

## **COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TO CABINET – 24 September 2020**

### **Question 1**

**Councillor Yolande Watson, Kerne Bridge Ward**

**To: cabinet member infrastructure and transport**

In October 2019, Herefordshire Council resolved that: the executive is requested to write to government to ask them to review the policy regarding part 3 class Q (General Permitted Development Order as amended) applications under the General Permitted Development Order. In light of the response received from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government dated 2nd July 2020 will the cabinet member seek to put in place a condition that any class Q permitted developments have an agricultural tie placed on them to help provide much-needed homes for family members and agricultural workers, and consult the local community on removing a permitted development right by making an Article 4 direction?

### **Response**

As you will be aware from MHCLG's reply in July 2020, the agricultural to residential permitted development right is seen by the government as an important measure to support our rural communities and help provide much-needed homes, including – but not just for - family members and agricultural workers. The government has also made it clear that they believe it makes best use of existing buildings for our housing supply. These Part Q applications are therefore Prior Approval applications where the development proposed is considered to be permitted development, subject to a number of criteria that need to be satisfied. If these criteria are satisfied, then the council would normally have no option other than for prior approval to be granted.

That said, I am happy to further consider the government's comment (below) about removing this permitted development right by making an Article 4 direction to allow Class Qs to be dealt with like any other planning application where it was felt that it was necessary to protect the local amenity or wellbeing of an area. However, this would in practice be quite difficult to justify, unless in a designated area for example. I would be happy to have officers discuss this with you and Cllr Swinglehurst further to understand the framework template we might use to consider such exceptions and the implications of making an Article 4 direction.

*'Where it is felt that it is necessary to protect the local amenity or wellbeing of an area, the local planning authority can consult the local community on removing a permitted development right by making an Article 4 direction. This then requires a planning application which the local planning authority can determine in accordance with its local plan'.*

### **Question 2**

**Councillor Nigel Shaw, Bromyard Bringsty Ward**

**To: cabinet member infrastructure and transport**

On 21st July the 151 officer of Shropshire County Council wrote to the Herefordshire Council 151 officer to demand the repayment of £3,843,609-71 due to the LEP following this administrations halting of the South Wye link road project. Has a reply been sent and, if so, can this reply and the original letter now be put in the public domain, in the interests of openness and transparency?

## **Response**

A letter was received on 21 July 2020 from Shropshire County Council and a response was sent on 4 August. Both of these documents are attached as appendices to this response.

## **Question 3**

**Councillor Jeremy Milln, Central Ward**

**To: cabinet member finance and corporate services**

In future could we please commonly include a measure for the historic environment in the Environment Scorecard at Appendix 7? This to track our stewardship of our heritage assets including listed buildings, archaeological sites and conservation areas much as we do our natural resources. In respect of scheduled monuments and grade I and II\* listed buildings at risk information is obtainable from Historic England.

## **Response**

The Environmental Scorecard is primarily designed to report on performance measures protecting the natural environment, rather than the built one. However, the planning team does monitor the performance of both the Building Conservation team and the Archaeology team at monthly service performance meetings. This management process tracks monthly performance measures which assess the number of both building conservation and archaeological consultations responded to within the specified planning deadline. In this way we ensure that the stewardship of our heritage assets are protected and are effectively considered in the determination of planning applications.