

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 4 November 2020

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

192979 - APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS FOLLOWING OUTLINE APPROVAL 130945 (APP/W1850/W/17/3180227) FOR APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE FOR THE ERECTION OF 20 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND AT TUMP LANE, MUCH BIRCH, HEREFORD

For: Ms Shaw per Mr John Renshaw, 86 Constitution Street, Leith, Edinburgh, EH6 6RP

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Following the publication of the Committee agenda, an additional representation has been received below:

Dear Sir/Madam,

My continued further objection to a Planning Application under your reference 192979 on land at Tump Lane, Much Birch, following outline approval 130945 for consideration on November 4 2020. In this lengthy application, assurances initially given to the Tump Lane community are being salami-sliced away particularly in two areas. Firstly, this cohousing community scheme was presented to the community as a low carbon development with shared transport facilities. With the shifting sands of this application it is understood at least 30 parking spaces are being considered.

A minimum of 14 Tump Lane resident's cars will be displaced from existing parking facilities. No one has been offered alternative parking. Tenants of over 50 years to be evicted from their rented garages before demolition and their vehicles displaced to find roadside parking. These "evicted" tenants will probably seek parking in the immediate vicinity around the only entrance to the site where householders routinely park on the pavement of this narrow road



The second assurance concerns the well-being and provision of communal play facilities for infant children. In 2015 Herefordshire Housing Association surprisingly uprooted swings and slides from an established communal meeting place stating that the facilities would be replaced and incorporated in the new development. The developer assured residents new, bigger and improved facilities would be made available for all as part of their plans. This whole issue now seems to be much diminished in importance at a time when open spaces are increasingly valued due to Covid-19 or perhaps reduced to enlarge car parking for the developer's benefit. There is no community scrutiny offered.

Wormelov
Home to
the Violette
Szabo GC
museum



Tump herald

FEBRUARY 2015

Wormelov
Ancient
Burial Site
and once
the counties
centre



Village Pride?

Living at the top of Tump Lane Mr. John Creaser asked where the civic or village pride was in allowing the land either side of the A49 school crossing to become so neglected. Although he, with neighbors Bill Padden and William Lewis had done their best to keep the area tidy for a number of years, it was surely time for a make-over. A group of volunteers are getting together and hope, in the spring, to breathe new life into this sizeable area. Used by parents and children for the school crossing many are concerned that the safety barriers are not staggered and that a distracted child could run straight into the road. It is hoped that community involvement in the site will promote a voice that must be heard on this dangerous issue. Lots of help needed from those who can spare an hour or two.

WHERE'S OUR PLAY STUFF?

Last autumn the grass was still green and dry enough for children to play on the only available communal space in Tump Lane when suddenly workmen appeared one morning and cleared the site of slides and other equipment. Parents were rightly upset at what was a heavy handed and inconsiderate action. No one was consulted and no note

do they think they can do it here"? In response to a letter from Much Birch Parish Clerk Alison Wright, Hereford Housing said equipment had been removed because it was no longer safe. They would review their financial arrangements as to the replacement of the equipment which seems short of guaranteeing its replacement in the short

New life for the old Pumphouse

What was for many years a neglected, overgrown eyesore of a site is being brought back to life by one man's hard work. Tump Lane resident Gary Perkins bought the almost invisible, ivy covered Pump House, which was complete with some of its vintage pumping gear and just across the road from the top of Tump Lane. A new roof can be seen above the now neatly trimmed

46 infant children from Tump Lane (at the last count) without communal play facilities for over 5 years. With each application of reserved matters this scheme becomes more and more removed from that initially presented to the Tump Lane community. Use of the communal facilities within the scheme was to be offered to the wider community but this has now been withdrawn. The developer expects to enrich the asset value by undermining the day- to- day convenience of existing residents and ignoring or minimising their social facilities. Indications are that the scheme has become a reclusive single owner private development enabled by access across land owned and managed by Connexus (formerly Hereford Housing). The Regulator of Social Housing has a duty to "ensure value for money is obtained from public money invested in housing" and yet in all the material presented so far there is no mention of agreement over the limited access.

OFFICER COMMENTS

In relation to the additional representation that has been received, Officers would comment as follows:

- the merits of the proposed development are assessed within the report in line with the relevant considerations of a reserved matters application;
- The proposed development will displace existing resident's cars that park informally outside the existing garages near the entrance to the proposed site. The proposed new parking spaces which are within the south east area of the site are for use of the existing residents in the area and;
- The proposed play equipment for the proposed open space is secured under the Outline application and its accompanying S106 Agreement as is the affordable housing element.

Further dialogue with the councillor fulfilling the role ward councillor, for this application, Councillor Bartlett has led to the inclusion of an additional condition to secure details of contractors/builders car parking on site. This is detailed below:

Development shall not begin until details and location of the parking for site operatives has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and which shall be operated and maintained during construction of the development hereby approved. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the construction of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform to the requirements of Policy MT1 of Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Also, for clarity, members should note that the site has a total of 45 car parking across the whole site and not 29 as reported within section 6.25 of the Committee report. The additional 16 spaces are provided to the south east of the site and as referenced above will assist with the displacement of existing resident's cars that park informally outside the existing garages near the entrance to the proposed site.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

The additional condition should be included in the recommendation which remains one of approval.

201757 – APPLICATION FOR VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 170440 (PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EXTANT CONSENT REF 160398 RE SINGLE STOREY, LOW IMPACT DWELLING HOUSE AND REPAIR OF THE CURTILAGE LISTED GLASS HOUSE AND GARAGE). TO INCORPORATE DESIGN CHANGES, INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF A PLANT ROOM ABUTTING THE BOUNDARY WALL AND WORKS TO THE GLASSHOUSE

201758 – PROPOSED DESIGN ALTERATIONS TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED APPLICATION 170440, INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF A PLANT ROOM ABUTTING THE BOUNDARY WALL AND WORKS TO THE GLASSHOUSE

AT LAND ADJACENT TO COACH HOUSE, LUMBER LANE, LUGWARDINE, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Mr & Mrs Roach per Lee Greening, 2nd Floor Offices, 46 Bridge Street, Hereford, HR4 9DG

OFFICER COMMENTS

In relation to paragraph 6.55 of the report, Officers would clarify that the approved dwelling and outbuilding already has consent for two roof lights on the dwelling and a roof-light on the outbuilding under the 2017 permission (170440) and so the proposal does not introduce new roof lights.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

201645 - PROVISION OF 2 NO. ADDITIONAL ROOFLIGHTS ON NORTH ELEVATION OF BARN AT 3 HIGH STREET, WEOBLEY, HEREFORD, HR4 8SL and;

202284 - APPLICATION FOR VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 184664 - TO ACCOMMODATE 2 NO. ADDITIONAL ROOF WINDOWS ON NORTH ELEVATION OF BARN 3 HIGH STREET, WEOBLEY, HEREFORD, HR4 8SL

For: Mr & Mrs Starnes per Mr. Laurence Ray, Waterloo, Ledgemoor Road, Weobley, Hereford, Herefordshire HR4 8RJ

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Members are advised that an additional representation has been received from the Applicant which provides a critique of the Committee report. The representation is set out in full at Appendix 1.

The Conservation Manager (Historic Buildings) has provided further comments referring to Historic England's 'Best Practice Guideline for Adaptive Use – Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings' (2017). The full guidance document can be viewed through the following link;

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/>

Section 3.5 of the Guidance states as follows;

'One of the most sensitive issues with any farm building adaptation is the insertion of roof lights. Farm buildings rarely had any form of glazing at roof level, though sometimes glazed tiles or slates were used. Numerous new roof lights poorly positioned can have an intrusive impact, particularly where the roof is the dominant characteristic and is steeply pitched. More sensitive alternatives can include carefully inserted new openings, such as the gable end of timber-framed buildings and the use of borrowed light.'

'Where roof lights are to be added it is often better to locate them on the least prominent roof-slope when viewed from a public vantage point. It is always preferable to use the flush 'conservation type' roof lights as these have less impact on the roof surface, particularly if non-reflective glass is used'

OFFICER COMMENTS

The representation received from the Applicant is not considered to raise any significant new information and the appraisal within the Officer Report remains applicable.

It is noted that the Applicant refers to the 'GV' reference on the barn's listing description. The 'GV' stands for 'Group Value' and this indicates that the exterior of the building contributes to the historic interest of a group of buildings of which it forms a part. In this case, the group value arises from the historic functional association between the barn and the adjoining dwelling at No 3. Together, they reflect a period in Weobley's history as a market place where agricultural and residential uses were more closely intertwined.

The Applicant contends that less weight should be given to the buildings defining characteristics owing to the 'Group Value' status. Officers however disagree with this view. The building is listed in its own right and has no less statutory protection on account of its 'Group Value' status. Indeed, it is the view of Officers that the 'GV' reference in the list description only reinforces the harmful impact of the works. This is in the sense that group value is clearly derived from the historic functional association between the barn and the main house, and that the domestication of the barn as a result of the roof lights is detrimental to the building's character and the ability to appreciate this historic relationship.

The additional Historic England Guidance highlighted by the Council's Conservation Manager aligns with the conservation policies of the development plan and reinforces the principle that multiple, poorly positioned roof lights can have an intrusive impact on the character of traditional agricultural buildings. It is considered that the scheme in this case fails to adhere to this guidance.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Appendix: Appendix 1 - 201645 and 202284 Applicant response to Committee Report