comments:

1. Highway safety.

While it is the case that the inspector concludes there is no conflict with policy MT1 of the Core Strategy, it is also true that the inspector, having visited the site, does express some reservations as to safety issues and the thoroughness of speed survey reporting. It is on that basis that the PC has commissioned its own survey from Balfour Beatty, and will present its

findings to the council on Wednesday. The Parish Council therefore supports Councillor Bowen's comments to the council.

2. Foul drainage:

Welsh Water has raised an objection to future connection of new housing to the WwTW and connection to public sewage networks, although the inspector will not have seen it. This came to the Parish Council by way of response to our Reg 14 NDP consultation, on 20th July 2016, from Ryan Norman, Forward Plans Officer at Welsh Water:

Dear Sir/Madam,

REGULATION 14 PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON YARPOLE GROUP PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN – JULY 2016 I refer to your email dated the 9th June 2016 regarding the above consultation.

Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW) appreciates the opportunity to respond and we offer the following representation: Given that the Yarpole Group NDP has been prepared in accordance with the Adopted Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), DCWW are supportive of the aims, objectives and policies set out. We are pleased to note the reference towards the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development under Policy YG15: Sustainable Design, and also welcome the inclusion of Policy YG13: Treatment of foul water in Yarpole. I can confirm that the Luston and Yarpole Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) is currently overloaded, and that until such a time that the improvement scheme is undertaken (it is programmed for completion by the end of our current Asset Management Plan 6 – 2015-2020) it cannot accommodate any new development. On completion of the improvements, there will be no issue in accommodating all of the growth proposed in Yarpole over the NDP period. With regard to providing a supply of clean water or connecting to the public sewerage network for the specific housing allocations YG9 (Croft Crescent) and YG10 (Brook House and adjacent land), as well as the dwellings to be delivered under Policy YG8 (small sites), there are no issues though some level of off-site water mains/public sewers may be required in order to connect to the existing networks. As you will be aware, DCWW do not provide public sewerage to the settlement of Bircher. With regard to Policy YG3 and Policy YG4, there are no issues in providing a supply of clean water though some level of offsite water mains may be required. We hope that the above information will assist as the NDP progresses. In the meantime, should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us at Forward.Plans@dwcymru.com or via telephone on 0800 917 2652.

Yours faithfully,

3. Landscaping:

In the original application it is stated that there is no need to alter vegetation around the access, and the inspector states that this matter can be dealt with by condition. None of the existing significant planting on the site needs to be disturbed as a result of the proposal. This is fine with the Parish Council, but we do note that on 4th November 2016, two days after the decision was deferred and the planning committee decided to organise a site visit, the applicant went down to the site and removed trees and vegetation from around the proposed site access, without applying for relevant permissions.

4. Public Footpath:

As far as we can tell the inspector did not disagree with Cllr Bowen or the PC with regard to need to divert the current footpath. The footpath will need to be diverted. So far the applicant has simply relocated the footpath on his plans, there has been no formal application made to Herefordshire for a diversion, and this will need to be forthcoming. Indeed in the PDA it is stated that if planning permission is granted an application will be made. The inspector says (9):

The planning application form suggests that there would be no interference with a public right of way. However, public footpath No YP6 passes diagonally across the appeal site, heading north-eastward from the western end of the road frontage, before turning north as it

heads up to Pound House. Although the submitted layout allows for a route through the development proposed, the footpath would not be retained on the definitive alignment. Were the appeal to succeed, any permission could not be implemented unless and until a successful application for diversion of the footpath had been made. Should such an application be unsuccessful, that would have implications for implementation of the appeal scheme. I have, however, made my decision based only on the planning merits of the case.

5. Design:

Mr Needham faults Cllr Bowen for stating that the inspector referred to the design of the scheme as suburban. But in her report the inspector states (25):

Firstly, it is not clear what has informed the eastern site boundary, which appears to follow an arbitrary stepped line across the open field. That to one side, I consider the cul-de-sac layout proposed, with each pair of dwellings sitting side by side separated by detached garages or parking spaces to be suburban in nature. There is nothing of the more rural, organic feel to the layout that characterises the group of dwellings opposite, which has more of a feel of being arranged around a courtyard. In my view, the layout proposed would present an unexpected and uncharacteristic suburban edge to this rural village and would result in harm to the established rural character and appearance of the area. In this regard, there would be conflict with Core Strategy policies SS6 and SD1, which together and among other things seek to Appeal Decision APP/W1850/W/16/3141786 7 ensure that new development is well integrated, taking into account local context and site characteristics in order to promote local distinctiveness.

6. Neighbourhood Plan:

Mr Needham did meet with me (Parish Clerk) and two members of the NDP Steering Group. The meeting was to try to find common ground concerning two sites that were brought forward under the Parish Council's NDP 'Call for Sites' in spring 2015, to see if further consultation could affect any changes to the design & layout of both sites, to meet the NDP criteria and allow the PC to support the two applications. One of these sites is just north of the historic centre of the village, and the other is further up, on the far side of the mid 20th century bungalow development off Green Lane. Unfortunately it was made plain to the PC that there would be no further consultation. Both sites have since been granted planning permission. But the site being dealt with here, at the bottom of the village, was not discussed at all as it was not brought forward in the NDP Call for Sites. So Cllr Bowen is correct in saying that there was no willingness to consult with the parish on this application (or the others).

The Parish Council supports Councillor Bowen in his representations to council on 2nd November and thanks him for his support in questioning the suitability of this application. The Parish Council also questions Mr Needham's continued assertion that costs were awarded to his client on each specific point he raises. Our understanding is that the inspector awarded costs against planning process with regard to some of these points, rather than against the points themselves.

The Parish Council's objections to this application continue to be based on issues of design and layout, flooding & emergency access, mains water/drainage connection, and highways safety. We would not seek to criticise the inspector's decisions in the report, or the work of the council, planning department or individual lay parishioners or councillors, and rather object to the tone of this letter, which, rather than seeking to commend the applications own merits, sets out instead to undermine the considered thoughts and processes of all these bodies.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The revised comments of the Transportation Manager are awaited following review of the recent speed survey.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

No change at present