

A G E N D A

Northern Area Planning Sub- Committee

Date: **Wednesday, 23rd February, 2005**

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:

*Pete Martens, Members' Services, Tel
01432 260248*

e-mail pmartens@herefordshire.gov.uk

**County of Herefordshire
District Council**

AGENDA

for the Meeting of the Northern Area Planning Sub-Committee

To: Councillor J.W. Hope (Chairman)
Councillor J. Stone (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors B.F. Ashton, Mrs. L.O. Barnett, W.L.S. Bowen, R.B.A. Burke, P.J. Dauncey, Mrs. J.P. French, J.H.R. Goodwin, K.G. Grumbley, P.E. Harling, B. Hunt, T.W. Hunt, T.M. James, Brig. P. Jones CBE, R.M. Manning, R. Mills, R.J. Phillips, D.W. Rule MBE, R.V. Stockton and J.P. Thomas

	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.	
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
3. MINUTES To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January, 2005.	1 - 8
4. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS To note the contents of the attached report of the Head of Planning Services in respect of appeals for the northern area of Herefordshire.	
5. APPLICATIONS RECEIVED To consider and take any appropriate action in respect of the planning applications received for the northern area of Herefordshire, and to authorise the Head of Planning Services 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. Agenda item Number 6 is an applications deferred for a site inspection at the last meeting and items Numbers 7 – 29 are new applications or items previously deferred.	

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 6. | <p>DCNC2004/3716/F - CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR TO SNOOKER HALL AT BROOK HALL, 27 BROAD STREET, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE DCNC2004/3717/L - AS ABOVE FOR: MR M ROBERTS PER MR T MARGRETT GREEN COTTAGE HOPE MANSEL ROSS-ON-WYE HEREFORDSHIRE HR9 5TJ</p> <p>Ward: Leominster North</p> | 9 - 14 |
| 7. | <p>DCNC2004/2250/F - QUAD BIKING TRACK AND PAINTBALLING AREA AT BODENHAM MANOR, BODENHAM, HEREFORD, HR1 3JS FOR: MR P WILLIAMS PER HOOK MASON, 11 CASTLE STREET, HEREFORD, HR1 2NL</p> <p>Ward: Hampton Court</p> | 15 - 18 |
| 8. | <p>DCNC2004/2651/F - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 44 DWELLINGS INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON LAND AT ST. BOTOLPH'S GREEN/SOUTHERN AVENUE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: WESTBURY HOMES (HOLDINGS) LTD PER MR G BROCKBANK HUNTER PAGE PLANNING LTD THORNBURY HOUSE 18 HIGH STREET CHELTENHAM GL50 1DZ</p> <p>Leominster South</p> | 19 - 30 |
| 9. | <p>DCNC2004/3698/F - PROPOSED THERAPEUTIC RIDING CENTRE COMPRISING INDOOR AND OUTDOOR ARENAS WITH ASSOCIATED FACILITIES, STABLE YARD AND HAY STORE AT WHARTON BANK FARM, WHARTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0NX FOR: HEREFORDSHIRE RIDING FOR THE DISABLED PER DAVID TAYLOR CONSULTANTS, THE WHEELWRIGHT'S SHOP, PUDLESTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0RE</p> <p>Ward: Leominster South</p> | 31 - 38 |
| 10. | <p>DCNC2004/3783/F - CHANGE OF USE TO RETAIL OF FURNITURE, BRIC A BRAC, CLOTHES, BOOKS & ALL DONATED ITEMS AT UNITS 17 & 18, STATION YARD, WORCESTER ROAD, LEOMINSTER. FOR: ST MICHAELS HOSPICE, BARTESTREE, HEREFORD</p> <p>Ward: Leominster South</p> | 39 - 40 |
| 11. | <p>DCNC2004/4265/F - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE RECEPTION CLASS, REMODEL INTERNAL CLASS 2 AND NURSERY AT ST. MICHAELS C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, BODENHAM, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3JU FOR: GOVENORS OF BODENHAM ST MICHAELS C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL PER HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL PROPERTY SERVICES FRANKLIN HOUSE 4 COMMERCIAL ROAD HEREFORD HR1 2BB</p> <p>Ward: Hampton Court</p> | 41 - 44 |

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| 12. | DCNC2005/0055/F - PROPOSED FARMHOUSE AT LOWER POOL FARM, LEYSTERS, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0HN FOR: MR & MRS N GREENER PER MR D DICKSON, 101 ETNAM STREET, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 8AF | 45 - 48 |
| | Ward: Upton | |
| 13. | DCNC2005/0062/F - NEW BUILD FAMILY CENTRE AT REAR OF TOP GARAGE, PANNIERS LANE, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4QU FOR: HOPE FAMILY CENTRE PER PROPERTY SERVICES HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL FRANKLIN HOUSE 4 COMMERCIAL ROAD HEREFORD HR1 2BB | 49 - 52 |
| | Ward: Bromyard | |
| 14. | DCNW2004/3221/F - SITE FOR MOBILE HOME FOR AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK (TEMPORARY) AT LAND AT WOONTON, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: MR J MILLS PER MCCARTNEYS, THE OX PASTURE, OVERTON ROAD, LUDLOW, SHROPSHIRE, SY8 4AA | 53 - 58 |
| | Wards: Castle | |
| 15. | DCNW2004/3562/F - PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL BARN AT TUNNEL LANE NURSERY, TUNNEL LANE, ORLETON, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4HY FOR:TUNNEL LANE NURSERY PER MR D LEE, OILMILL STUDIOS, BRAMPTON BRYAN, BUCKNELL, SY7 0EW | 59 - 66 |
| | Ward: Bircher | |
| 16. | DCNW2004/4206/L - INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND UPGRADING, DEMOLITION OF GARDEN SHEDS AT 1 GLAN ARROW COTTAGES, BRIDGE STREET, PEMBRIDGE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, 6 9EX FOR: MRS E C FRANCIS PER MS G AMOS, BOULTIBROOKE, NORTON ROAD, PRESTEIGNE, POWYS, LD8 2EU | 67 - 70 |
| | Ward: Pembridge & Lyonshall with Titley | |
| 17. | DCNW2004/4300/F - SINGLE STOREY REPLACEMENT GARDEN ROOM AND TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT THE HALLETS, ORLETON, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4HJ FOR: MS S ATKINSON & MS J FOWLER PER MR A LAST, BROOKSIDE COTTAGE, KNAPTON, BIRLEY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 8ER | 71 - 74 |
| | Ward: Bircher | |
| 18. | DCNW2005/0036/F - ERECTION OF PERMANENT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DWELLING WITH GARAGE AT THE BOOZIE, UPHAMPTON FARM, UPHAMPTON, SHOBDON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9PA FOR: MR & MRS J ROBERTS PER BRYAN THOMAS, ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN LTD, THE MALT HOUSE, SHOBDON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9NL | 75 - 78 |
| | Ward: Pembridge & Lyonshall with Titley | |

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 19. | <p>DCNW2005/0072/O - SITE FOR PROPOSED LOCAL NEEDS HOUSING AT DIS-USED FILLING STATION, ADJOINING THE OLD CARPENTERS SHOP, KINNERSLEY, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR3 6QB FOR: MR & MRS P BISHOP PER MR A JENKINS 12 BROAD STREET HAY-ON-WYE HEREFORDSHIRE HR3 5DB</p> <p>Ward: Castle</p> | 79 - 84 |
| 20. | <p>DCNW2005/0079/O - SITE FOR DWELLING AS PART OF EQUESTRIAN BUSINESS AT RIDGEWAY PADDOCKS, LUCTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: MR R. MATHIAS & MISS C.J. THOMAS MCCARTNEYS CORVEDALE ROAD CRAVEN ARMS SHROPSHIRE SY7 9NE</p> <p>Ward: Bircher</p> | 85 - 88 |
| 21. | <p>DCNE2004/3080/F - EXTENSION TO EXISTING ANNEXE TO PROVIDE TWO BEDROOM ACCOMMODATION AT ROYAL OAK INN, SOUTHEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE & DCNE2004/4327/L - AS ABOVE FOR: I P MARTIN PER C A MASEFIELD, BUILDING DESIGN SERVICES, 66-67 ASHPERTON ROAD, MUNSLEY, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE HR8 2RY</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 89 - 92 |
| 22. | <p>DCNE2004/3402/L - REMOVAL OF WINDOW AND INSERTION OF DOORWAY WITH INTERIOR LOBBY TO RESTAURANT AT THE FEATHERS HOTEL, HIGH STREET, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: THE FEATHERS HOTEL PER MR N J TEALE, BRAMBLE FARM, NAUNTON UPTON UPON SEVERN, WORCESTERSHIRE WR8 0PZ</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 93 - 96 |
| 23. | <p>DCNE2004/3889/F - PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AT BUDDING COTTAGE, CANON FROME, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2TA & DCNE2004/3891/L - REMOVAL OF SINGLE STOREY LEAN-TO STRUCTURE AND PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT SAME ADDRESS.FOR: MR A G BUTCHER AT SAME ADDRESS</p> <p>Ward: Frome</p> | 97 - 100 |
| 24. | <p>DCNE2004/3988/F - PROPOSED EXTERIOR ACCESS TO REAR VIA STAIRWAY, TWO ROOF LIGHTS AND FLUE ON THE CIDER BARN AT CHURCH HOUSE, RECTORY LANE, CRADLEY, MALVERN, WR13 5LHFOR:MR DAVIES AT ABOVE ADDRESS.</p> <p>Ward: Hope End</p> | 101 - 104 |
| 25. | <p>DCNE2004/3965/F - RETROSPECTIVE RELOCATION OF FENCE AT 8 HALLWOOD DRIVE, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2FY FOR: MS M JOHNSON AT ABOVE ADDRESS.</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 105 - 108 |

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 26. | <p>DCNE2004/4078/F - PROPOSED RELOCATION OF BOUNDARY FENCE AT 51 HALLWOOD DRIVE, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2FYFOR:MR C BELL & MRS D J SWIFT AT SAME ADDRESS</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 109 - 112 |
| 27. | <p>DCNE2004/4186/F - EXTENSION TO EXISTING UNIT AT UNIT 16, COURT FARM BUSINESS PARK, BISHOPS FROME, WORCESTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, WR6 5AYFOR: W J HOLDEN & ASSOCIATES MICHAEL LATCHEM & ASSOCIATES 9 AYLESTONE DRIVE HEREFORD HR1 1HT</p> <p>Ward: Frome</p> | 113 - 116 |
| 28. | <p>DCNE2005/0083/F - NEW DWELLING ON THE SITE OF EXISTING DOUBLE GARAGE AT THE GARDEN OF MELROSE HOUSE, 141 THE HOMEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE. HR8 1BP FOR:MR EVANS AT ABOVE ADDRESS.</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 117 - 120 |
| 29. | <p>DCNE2005/0108/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS TO FRONT, REAR AND SIDE OF DWELLING AT BRAMLEIGH, NEW STREET, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2EY FOR: MR & MRS G WILLIAMS PER MR R PRITCHARD THE MILL KENCHESTER HEREFORD HR4 7QJ</p> <p>Ward: Ledbury</p> | 121 - 124 |

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.

COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Northern Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 26th January, 2005 at 2.00 p.m.

Present: Councillor J.W. Hope MBE (Chairman)
Councillor J. Stone (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: B.F. Ashton, Mrs. L.O. Barnett, W.L.S. Bowen, R.B.A. Burke, P.J. Dauncey, Mrs. J.P. French, J.H.R. Goodwin, K.G. Grumbley, P.E. Harling, B. Hunt, T.W. Hunt, T.M. James, R.M. Manning, R. Mills, R.J. Phillips, D.W. Rule MBE, R.V. Stockton and J.P. Thomas

In attendance: Councillor P.J. Edwards

The Chairman welcomed Mr P Mullineux (Senior Planning Officer) to the meeting

167. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors WLS Bowen, B. Hunt, Brig P Jones CBE, RM Manning, RV Stockton and JB Williams.

168. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor/Officer	Item	Interest
Councillor J Stone	DCNW2004/3221/F - SITE FOR MOBILE HOME FOR AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK (TEMPORARY) AT LAND AT WOONTON, HEREFORDSHIRE For: Mr J Mills per McCartneys The Ox Pasture Overton Road Ludlow Shropshire SY8 4AA	Prejudicial and left the meeting for the duration of this item.
Councillor Mrs JP French	DCNC2004/3716/F - CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR TO SNOOKER HALL AT BROOK HALL, 27 BROAD STREET, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE AND DCNC2004/3717/L - AS ABOVE For: Mr M Roberts per Mr T Margrett Green Cottage Hope Mansel Ross-on-Wye Herefordshire HR9 5T	Prejudicial and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE WEDNESDAY, 26TH JANUARY, 2005

Councillor James TM	DCNW2004/3419/F - PROPOSED BARN CONVERSION TO 3 BEDROOMED DWELLING AT TRADITIONAL BARN (ADJ STANSBATCH HOUSE), STANSBATCH, STAUNTON-ON-ARROW For: A H Morris & Son per McCartneys 46 High Street Builth Wells Powys LD2 3AB	Prejudicial and left the meeting for the duration of this item.
Mr M Tansley	DCNW2004/4118/F - PROPOSED REMOVAL/ DEMOLITION OF 2 INDUSTRIAL UNITS AND THE ERECTION OF HOUSE AND GARAGE ON LAND BEHIND WALCOTE BUNGALOW, HIGH STREET, PEMBRIDGE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9DT AND DCNW2004/4119/C For: Mr J A Price per Mr D Walters, 27 Elizabeth Road, Kington, Herefordshire, HR5 3DB	Prejudicial and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

169. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 5th January, 2005 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

170. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS

The report of the Head of Planning Services was received and noted.

171. APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Sub-Committee considered the following planning applications received for the Northern Area of Herefordshire and authorised the Head of Planning Services to impose any additional or varied conditions and reasons considered to be necessary.

172. DCNW2004/3221/F - SITE FOR MOBILE HOME FOR AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK (TEMPORARY) AT LAND AT WOONTON, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: MR J MILLS PER MCCARTNEYS THE OX PASTURE OVERTON ROAD LUDLOW SHROPSHIRE SY8 4AA

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking Mrs Shayler spoke against the application and Mr Skelton spoke in favour.

The Chairman expressed reservations about the proposed siting of the mobile home and proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable the officers to hold further discussions with the applicant to ascertain if a more satisfactory location could be agreed.

RESOLVED

That the Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to determine the application subject to agreeing a more suitable location for the mobile home in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, subject to the conditions considered necessary by Officers and that if such an agreement cannot be reached the matter be referred back to the Committee for

consideration

173. **DCNW2004/3597/F - PROPOSED 2 STABLES AND TACK ROOM ON 3.2 ACRES OF LAND AT UPPER WELSON, EARDISLEY, HEREFORD, HR3 6ND FOR: MR & MRS S & S HARRIS, PINE TREE COTTAGE, 7 CHURCH ROAD, EARDISLEY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR3 ENJ**

The Chairman proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds of development in the open countryside, it did not relate to any existing dwellings; and there was a need to protect local environment.

RESOLVED

(a) That the Northern 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 Services), provided that the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee.

- 1. That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proposal would be contrary to policy A9 - . Development in the open countryside.**
- 2. Policy A2 in respect of protection of the landscape contained in the emerging Unitary Development Plan.**

(b) If the Head of Planning 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.

(The Development Control Manager said that given that the Sub-Committee had considered the issues involved, he would not refer the application to the Head of Planning Services)

174. **DCNW2004/3725/F - CHANGE OF USE FROM Paddock TO RESIDENTIAL GARDEN AND RETENTION OF PART OF DECKING AT THE BOTHY, LOWER HERGEST, KINGTON, HEREFORDSHIRE FOR: MR D BROADLEY AT ABOVE ADDRESS**

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking Mr Davison spoke against the application.

The Sub-Committee had a number of reservations about application because of the prominent location of the decking on a hillside and the potential for the overlooking of the adjoining property. They were of the view that the decking could be relocated in another part of the applicants garden where these problems would not arise.

RESOLVED

(a) That the Northern 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 Services), provided that the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee.

- 1. The development would result in an unreasonable level of overlooking and consequent loss of privacy to the private**

garden space of the adjoining dwelling, having an adverse effect on residential amenity.

2. The adverse impact on the landscape.

- (b) if the Head of Planning 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

(The Development Control Manager said that given that the Sub-Committee had considered the issues involved , he would not refer the application to the Head of Planning Services)

175. **DCNC2004/3716/F - CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR TO SNOOKER HALL AT BROOK HALL, 27 BROAD STREET, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE AND DCNC2004/3717/L - AS ABOVE FOR: MR M ROBERTS PER MR T MARGRETT GREEN COTTAGE HOPE MANSEL ROSS-ON-WYE HEREFORDSHIRE HR9 5T**

The receipt of further letters of objection was reported together with the observations of the Conservation Officer raising no objections. The Northern Team Leader advised that the applicant had submitted amended plans from which he had determined that Listed Building consent would not be necessary.

The Chairman suggested that there was merit in holding a site inspection of the premises.

RESOLVED

That consideration for the application be deferred pending a site inspection on the following grounds.

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

176. **DCNW2004/3353/F - REMOVAL OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND GARAGE, PROPOSED THREE COTTAGE TYPE DWELLINGS AT SUNNYDALE, FLOODGATES, KINGTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR5 3NE FOR: KINGTON BUILDING SUPPLIES LTD PER GARNER SOUTHALL PARTNERSHIP, 3 BROAD STREET, KNIGHTON, POWYS, LD7 1BL**

The receipt of a further letter of objection from Mr Otter was reported. The Northern Team Leader reported that the applicant had advised that he had obtained discharge consent from the Environment Agency in respect of sewage disposal from the property. He advised that at its last meeting the application had been deferred to ascertain if the applicant would be prepared to reduce the number of dwellings from three to two on the site but that the applicant had declined.

The Sub-Committee expressed a number of reservations about the application, particularly in respect of over- development of the site and was also concerned that it

appeared to be at variance with Policy K8 of the Leominster District Local Plan.

RESOLVED

(a) That the Northern 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 Services), provided that the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee.

- 1. The development would constitute over development of the site.**
- 2. proposal was out of character with the local environment**

(b) If the Head of Planning 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

(The Development Control Manager said that given that the Sub-Committee had considered the issues involved , he would not refer the application to the Head of Planning Services

177. DCNW2004/3419/F - PROPOSED BARN CONVERSION TO 3 BEDROOMED DWELLING AT TRADITIONAL BARN (ADJ STANSBATCH HOUSE), STANSBATCH, STAUNTON-ON-ARROW FOR: A H MORRIS & SON PER MCCARTNEYS 46 HIGH STREET BUILTH WELLS POWYS LD2 3AB

Councillor RJ Phillips the local Ward Member expressed a view that the applicant had made every effort to market the barn for agricultural/ commercial purposes without success and had therefore fulfilled the necessary requirements. He pointed out that permission had previously been granted by the Sub-Committee for the similar conversion of barns to residential in nearby parishes and asked for the application to be considered favourably.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The Local Planning Authority, based upon the evidence provided, are not convinced that every reasonable attempt has been made to secure a suitable business re-use and it is not considered that the element of studio/workshop and office proposed represents a sufficiently dominant part of the scheme to enable support for the residential use. Accordingly the proposed residential conversion of the barn would be contrary to Policy A.60 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) and the guiding principles identified in PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.**

- 2 The main barn is in poor structural condition, and not withstanding the information in relation to the condition of the existing timber framing, it is not considered that the building is capable of conversion without extensive alteration and major reconstruction. Furthermore it is maintained that the extent of alterations would have a detrimental effect on the simple character of the building and its setting. This would be contrary to Policies A1, A2(D), A9 and A60 of the Leominster District Local Plan, Policies H.20 and CTC14 of the Hereford & Worcester Council Structure Plan and the guiding principles identified in PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
- 3 The local planning authority do not consider that the information provided with the application relating to the presence of bats, great crested newts and other protected species is sufficient to enable its impact to be thoroughly assessed. In the absence of sufficient information it is concluded that harm could result that would be contrary to Policies A5, A7 and A8 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) and Policies CTC3 and CTC14 of the Hereford & Worcester Council Structure Plan.

178. **DCNW2004/3904/F - PROPOSED DECKING AREAS, CREATION OF BIN STORE AND GENERAL LANDSCAPING AT THE JOLLY FROG THE TODDEN LEINTWARDINE CRAVEN ARMS SHROPSHIRE SY7 0LX FOR: J A TAIT AT THE SAME ADDRESS**

In accordance with the criteria of public speaking Mr Tilson spoke against the application and Miss Tait spoke in favour.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 - **A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

- 2 - **G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 - **G06 (Scope of landscaping scheme)**

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the deposited scheme will meet their requirements.

Informatives:

- 1 - **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

2 - **This permission does not authorise any exterior lighting. A separate application should be made for this to Herefordshire Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990**

179. DCNW2004/4118/F - PROPOSED REMOVAL/ DEMOLITION OF 2 INDUSTRIAL UNITS AND THE ERECTION OF HOUSE AND GARAGE ON LAND BEHIND WALCOTE BUNGALOW, HIGH STREET, PEMBRIDGE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9DT AND DCNW2004/4119/C FOR: MR J A PRICE PER MR D WALTERS, 27 ELIZABETH ROAD, KINGTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR5 3DB

In accordance with the criteria of public speaking Mr James spoke against the application and Mr Walters the applicant's agent spoke in favour.

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 - A08 (Development in accordance with approved plans and materials)

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans and to protect the general character and amenities of the area.

- 3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

- 4 - Prior to any development on site details will be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority with regards to details of window sections and construction, external doors, barge boards and mortar mix to be used in the external construction of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the surrounding vicinity of the development site.

- 5 - D01 (Site investigation - archaeology)

Reason: To ensure the archaeological interest of the site is recorded.

- 6 - E08 (Domestic use only of garage)

Reason: To ensure that the garage is used only for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling.

- 7 - Foul water and surface water discharges must be drained separately from the site.

Reason: To protect the integrity of the Public Sewerage System.

- 8 - No surface water shall be allowed to connect (either directly or indirectly) to the public sewerage system.

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

- 9 - No land drainage run-off will be permitted, either directly or in-directly, to discharge into the public sewerage system.**

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overload of the public sewerage system and pollution of the environment.

- 10 - G01 (Details of boundary treatments)**

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

- 11 - G09 (Retention of hedgerows)**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

Informatives:

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

That conservation area consent be granted subject to the following condition:

- 1 – C01 Time limit for commencement (Listed Building Consent)**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Informatives:

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

The meeting ended at 3.15 a.m.

CHAIRMAN

6 DCNC2004/3716/F - CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR TO SNOOKER HALL AT BROOK HALL, 27 BROAD STREET, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mr M Roberts per Mr T Margrett, Green Cottage, Hope Mansel, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5TJ

Date Received:
26th October 2004

Ward:
Leominster North

Grid Ref:
49556, 59240

Expiry Date:
21st December 2004

Local Member: Councillors Brig P Jones CBE and Mrs J French

Introduction

This application was deferred at the last meeting of the Sub-Committee for a site visit.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Brook Hall, a Grade II Listed building, is located on the west side of Broad Street, between the restoration shop and Vicarage Street. It is in the Leominster Conservation Area and within a primarily residential area as shown on the Leominster Town Centre Inset Map in the Leominster District Local Plan. It is a two-storey building with attic rooms, faced in yellow brick under a Welsh slate roof. The ground floor is vacant, last used by New Life Church, and the first floor is occupied by a residential flat.
- 1.2 These applications propose the use of the ground floor only accommodating a snooker hall, bar, bar storage, managers office and general office.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)

- A2 – Settlement hierarchy
- A18 – Listed Buildings and their settings
- A21 – Development within Conservation Areas
- A52 – Primarily residential areas
- A54 – Protection of residential amenity

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

- CTC7 – Development and features of historic and architectural importance

2.3 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

- HBA1 – Alterations and extensions to Listed Buildings
- HBA3 – Change of use of Listed Buildings
- HBA6 – New development within Conservation Areas

- 2.4 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG6 – Town Centres and Retail Development
PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

3. Planning History

98/0142 - Internal works. Approved 17.8.98.

DCNC2004/0182/F & DCNC2004/0183/L - Conversion to snooker hall and bar area and 4 flats. Refused 11.8.04.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager: No objection.

4.3 Chief Environmental Health Officer: "No comment."

4.4 Conservation Manager: 'Behind the early C20 brick facing lies a remarkable timber-framed, two-storey with attic, C16 house with a jettied cross wing to the north. A brief survey undertaken some ten years ago revealed that this is a quality building whose high status is shown by its close studding and chevron decoration on the north side which is now also hidden by a rendered covering.

The early floor plan, with cross passage, is evident and much of the timbered structure remains. At first floor level, there is evidence of some remarkable and rare wall paintings one of which is partly visible behind a more recent covering of fibre-board.

Later changes to the house are also of significant interest. One of the rear first floor chambers contains surprisingly complete C17 fielded panelling and a moulded fireplace. Features from an C18 fashionable 'makeover' include the plastering of internal floor beams, some of which contain decorative mouldings; moulded architraves, heavy six-panel doors and deep skirtings. All of these add distinction and character to the property.

Brook hall is a property of great historical and architectural interest. In view of its status and of its surviving features, it is considered to be approaching the category of a two star rated building.

As the application states that there will be no alterations, the need for Listed Building Consent is questioned. However, despite the statement that there will be no changes, there are concerns with this application because it is likely that some aspects of the work will affect the character of the building. The proposed use of the smaller rooms in the older part of the property is not entirely clear except that one room will contain a bar. To ensure that the character and fabric of the room is retained, details of how that bar will be serviced, as well as details of the bar itself will be required. During a previous application, it was noted that several doors had been removed. The application drawing shows doors in place and details of re-instated, replacement doors will need to be provided.

More major changes, such as the installation of kitchens, wastes and extracts, are likely to have an impact on this property and listed building consent will be required for such works.

Any changes to the fabric of the building to comply with the building regulations, especially fire, sound and access, are likely to affect the special interest of the building

and listed building consent will be required for these works. Given the sensitivity of this building to change, these issues could be problematical. Any repairs, other than purely traditional and 'like for like' will need listed building consent.

Although there is no objection in principle to change of use for rear of building, the lack of information regarding the proposals for the rest of the ground floor cause serious concern. As the application stands, I must reluctantly recommend approval, but request that conditions regarding the provision of details of bar area and doors are imposed. I would also request that the applicant is made aware of the fact that any additional works, not contained in this application, will require an additional application for listed building consent.'

5. Representations

5.1 Leominster Town Council: 'Recommends refusal as this development is considered to be:

- 1) inappropriate use of an historic building; and
- 2) in an inappropriate location on a busy, blind corner.'

Further comment from the Town Council: "Members expressed concern with regard to the preservation of the architectural merit of the building and would request that your Sub-Committee consider the building as a whole, as it is so important architecturally. It was suggested that consideration of the application might be deferred and the local representative of the Council for British Archaeology and/or Victoria and Albert Museum be given access and invited to produce a report."

5.2 Ten letters of objection have been received:

- a) This is not a suitable location for a snooker hall and would be detrimental to Brook Hall, and to the Conservation Area.
- b) This is a primarily residential area with established shops and boarding house businesses which assist other businesses in the town. The ambience and well-being of areas like this is vital to the regeneration of the town centre and its long-term business future.
- c) There is inadequate parking.
- d) There are already 3 snooker halls in Leominster, we do not need another, and there are enough bars.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application has been submitted following the decision to refuse the previous proposals NC2004/0182/F and NC2004/0183/L, for the following reason:

'It is considered that the proposal does not recognise or respect the special qualities of this Listed Building. The alterations required to bring this building into alternative use are considered invasive so as to adversely affect and destroy its architectural and historic character. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy A18(D) of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire), Policy CTC7 of the Hereford and

Worcester County Structure Plan and the advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment.'

- 6.2 This application is for the change of use of the ground floor only to snooker hall in the former church hall that is at the rear of the building, accommodating 2 full size snooker tables and 6 pool tables, with other rooms being used as a bar, bar store, manager's office and general office. The application does not involve any alterations to the historic fabric of this Listed building, but a free-standing bar is proposed. The proposal does not affect the upper floors. Notwithstanding the further comments of Leominster Town Council, there is no reason as to why this application cannot be considered as submitted. Further, as the proposal does not involve the demolition of a Grade II Listed building there is no requirement to consult with the national amenity societies, which would include the Council for British Archaeology and the Victorian Society, but not the Victorian and Albert Museum.
- 6.3 Brook Hall is located within a primarily residential area where other uses can be developed while maintaining a pleasant residential environment, as shown on the Leominster Town Centre Inset Map in the Leominster District Local Plan. The ground floor of the building was last used as a place where people congregate, uses included place of worship, day nursery and other group activities.
- 6.4 Generally, snooker halls do not cause noise nuisance that would give rise to loss of residential amenity. While it is acknowledged that there may be some unwelcome and undisciplined behaviour of patrons when leaving the snooker hall, it is not considered that this will lead to unacceptable disturbance. However, given the location of the building, it would not be unreasonable to restrict opening times to coincide with licensing hours.
- 6.5 Matters of competition with other snooker halls and other licensed premises in Leominster are not material planning considerations in the determination of this application.
- 6.6 Brook Hall is located close to a large public car park and close to available public transport. Given the close proximity to these facilities the proposal lends itself favourably to underprovision of parking, thereby creating a sustainable form of development.
- 6.7 Details of the free-standing bar and doors, which are to be replaced like for like, required by the Conservation Manager have been received, and confirms there is no objection.

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 - The use of the bar and snooker hall shall not be open to customers between the hours of 11.00 pm and 10.30 am daily.**

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential properties in the locality.

- 3 - Before the development hereby permitted commences a scheme for noise attenuating measures for the snooker hall and lounge bar shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented before the first use of the development to which it relates commences and shall be retained for the duration of the use.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

Informatives

- 1 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

**7 DCNC2004/2250/F - QUAD BIKING TRACK AND
PAINTBALLING AREA AT BODENHAM MANOR,
BODENHAM, HEREFORD, HR1 3JS**

**For: Mr P Williams per Hook Mason, 11 Castle Street,
Hereford, HR1 2NL**

Date Received:
21st June 2004

Ward:
Hampton Court

Grid Ref:
52691, 51462

Expiry Date:
16th August 2004

Local Member: Councillor K Grumbley

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Bodenham Manor is located on the north side of the C1121, in open countryside designated as being of Great Landscape Value and in the Bodenham Conservation Area.
- 1.2 This is a retrospective application for a quad biking track, and paintballing area which is enclosed by green netting and in woodland just to the rear of Bodenham Manor.

2. Policies

Leominster District Local Plan

A1 – Managing the District’s Assets and Resources
A9 – Safeguarding the rural landscape
A10 – Trees and woodland
A21 – Development with Conservation Areas
A38 – Rural Tourism and Recreational Activities
A54 – Protection of Residential Amenity

Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC2 – Development in Areas of Great Landscape Value
CTC7 – Development and Features of Historic and Architectural Importance
CTC9 – Development Criteria

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

LA2 – Landscape Character and Areas Least Resilient to Change
HBA6 – New Development within Conservation Areas
RST1 – Criteria for Recreation, Sport and Tourism Development

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment
PPG17 – Sport and Recreation

3. Planning History

None relevant.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager - No objection.

4.3 Conservation Manager - No in principle objection.

4.4 Head Environmental Health and Trading Standards - No objection.

4.5 Public Rights of Way Officer - No objection.

4.6 Landscape Officer - No in principle objection.

5. Representations

5.1 Bodenham Parish Council strongly object to this application as it considers the nature of the activities proposed to be totally inappropriate in such a sensitive area. This view is fully endorsed by various national and local designations (Area of Great Landscape Value, Conservation Area, SSSI and SWS) covering the site and adjacent areas. It is also in direct conflict with development plan policies designed to protect such sensitive areas from adverse impact of just this type of proposal. It is felt that activities have a damaging effect on resident fauna and on the quiet enjoyment of visitors to Bodenham Lake's Nature Reserve by reason of noise and disturbance.

5.2 Nine letters of objection have been received from local residents.

a) The activities have been and continue to be a source of offensive noise and disturbance.

b) This is an inappropriate activity to this residential neighbourhood and Conservation Area.

c) Paint balling sounds like constant gun fire.

d) The activities operate 7 days a week and therefore no respite from constant noise.

f) Trees have appeared to have been removed contrary to Policy A10

g) Why does Bodenham require another paint balling venue when one was already within the Parish?

h) Increased traffic through the village has caused problems with speed and minor collisions.

i) The proposal does not provide stimulation or employment for the local people.

j) No regard has been given to local people.

5.3 The applicant has said:

a) This application seeks to formalise leisure uses on the site to include both quad biking and paint balling activities.

b) The quad biking track has been laid out to use with straw bales and is surrounded by mature trees providing both privacy and sound attenuation to the surrounding area.

c) The quad biking consists of groups of a group of 10 bikes at any one time driving around the track and is supervised by three instructors. Competitive racing is not undertaken. The bikes are between 90-125cc and service and storage will be carried out in a building to the east of Bodenham Manor.

d) The paint balling activities are held in the area to the north of Bodenham Manor as shown on the submitted plan and is secluded being within a densely wooded area. Between 8 - 25 persons may be involved with the paint balling activity at any time depending on the group requirements.

e) Both activities are aimed at corporate or family clients using Bodenham Manor are intended to be used during daylight hours only.

f) As you are aware from previous correspondence with your officers we have shown that the quad biking is undertaken on site for many years and a track established itself approximately in 1990 when a previous company ran courses at the site.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application has been submitted following complaint to and investigation by the Enforcement Officer, that the grounds of Bodenham Manor are being used for both quad biking and paint balling activities without the benefit of planning permission.

6.2 The determining factor in this application is a nuisance to neighbours from noise arising from the activities. The Environmental Health Officers have visited the site on numerous occasions to monitor the uses from outside the grounds of Bodenham Manor to assess the harm to neighbours, and concludes they do not cause significant nuisance to residential amenity.

6.3 In so far as its visual impact on the locality is concerned, the Landscape Officer advises the uses which are self contained within a woodland just to the rear of Bodenham Manor do not harm the acknowledged visual qualities of the area.

6.4 In exercising its development control function within Conservation Areas, the Council must give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character

or appearance of the area. In terms of its impact on the Conservation Area the Conservation Manager acknowledges the site forms an attractive backdrop to the village, and raises no in principle objection to the continued use of Bodenham Manor for quad biking, and paint balling.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The uses hereby permitted shall be restricted to those areas shown on the amended plan received and date stamped 22 September 2004.**

Reason: In order to define the permission.

- 2. E03 – Restrictions of opening hours (6.00 pm and 10.00 am)**

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential property in the locality.

- 3. G10 – Retention of trees**

Reason: In order to preserve the character and amenities of the area.

Informatives

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

8 DCNC2004/2651/F - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 44 DWELLINGS INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON LAND AT ST. BOTOLPH'S GREEN/SOUTHERN AVENUE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd per Mr G Brockbank Hunter Page Planning Ltd Thornbury House 18 High Street Cheltenham GL50 1DZ

Date Received:

19th July 2004

Ward:

Leominster South

Grid Ref:

49739, 57888

Expiry Date:

13th September 2004

Local Member: Councillors R Burke and J P Thomas

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The site is located north of Southern Avenue at the southern fringes of Leominster Town. To the west is the recently completed St Botolph's residential estate which will be used to gain vehicular access to the site. To the north is largely garden land associated with a nearby dwelling. East and south are existing industrial units forming part of Southern Avenue Industrial Estate. Ground levels fall from west to east within the site, the boundaries being relatively open other than the northern boundary where there is a relatively mature hedge.
- 1.2 The site lies within the settlement boundary for Leominster Town as identified in the Leominster District Local Plan and is specifically allocated both within the Local Plan and forthcoming Unitary Development Plan for employment purposes. Public Footpath ZC101 runs along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site with part of the footpath crossing the south-eastern corner and the majority of the site falls within the flood plain identified by the Environment Agency as a Flood Zone 1 category area.
- 1.3 The application proposes the construction of 44 dwellings, with 12 house designs, 36% of which (16 units) are affordable dwellings to be managed by a registered social landlord. The composition of houses is as follows:

Open market housing 9 four-bedrooms, 16 three-bedrooms, 3 two-bedrooms

Affordable housing: 7 three-bedrooms, 5 two-bedrooms, 4 one-bedroom

All of the open market housing has at least a single garage with one off-street parking space, and parking for the affordable housing is in the form of open plan parking with additional secure cycle storage. It is also proposed that the existing equipped play area be relocated to within the site and made slightly larger with new pedestrian links from the existing estate, along with the provision of a small equipped play area for children over the age of 7.

2. Policies**2.1 National Policies**

- PPS1 – General policy and principles
- PPG3 – Housing
- PPG4 – Industrial and commercial development and small firms

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

- CTC9 – Development requirements

2.3 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)

- A1 – Managing the district's assets and resources
- A2 – Settlement hierarchy
- A14 – Safeguarding water resources
- A15 – Development and water courses
- A23 – Creating identity and an attractive built environment
- A24 – Scale and character of development
- A27 – Maintaining the supply of employment land on industrial estates
- A47 – Targets for housing land
- A49 – Affordable housing on larger housing sites
- A54 – Protection of residential amenity
- A55 – Design and layout of housing development
- A64 – Open space standards for new residential development
- A65 – Compliance with open space standards

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

- S1 – Sustainable development
- S2 – Development requirements
- S3 – Housing
- S4 – Employment
- S6 – Transport
- S8 – Recreation, sport and tourism
- S11 – Community facilities and services
- DR1 – Design
- DR2 – Land use activity
- DR3 – Movements
- DR4 – Environment
- DR5 – Planning obligation
- DR7 – Flood risk
- DR11 – Noise
- H3 – Managing the release of housing land
- H9 – Affordable housing
- H13 – Sustainable residential design
- H15 – Density
- H16 – Car parking
- H17 – Open space requirement
- E5 – Safeguarding employment land and building
- T1 – Public transport facilities
- T6 – Walking
- T7 – Cycling

RST1 – Criteria for recreation, sport and tourism
RST3 – Standards for outdoor playing and public open space

3. Planning History

NC2002/2418/F - Construction of control kiosk (for waste water pumping station) with fence around and access road to pumping station compound. Approved 27th September 2002

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency: The Environment Agency objects to the proposed development as the site is located with Flood Zone 1 and the development may present a significant flood risk through the generation of surface water run off. The application is not accompanied by a flood risk assessment, as required by PPG25. A full response will be provided on the application upon receipt of satisfactory surface water details as part of the flood risk assessment.
- 4.2 Welsh Water: No objection raised subject to condition concerning the control of foul and surface water.
- 4.3 River Lugg Internal Drainage Board: No objection subject to control over the surface water drainage runoff.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.4 Traffic Manager: No objection raised generally to the road and footpath layout and parking provision, but the proposed cycle storage facilities seem to be poorly thought out and a bit of an afterthought. The facilities should be better related to the needs of the residents, closer to where they live and less likely to suffer from lack of ownership.
- 4.5 Public Rights of Way Manager: Public Footpath ZC101 runs across the proposed development site. A Public Footpath Diversion Order must therefore be confirmed and certified before the development is substantially complete. Also, the maximum height of any fencing shall be no greater than 2m along the footpath to prevent a tunnel effect, in the interest of public safety and enjoyment of the public footpath.
- 4.6 Strategic Housing will be seeking the full 36% affordable housing element as per the Supplementary Planning Guidance provision of affordable housing, i.e. 16 affordable housing units with a mix of tenure types managed by a Registered Social Landlord.

The location of the affordable units will need to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority and the RSL. The developer has not yet selected a RSL although a number of the preferred partner associations have been approached. Affordable housing must also meet the current Housing Corporation Scheme development standards and lifetime homes standards. The Section 106 Agreement accompanying any planning permission must include for these requirements and also that the affordable homes be available to future as well as initial occupants and that they will be allocated through Home Point Herefordshire.

The scheme is supported in principle by Strategic Housing but that support is subject to the above provisos.

- 4.7 Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards: 'I would express concerns regarding this application as the BS4142 Noise Assessment indicated that the power wash and vacuum cleaner of Bengry Motors are likely to give rise to complaints, particularly to the property on the south-western corner of the site.'

The properties along the southern boundary adjacent to Southern Avenue are likely to be affected by traffic noise from Southern Avenue. The use of suitable glazing, provision of acoustic ventilators to habitable rooms at ground and first floor to insulate against noise and the provision of a close boarded fence are likely to be sufficient to reduce noise to an acceptable level.

I am satisfied that providing no houses adjacent to the eastern boundary have windows facing eastwards along with the proposed 2m close boarded fence will be adequate to reduce the noise level to below 55 dB.'

- 4.8 Parks Development Manager: 'I am concerned that the proposed development is very dense and does not provide sufficient open space or play facilities for the potential number of users. If planning consent is granted for this development, I feel it would be appropriate to ask for the provision of off-site facilities that children from these new houses might travel to use. The most beneficial use of such a donation would be towards a skate park for Sydonia or, if this is not forthcoming, Herefordshire Council could use the money to provide equipment other than skate ramps for older children at Sydonia.'
- 4.9 Landscape Officer: 'I have no objection to the development but do require details of the play area, particularly the entrances and circulation within it. I recommend that more trees should be incorporated into the planting scheme for the play areas given that there is such limited opportunities for tree planting on the rest of the development. Fruit trees would be suitable.'
- 4.10 Head of Economic Development:: Objects to the application due to the loss of employment land.
- 4.11 Drainage Engineer: 'Details of drainage is required to avoid flooding of Southern Avenue/Castlefields Estate and to attenuate flows to Kenwater/Lugg, Wye, etc.'
- 4.12 Head of Planning Policy: The development site is located within the settlement boundary for Leominster on land identified as an industrial estate, protected for use through Policy A27 within the Leominster District Local Plan. This policy seeks to ensure that such land brought forward to accommodate Part B industrial uses is retained for that purpose in order to maintain a supply of land available for industry. Clearly the proposal is contrary to this policy.

However, development should be considered within the context of what the policy is seeking to achieve, i.e. ensuring that there is an adequate supply of serviced employment land. Advice in PPG3 requires authorities to consider loss of employment land for housing when this land cannot realistically be taken up in the quantities envisaged over the lifetime of the Development Plan. In terms of employment land supply and take up rates in Leominster, the latest figures suggest that there will be an over-supply of employment land at the end of the Plan period (Draft Herefordshire Employment Land Study 2004). The site is also included within the study conducted by West Midlands Employment Land Advisory Group on long-standing employment sites. It concluded that proposals for employment development were limited as the

owners are seeking a higher value use of the land, the Leominster Enterprise Park is meeting demand for employment land and that the employment development might be out of conformity with some surrounding uses. For these reasons, the principle of housing development in this location could be acceptable.

Other issues that need to be addressed are:

- 1) The development does not include any form of buffer between the proposed residential development and adjacent employment uses. PPG4 and Policy A28 of the Local Plan state that Local Authorities should carefully consider that their proposals for new development might be incompatible with existing industrial and commercial activities. Policy A28 suggests a 12m buffer zone would normally be sought for sites adjacent to residential areas. It would be reasonable to expect such a buffer zone in order to protect the amenity of the residents.
 - 2) Policy A65 of the Local Plan suggests that developments of greater than 30 family dwellings should provide small children's/infants' play spaces along with older children's informal play areas. Where these can't be provided on site, financial contributions to such a provision may be made. These requirements should be for both the proposed development site and the existing site as the play area is proposed to be relocated to within the current application site. Whilst the provision of equipped play area and older person's informal play area is made, it is some way short of reaching the suggested sizes in the Local Plan. The location of the play area is also of concern as it is some distance away from the existing estate which it would also be serving. Details for the arrangements for the provision of a play area during the construction phase should also be sought.
- 4.13 Director of Education: 'We confirm that we will be looking for a contribution from the developers. The associated schools for the development would be Leominster Infants, Leominster Juniors and the Minster College. Additional children in the area would prevent us from moving temporary classrooms at Leominster Infants that we would otherwise be able to do, and therefore would be looking for a contribution towards improvements at this school, in particular.'

5. Representations

- 5.1 Leominster Town Council: 'Recommend refusal, as the Leominster District Local Plan and Draft UDP show the land as being outside the settlement boundary and designated for light industrial use.'
- 5.2 Six letters of objection have been received including a letter submitted by St Botolph's Residents Committee and signed by 35 residents. The main points raised are:
 - 1) The use of the existing estate for all traffic including construction traffic will be dangerous, as the estate road is not suitable to accommodate the likely traffic. All traffic should utilise the proposed alternative access via Southern Avenue.
 - 2) The loss of the play space to allow vehicular access to the site is totally unacceptable both in terms of the fact that children will no longer have a playground, and the safety issues with the play space being sited alongside the construction access. Land should be set aside before the start of build for a large enough area for both a young children's playground and for older children to play football on.

- 3) The parking provision is inadequate. The existing estate already suffers from congestion due to lack of parking and there being no visitor parking available.
 - 4) The speed limit should be reduced on Hereford Road down to 30mph due to its residential status along with additional signs saying 'Children and play area'.
 - 5) The existing footpath at the eastern end of the site should be upgraded allowing faster access to the nearest shops and Minster School.
 - 6) We are concerned that a 3-storey dwelling is proposed close to our boundary invading our privacy and amenity. We have no objections to a 2-storey dwelling being built on the plot.
 - 7) If permission is approved, the new site compound should be located so as to minimise the noise, dust and dirt for residents.
 - 8) The narrowing of the roads to reduce the speed and generally calm down traffic is a good idea in principle but when 2 cars meet I am concerned whether there is sufficient space to allow them to pass particularly with on street parking.
 - 9) The play space is inadequate and inappropriately located. A larger area of open space should also be provided for older children to play. Any play equipment should be phased with the development rather than being built at the very end.
 - 10) The developers are not incorporating any of the existing trees as part of the development. Many trees are presently an attraction for wildlife, including buzzards, hawks and other birds.
 - 11) Not enough thought has been given to the needs of the present and future residents of this estate and it is merely a question of squeezing the maximum number of properties into the space with no regard for people's future quality of life and happiness in their surroundings. I question whether profit should outweigh these important considerations.
 - 12) Alexander & Duncan, Agricultural Engineers, ajoin the eastern boundary who operate 7 days a week often from dawn to dusk involving large and noisy machines serving the agricultural community. They also operate an outdoor tannoy system which covers their entire site for communication purposes and are fully alarmed through the night.
- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The main issues for consideration with this application are:

- 1) The principle of development
- 2) Amenity issues
- 3) Density, layout and design
- 4) Open space requirements
- 5) Other material considerations

- 1) The principle of development
- 6.2 The applicants have provided a detailed supporting document which includes a design statement and a policy assessment, particularly with reference to the principle of development on the site.
- 6.3 Policy A27 of the Leominster District Local Plan and Policy E5 of the Draft UDP specifically outline that the change of use of allocated employment sites to non-employment uses such as residential, will not be permitted. As such, the development is contrary to both the Local Plan and Draft UDP policy in this regard. Housing and employment allocations generally coincide with the life of any particular Development Plan. Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 indicates that such allocation should be reviewed periodically to assess whether land allocated for employment is likely to be realistically taken up in the quantities envisaged over the lifetime of the Development Plan.
- 6.4 Paragraph 42 states in particular that Local Planning Authorities should review all their non-housing allocations when reviewing the Development Plan and consider whether some of this land might be better used for housing or mixed use developments. Paragraph 42a of the Draft Revision to PPG3, dated September 2003, goes a stage further and suggests that applicants may expect an expedient and sympathetic handling of planning proposals on land allocated for industrial or commercial use in Development Plans but which is no longer needed for such use.
- 6.5 Based on information provided by the Draft Herefordshire Employment Land Study 2004 and a further study conducted by West Midlands Employment Land Advisory Group, there is likely to be an oversupply of employment land in Leominster up to and beyond the end of the Plan period (2011). Furthermore, the study reveals that the application site is unlikely to become available for employment purposes due to the owner's desire for higher land value. The short / medium term employment land supply is satisfactorily provided by other areas of the existing industrial estates and the new Leominster Enterprise Park.
- 6.6 The site cannot be regarded as brownfield or previously developed land and therefore the normal sequential test outlined in PPG3 for the release of housing land does not necessarily apply to this site. Nevertheless, both PPG1 and PPG3 promote a planning framework which should be supportive of development in sustainable locations where the need to travel is minimised. In this regard, although sited on the fringes of Leominster Town, the site is within walking distance of the Infants School, Junior School and Minster College and has good footpath and bus links with the town and therefore access to all the basic facilities and amenities whilst also being close to employment base. Therefore, although not brownfield land, the site is satisfactorily sustainable for the purposes of residential development.
- 6.7 If the principle of the loss of an employment site is accepted, the need for additional housing within Leominster must also then be considered. The Herefordshire Housing Land Study 2003 outlines anticipated and actual completions and it identifies that Leominster has achieved just 14% of anticipated dwellings in 2000-2006 (61 of 336). Therefore, notwithstanding the allocations outlined in the UDP such as the 400 houses at the Barons Cross site, the need for additional housing over the Plan period is anticipated based on current trends.
- 6.8 To conclude, the development of the site will be contrary to both local and emerging employment policies within the Development Plans. However, these policies must

also be weighed against other guidance contained within Planning Policy Guidance and up-to-date employment and housing needs surveys. As these surveys indicate an over-supply of employment land in Leominster whilst at the same time identifying a likely need for further housing and given the sustainable location of the site, the principle is accepted.

2) Amenity issues

- 6.9 The applicants have undertaken several revisions of the plans to take on board the concerns of residents with regard to the impact of the development on existing properties along the western boundary. The proposed layout now safeguards a satisfactory level of privacy and amenity for the existing residents.
- 6.10 As the site is bordered by existing industrial premises to the east and a busy estate road with further industrial units to the south, the impact of any potential noise sources on the amenity of the occupants of the proposed dwellings must also be considered. In this regard, the applicants have submitted a noise report which includes actual and predicted noise readings. The findings of this report have been assessed by Environmental Health, the conclusion being that with the exception of property 39 in the south-western corner of the site, potential noise levels can be controlled to a satisfactory level through various measures including provision of a 2m high close-boarded fence along the boundaries, restriction on number of windows on elevations bordering industrial units and the use of acoustic ventilators to habitable rooms at ground and first floor of the most affected properties. The noise report suggests that plot 39 (south-western corner) is likely to be subject to unacceptable noise levels from Bengry's Car Wash immediately to the south. However, given that there are newly constructed properties within a similar proximity to this car wash and no complaints of noise have been generated, the situation is considered acceptable.

3) Layout, density and design

- 6.11 The layout has been amended on several occasions to accommodate concerns expressed by residents and your officers. It is now believed that the presented layout achieves an interesting and coherent residential environment complementing the adjoining residential estate and the character of Leominster generally. The layout incorporates a home zone area where pedestrians and vehicles have equal priority and other measures such as reduced road widths, on-street parking, contrasting shared services and the use of the street furniture and trees all go towards creating a more an informal layout whilst also reducing the speed of vehicles making a safer pedestrian environment.
- 6.12 The proposed density equates to around 36 dwellings per hectare which is in line with both Development Plan policies and PPG3 guidance. However, the density is likely to appear higher due to the number of detached and semi-detached properties, the siting of some properties directly fronting the road, and the height with a numbering being 2½ storey. Such arrangements of properties can be found elsewhere in Leominster and is not considered unacceptable. The designs will largely be similar to the existing St Botolph's estate with 12 different house designs proposed. This mix of house types along with the use of a different palette of materials and subtle changes in the detailing, will give the development its own identity complementing the local vernacular evidenced elsewhere in Leominster.

4) Open space provision

6.13 The applicant proposes to relocate the existing play area to within the application site along with its enlargement and additional soft landscaping around. As such, there will no longer be an infants' play area within the existing estate. In addition, an equipped play area for ages 7+ is to be provided on the eastern boundary of the site. No casual amenity or open space of any note is proposed. Whilst the equipped play area and over 7's provision is welcomed, the proposed provisions fall a long way short of that which is recommended both within the Local Plan and the UDP, particularly given that the necessary provision must be viewed in conjunction with the existing estate, now completed. The applicants have been reluctant to enlarge the open space provision. Therefore, in view of the short fall, a contribution of £30,000 is required to be used towards the provision of a new skate park at Sydonia in central Leominster. Such a contribution will be submitted to Herefordshire Council by way of legal agreement.

5) Other material planning considerations

6.14 Concerns have been expressed by residents regarding the proposal to provide access to the site through the existing estate. Whilst Highways raise no objection to this, the applicants have taken on board the concerns and propose to provide the principal access to the site via Southern Avenue with the currently proposed site access being restricted for pedestrian use only through the use of bollards.. However, as this entails land outside of the application site, this would be subject to a separate application should permission be given for the development.

6.15 The Environment Agency maintain their objection to the proposal as the applicant has not undertaken a flood risk assessment. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 where the primary flood risk issue proposed by new development is as a result of surface water runoff. Therefore, full surface water drainage details are required to assess the suitability of the drainage arrangements and the potential effects they will have on the flood plain. Whilst this is unlikely to present a reason for withholding permission, further information is required before an assessment can be made.

6.16 The Public Rights of Way Manager has commented that a public footpath runs along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site and in fact crosses the south-eastern corner. As such, a formal Diversion Order will be required. The existing footpath along the eastern boundary is currently unsurfaced, overgrown with vegetation in parts and is not floodlit. Therefore, part of the S106 agreement will also incorporate the upgrading of this footpath to make it more user friendly.

6.13 The development also incorporates the construction of 16 affordable dwellings equating to a provision of 36%. Leominster Housing Needs Survey 2003 and Home Point Herefordshire estimated a net total requirement of 143 units within Leominster. Therefore, the provision of the units on this site is welcomed. The tenure is likely to comprise a mixture of rented, supported housing and shared ownership, all managed by a Registered Social Landlord. The precise mix of house types and sizes is yet to be agreed but will be finalised through the preparation of the legal agreement should permission be approved.

6.17 The Director of Education has also identified that the proposed development is likely to result in greater pressure on the existing school facilities in the locality, which are all less than 800m away. As a result, a financial contribution of £1000 per dwelling towards improved facilities will also form part of the legal agreement.

Summary

- 6.18 The development site lies within the settlement boundary for Leominster that is presently allocated for employment purposes both within the Local Plan and Unitary Development Plan. However, sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that there is an over-supply of employment land for Leominster for the Plan period and that at the same time there is likely to be the need for further dwellings. In view of this, the principle is accepted. Overall, the development is considered satisfactory subject to the concerns of the Environment Agency being addressed and other minor details such as secure cycle storage and noise attenuation measures being agreed.
- 6.19 Finally, a further consultation exercise has been undertaken on the most recent set of amended plans, which is yet to expire.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to no further objections raising additional material planning considerations at the end of the consultation period and the objection from the Environment Agency being addressed and overcome:

- 1) **The County Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to complete a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for**
 - **the provision of 16 affordable dwellings,**
 - **a contribution of £1000 per dwelling for education,**
 - **a contribution of £30,000 towards provision of a new skate park facility or other older children's play equipment at Sydonia,**
 - **the upgrading of Footpath ZC101 for a distance and standard to be agreed****and any additional matters and terms that she considers appropriate.**
- 2) **Upon completion of the aforementioned planning obligation that the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following conditions and any further conditions considered necessary by officers:**

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 - A09 (Existing plans to be clarified) (And amended plans) (31 January 2005)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the appropriate plans.

3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 - F16 (Restriction of hours during construction)

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

5 - E09 (No conversion of garage to habitable accommodation)

Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking arrangements remain available at all times.

6 - E16 (Removal of permitted development rights) (delete 'fences, gates, walls, and dormer windows)

Reason: To enable the LPA to maintain control over further development on the site to prevent overdevelopment.

7 - F41 (No burning of materials/substances during construction phase)

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and prevent pollution.

8 - G02 (Landscaping scheme (housing development))

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and well planned development and to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment.

9 - G03 (Landscaping scheme (housing development) - implementation)

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and well planned development and to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment.

10 - G09 (Retention of hedgerows) ('boundary hedgerows')

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

11 - Various standard highway conditions concerning road construction, road and pavement surfacing, parking provision, etc.

12 - Drainage conditions as necessary and supported by the Environment Agency

13 - G30 (Provision of play area/amenity area)

Reason: To ensure a reasonable standard of amenity for future occupants of the development.

14 - G31 (Details of play equipment)

Reason: To ensure the play area is suitably equipped.

15 - H27 (Parking for site operatives)

Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

16 - H28 (Public rights of way)

Reason: To ensure the public right of way is not obstructed.

Informative:

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

9 DCNC2004/3698/F - PROPOSED THERAPEUTIC RIDING CENTRE COMPRISING INDOOR AND OUTDOOR ARENAS WITH ASSOCIATED FACILITIES, STABLE YARD AND HAY STORE AT WHARTON BANK FARM, WHARTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0NX

For: Herefordshire Riding for the Disabled per David Taylor Consultants, The Wheelwright's Shop, Pudleston, Leominster, Herefordshire, HR6 0RE

Date Received:
26th October 2004

Ward:
Leominster South

Grid Ref:
50619, 55511

Expiry Date:
21st December 2004

Local Member: Councillor Burke and Councillor Thomas

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The site lies to the west of the B4361 in the small hamlet of Wharton/Ford Bridge, approximately 1.5 miles south of Leominster Town. The site forms part of the former agricultural holding known as Wharton Bank and was formerly used as a silage clamp. Immediately to the east are a range of additional agricultural buildings which are now being converted into private residences. Beyond these are a number of detached and semi-detached properties sited linearly between the road and the main Hereford-Shrewsbury railway line. Ground levels are relatively uneven both within and surrounding the proposed area to be developed with the site being elevated above the nearby main road.
- 1.2 The site lies within the open countryside with the landscape being designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value and also described as a Principal Wooded Hills landscape within the Landscape Character Assessment. To the north and running through the site is footpath/bridleway No. ZC82 and much of the land to the east is designated as falling within the flood plain and is an Environment Agency classification Flood Zone 1.
- 1.3 The application has been submitted by Herefordshire Riding for the Disabled who are a registered charity. It comprises the construction of a bespoke building to be used as an indoor riding arena measuring 75m in length x 45m in width x 9m in height to the ridge of the roof. The indoor arena building will also incorporate a terraced seating area, staff facilities including kitchen, toilets, conference room, teaching rooms, volunteers room and manager's office with a principal entrance and reception area in the form of an octagonal two-storey tower. Also attached to the arena building by way of the vehicle width link is a stable yard development comprising 19 loose boxes with ancillary facilities such as office, tack room, feed store and toilets. To the rear (west) of the main buildings is an outdoor manege measuring 40m in length x 30m in width along with a further open-sided agricultural building to be used for the storage of hay of

15.5m in length x 10m in width x 9m in height. An existing access off the B4361 is to be utilised with a new access track to be constructed along with various hard and soft landscaping and a reed/willow bed foul drainage system.

2. Policies

2.1 National Policies

PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

E6 – Commercial development in rural areas

CTC2 – Areas of Great Landscape Value

CTC6 – Landscape features

CTC9 – Development requirements

A1 – Development on agricultural land

A2 – Diverse agricultural diversification

A3 – Agricultural buildings

LR1 & LR2 – Leisure and recreational development

2.3 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)

A1 – Managing the district's assets and resources

A2 – Settlement hierarchy

A9 – Safeguarding the rural landscape

A12 – New development and landscape schemes

A15 – Development and watercourses

A16 – Foul drainage

A35 – Rural employment and economic development

A38 – Rural tourism and recreational activities

A41 – Protection of agricultural land

A42 – Agricultural buildings

A45 – Diversification on farms

A61 – Community, social and recreational facilities

A66 – Access for the disabled

A70 – Accommodating traffic from developments

A78 – Protection of Public Rights of Way

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

S1 – Sustainable development

S2 – Development requirements

S7 – Natural and historic heritage

S8 – Recreation, sport and tourism

DR1 – Design

DR2 – Land use and activity

DR3 – Movements

DR4 – Environment

E11 – Employment in small settlements in open countryside

E13 – Agricultural and forestry development

E15 – Protection of green field land

LA2 – Landscape character and areas least resilient to change
LA6 – Landscaping schemes
RST1 – Criteria for recreational sport and tourism development
RST6 – Countryside access
S11 – Community facilities and services

3. Planning History

NC2003/3508/S - Re-stoning existing farm track. Prior approval not required 22.12.03.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency: 'The site lies within Flood Zone 1 where the primary risk to flooding is generated by surface water run off. The Agency therefore expects the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and recommends a condition concerning prior agreement of surface and foul drainage systems.'

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager: No objection subject to conditions concerning improved visibility from the access and the provision of suitable parking and vehicle manoeuvring area.
- 4.3 Public Rights of Way Manager: The development is not acceptable as it will obstruct Public Bridleway ZC82. A Division Order is required to enable the development to be carried out, which must be confirmed and certified before the development is substantially complete.
- 4.4 Head of Forward Planning: The application fails to meet the criteria laid out in Policies A1, A2 and A9 of the Leominster District Local Plan. The scale and design of the proposal would be harmful to the AGLV and the location would generate car journeys. There may be exceptional circumstances under Policy A2 that could permit this development.
- 4.5 Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards: No objection subject to conditions concerning restriction on operating hours during the construction phase and control over the disposal of stable waste.
- 4.6 Landscape Officer: Comments predominately included within officers appraisal but conclude with 'I recommend that permission be refused for this development because it would have a harmful effect on the AGLV and would thus be contrary to policy A9 of the Leominster District Local Plan (1999)'

5. Representations

- 5.1 Leominster Town Council: Recommend approval.
- 5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Ian and Linda Hamilton, Cook's Folly, Wharton. The main points raised are:

1) Wharton Bank Farm has been developed into a housing estate. We are continually plagued by the obnoxious smell from Wharton Court and we are now faced with the prospect of a riding school adjoining our land. Surely this small hamlet of Wharton has been developed enough.

2) There have been 3 accidents in the last 3 years within 100 yards of Cook's Folly. The proposed entrance to the development will be very close to a blind bend and the increase in traffic is likely to increase the number of accidents.

3) We are concerned with the noise generated by a complex of this size.

4) The visual impact of the development will be an eyesore on the beautiful natural landscape.

5) We are concerned the development will lead to increased risk of flooding by surface water run off.

5.3 29 letters of support have been received. These include letters from Herefordshire NHS Integrated Learning Disability Service, The Martha Trust, Hereford, SCOPE - for people with cerebral palsy, local specialist schools such as Barrs Court School, Stable Cottage Care Home, Bishop of Hereford's Bluecoat School, and Social Services and Housing Department of Herefordshire Council. Supporting information has been provided by the applicants and their agent, which will be referred to in the officer's appraisal.

The main points raised are:

1) Wharton has the advantage of good access to off-road riding to complement the proposed development as well as good road communications.

2) The plans are carefully considered in order to blend into the landscape.

3) The charity has sought other sites in other parts of the county.

4) The benefit of these facilities for children with severe, profound and multiple learning disabilities or autism and challenging behaviours is remarkable with pupils gaining in confidence and self-esteem and becoming more relaxed and developing concentration and listening skills as well as developing language and communication skills. This proposal will allow the number of sessions for the children to be increased both during and outside of school times, especially after school, weekends and holidays.

5) Herefordshire Riding for the Disabled is an admirable charity dependent upon voluntary contributions from many ordinary people who have been touched by the distress of the disabled whether from illness or accident.

6) The site is the most conveniently located area central to the county with good access roads. The design of the development is sensitive to the surrounding landscape.

7) The existing facility at Holme Lacy does not provide enough staff, horses or facilities to allow more people to benefit from working with horses.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 Before considering the planning issues, it will be useful for members to understand the nature of the applicants business and what has led to the submission of this application. Herefordshire Riding for the Disabled (HRDA) is a charity, which provides therapeutic riding for adults and children with all levels and types of disabilities, both mental and physical. Disabled people are referred to RDA by medical, educational and social services from across the West Midlands including Shropshire and Worcestershire, Herefordshire and mid-Wales. RDA also treat road traffic accident and stroke victims directly from hospital.
- 6.2 HRDA is one of only a few centres nationwide who offer hippo therapy (physiotherapy on horseback). HRDA currently rent a premises at Holme Lacy College but have been given notice to quit within the next 2 to 3 years due to the College's future redevelopment plans. There is presently a client waiting list with the need to expand the existing premises to cater for future expansion plans including offering NVQ training for special needs students along with other specialist courses.
- 6.3 HRDA have been actively looking for a new site for a number of years. Six sites in particular have been given serious thought, which are Westhide, OS585442, Mill Farm, Credenhill, OS446430, Hampton Bishop, OS545386, St Mary's School, Lugwardine, OS548408, Lady Bank Farm, Credenhill, OS446439, and New Court Farm, Lugwardine, OS544414. All these sites have proved unsuitable for various reasons including negative planning reaction, poor access, unacceptable landscape impact, flood risks and restrictions on the purchase of the land.
- 6.4 In considering the determination of this application there are two principal planning issues, which must be assessed.
- 1) The principle of development,
 - 2) Landscape impact.
- 1) The principle of development
- 6.5 It is estimated that the proposal will create 8 full-time and 11 part-time staff, in addition to NVQ students employed with base training. The existing premises at Holme Lacy also has around 92 regular volunteers and it is likely that this figure will increase given the scale of the development proposed. In view of this, the proposal must be assessed against employment as well as community and recreational policies within the Development Plans. Policy A35 of the Leominster District Local Plan and Policy E11 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) both state that large-scale development for employment uses in the open countryside should not be permitted. The floor area of the main building alone is around 2650 square metres (28,525 square feet) therefore the development is unquestionably large scale.
- 6.6 Policy A61 of the Leominster District Local Plan concerning community, social and recreational facilities states that:
- 6.7 'Proposals for new community, social and recreational facilities and services which aim to satisfy health, general welfare, recreational and social needs will be permitted where

they accord with criteria listed within Policy A1 of the Local Plan, are appropriate in scale to the need of the local community and reflect the character of the area and are located within or around the settlement within the area they serve.'

Again, the proposal does not accord with the criteria contained within this policy or Policy A1.

- 6.8 However, the proposal serves an extremely wide catchment area with the majority of its staff and volunteers emanating from rural areas (reflecting horse ownership). All of the users of the facilities are transported by bus. The Hereford-Leominster bus route passes the site entrance with a bus stop being in close proximity. In view of this, the opportunity exists for staff and volunteers to commute to the site by non-car based modes of transport. Whilst the proposal does not accord with the employment, community, and general sustainability principles outlined in the Development Plans, the nature of the proposal and the people that it serves is such that it is unlikely the development could ever be fully sustainable and therefore the principle of the development in the location proposed is accepted.

2) Landscape Impact

- 6.9 A pre-application proposal for the site in question was submitted in April of last year, with the applicants being advised that the proposal could not be supported due to the harmful impact that the development would have on the character and appearance of the landscape. This view has not changed. The site lies within an Area of Great Landscape Value.
- 6.10 Policy A9 of the Leominster District Local Plan states:
'The beauty and amenity of the rural landscape will be conserved and enhanced by paying particular regard to the design, scale, character and location of development proposals to ensure that they do not detract from the quality and visual appearance of the landscape within which they sit.'
- 6.11 The proposal is for a large development (much larger than most agricultural buildings) in an elevated position. The site is also prominent being readily visible from the A49, the B4361, the railway line, footpaths in the locality, and from slopes above Marlbrook on the opposite side of the Lugg valley. The visual impact is compounded by the overall scale of the development and particularly the large expanse of roof to the indoor riding arena, which will be visually intrusive in this planned position.
- 6.12 The applicants have recognised the prominent and elevated position of the site and have tried to mitigate the visual impact of the main riding arena building by excavating it some 3m into the rising ground levels. Landscaping is also proposed on the most visible elevations. However, the Landscape Officer also raises concerns regarding the extent of excavation and the large-scale embankments that would result, which would look artificial and further detract from the landscape. The site is also classified as Principal Wooded Hills within the Supplementary Planning Guidance Landscape Character Assessment. The definition of such a landscape is described as 'highly visible landscapes framing long-distance views and therefore their visual integrity is of paramount importance in the rural landscape.' The proposal is also considered to be contrary to guidance contained within this Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- 6.13 Members should, however, be aware that landscape policy A9 of the Leominster District Local Plan, criteria 2, states that

‘Proposals should only be permitted which would not adversely affect the landscape quality of the Area of Great Landscape Value unless the exceptional need for the development is sufficient to outweigh the need for protection.’

This policy does therefore allow for developments to be permitted in exceptional cases even where the impact on the landscape is considered to be harmful.

6.14 Having carefully considered and balanced out the planning issues including the social benefits of the proposal, it is felt that as the proposed development is not site specific, a more appropriate location could be found which is acceptable in landscape terms.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1 The proposal is for a large-scale development in an elevated and prominent position within the landscape which is designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is considered that the development by virtue of its siting and design would have a harmful impact on the Area of Great Landscape Value contrary to Policies CTC2, CTC6 and CTC9 of the Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan, Policy A9 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) and advice contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled Landscape Character Assessment and Planning Policy Statement 7:Sustainable Development In Rural Areas.**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

AREA SUB-COMMITTEE

10 DCNC2004/3783/F - CHANGE OF USE TO RETAIL OF FURNITURE, BRIC A BRAC, CLOTHES, BOOKS & ALL DONATED ITEMS AT UNITS 17 & 18, STATION YARD, WORCESTER ROAD, LEOMINSTER.

For: St Michaels Hospice, Bartestree, Hereford

Date Received:

2nd November 2004

Ward:

Leominster South

Grid Ref:

50290, 58547

Expiry Date:

28th December 2004

Local Member: Councillor J Thomas and Councillor R Burke

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Vacant industrial unit between Promopak UK Ltd and RPM Motors, and on the east side of Worcester Road. The premises were last used for motor vehicle repairs and sale of motor vehicle spare parts. There is car parking to the front of the unit.
- 1.2 This application proposes the change of use to retail sales; furniture, bric-a-brac, clothes, books and other donated items.

2. Policies**Leominster District Local Plan**

A1 – Managing the District’s Assets and Resources

A2 – Settlement Hierarchy

A27 – Maintaining the Supply of Employment Land on Industrial Sites

A30 – Redevelopment of Employment Sites to Alternative Uses

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

E5 – Safeguarding Employment Land and Buildings

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPG6 – Town Centre and Retail Developments

3. Planning History

79/82 - Use of premises for motor vehicle repairs. Approved 7th March 1979.

80/1184 - Use of premises for sale of motor vehicles spare parts. Approved 31st October 1980.

4. Consultation Summary

AREA SUB-COMMITTEE

Statutory Consultations

4.1 No statutory consultations are required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager recommends refusal. There is insufficient designated car parking for the proposed use, and as such would not conform with the requirements of the County Council's Design Guide and specification for parking provision.

5. Representations

5.1 Leominster Town Council: Recommend approval.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application seeks the change of use of a building within an identified industrial estate to retail use. The policies of the adopted local plan aim to concentrate retail development within existing town centres, Policy A33, and to maintain the supply of industrial land upon existing industrial estates, Policy A27 refers.

6.2 While, the site was last used partly for the sale of motor vehicle spare parts it was so as part of planning permission ref: 80/1185 and in connection with the use of the building for the repair of motor vehicles. This application is for the use of the whole building to an A1 Use. This is contrary to Policy A27 of the Leominster District Local Plan. The applicant has not given any reason as to why this use cannot be located within the Town Centre.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposal involves the establishment of a retail use on an industrial estate outside the Town Centre. As a result the proposal is contrary to Policy A27 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) in that it would result in the loss of a building from industrial use to retail use, contrary to the objectives of that Policy, and in the absence of reasoned justification to indicate otherwise it is contrary to Policy A33 in that it proposes retail development beyond both Town Centre and edge of Centre locations.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers Internal departmental consultation replies.

11 DCNC2004/4265/F - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE RECEPTION CLASS, REMODEL INTERNAL CLASS 2 AND NURSERY AT ST. MICHAELS C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, BODENHAM, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3JU

For: Govenors of Bodenham St Michaels C of E Primary School per Herefordshire Council Property Services Franklin House 4 Commercial Road Hereford HR1 2BB

Date Received:
14th December 2004

Ward:
Hampton Court

Grid Ref:
53070, 51029

Expiry Date:
8th February 2005

Local Member: Councillor K Grumbley

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 St Michael's School, a Victorian school building under a clay tiled roof, with modern single storey flat roofed extension, is located on the east side of the unclassified 94029, almost opposite a small car park, and on the north side of the Peas Green, a Grade II Listed building. It is located in the Bodenham Lake Conservation Area and within an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is also located in a flood plain.
- 1.2 This application proposes a single storey extension with pitched roof to be constructed between the flat roofed addition and the northern boundary of Peas Green. A water tower that is to the rear of the school building is to be demolished.

2. Policies

Leominster District Local Plan

A1 – Managing the Districts Assets and resources
A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
A18 – Listed Buildings and their Settings
A21 – Development within Conservation Areas
A24 – Scale and Character of Development
A54 – Protection of Residential Amenity

Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC2 – Development in Areas of Great Landscape Value
CTC7 – Development and Features of Historic and Architectural Importance
CTC9 – Development Criteria

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

LA2 – Landscape Character and Areas Least Resilient to Change
HBA4 – Setting of Listed Buildings
HBA6 – New Development Within Conservation Areas

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment
PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk

3. Planning History

93/0172/N - Extension to form library. Approved 23rd April 1993.

DCNC2004/2612/F - Single storey extension to provide reception class. Refused 6th October 2004 for the following reason:

The proposal conflicts with Policy A54 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) in that design, scale and position of the classroom extension will harm the amenities of the neighbour through overlooking.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency - No objection.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager - No objection.

4.3 Environmental Health Officer - No comments.

4.4 Historic Buildings Officer - No objection in principal, but would prefer gable to include any detail as per the original building.

5. Representations

5.1 Bodenham Parish Council comment as follows: 'have examined this resubmission of an earlier application and have noted the re-designed elements which address the earlier concerns. The Council is now satisfied that the application addresses those concerns and offers its unqualified support for the project.'

5.2 A letter of objection has been received from Mr and Mrs Gately, Peas Green, Bodenham.

- a) The extension will bring the school within a metre of our bounday and reduce privacy.
- b) It will be intrusive in the Conservation Area, it will be higher to that part closest to our house.
- c) Inadequate car parking for parents.
- d) Would have no objection to the proposal if the proposed fence is extended down to the road.

5.3 The applicants have said:

- a) The present classroom is used for reception and nursery children. The room is registered for 26 children but we need 32 spaces.
 - b) We have a waiting list for the nursery.
 - c) We are only able to offer nursery facilities 3 mornings per week. The proposal will enable us to provide 5 mornings.
 - d) The classroom will also provide individual music to tuition and special needs teaching.
 - f) The water tower is no longer in use and expensive to maintain.
- 5.4 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford, and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 This application has been submitted following the refusal of DCNC2004/2612/F. While the proposal maintains the same accommodation as previous its height has been reduced down from 7.2 m to 6.3 m.
- 6.2 The proposal is for an extension, to be used as a reception classroom, to the flat roofed single storey addition that is on the south side of this Victorian school building.
- 6.3 The extension has been designed so that the height of the pitched roof will be lower than the height of the main school building. As the Historic Buildings Officer has not recommended refusal in relation to the arch detail, it is not considered that there are grounds to refuse on this basis.
- 6.4 The proposed classroom will be within a metre of the boundary hedge to Peas Green, with proposed windows in this elevation. While, the existing hedgerow provides some protection of residential amenity to the neighbour it would not be unreasonable to require the hedgerow to be reinforced with additional planting to provide added screening.
- 6.5 An extension is of a design that would not detract from this part of the Conservation Area or cause harm to acknowledge visual qualities of the area, or to the setting of the adjoining listed building. There is no objection to the demolition of the water tower.
- 6.6 Although the school is located within a flood plain the Environment Agency has raised no objection to the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be recommended 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 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

3 - G12 (Planting of hedgerows which comply with Hedgerow Regulations)

Reason: To ensure that hedges planted are ecologically and environmentally rich and to assist their permanent retention in the landscape.

Informative:

N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

12 DCNC2005/0055/F - PROPOSED FARMHOUSE AT LOWER POOL FARM, LEYSTERS, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0HN

For: Mr & Mrs N Greener per Mr D Dickson, 101 Etnam Street, Leominster, Herefordshire, HR6 8AF

Date Received:
10th January 2005

Ward:
Upton

Grid Ref:
55310, 63364

Expiry Date:
7th March 2005

Local Member: Councillor J Stone

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Pool Farm is a 22.23 hectare (approximately 55 acres) agricultural unit located on the south-east side of the A4112. There is a range of livestock and storage buildings adjacent to the farm drive and alongside this is temporary living accommodation. The site is located in open countryside.
- 1.2 This application proposes a 2-storey, 4-bedroomed farmhouse and detached 3-bay garage/car port to be located on the north side of the farm buildings.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)

- A.2 – Settlement hierarchy
- A.24 – Scale and character of development
- A.43 – Agricultural dwellings

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

- A4 – Agricultural dwellings
- CTC9 – Development criteria

2.3 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

- H8 – Agricultural and forestry dwellings and dwellings associated with rural businesses

- 2.4 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

3. Planning History

NC2002/2371/F - Temporary siting of 2 portacabin type structures to provide living accommodation. Approved 7.11.02.

NC2002/2372/F - Extend existing pool for fishing. Approved 30.10.02.

NC2003/0670/F - Retrospective application for siting of a residential caravan. Approved 28.4.03.

NC2003/1304/F - Amend siting of fishing pool. Approved 25.6.03.

DCNC2004/2689/F - Proposed farmhouse. Refused 30.9.04 for the following reason:

'The proposed dwelling, in view of its overall size, is not considered to be commensurate with the functional need of the farming enterprise and, as such, the future occupation of the property, in accordance with the occupancy condition, would be compromised due to the relatively high value of such a property. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to the advice set out in Annex A of Planning Policy Statement 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas and Policy A43 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire).'

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency: No in principle objection.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager: No objection.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Leysters Parish Council: 'The smaller size of the revised application meets with our approval and is more appropriate. However our previous comments made on the application dated 18.8.04 particularly in reference to screening and the agricultural tie still apply.'

- 5.2 The applicant has said:

a) An application for a farmhouse has been previously refused under delegated powers, DCNC2004/2689/F, refers. An appeal has been lodged. The refusal was because of the size of the proposed dwelling not being commensurate with the functional needs of the holding.

b) Since the refusal, the farmhouse has been redesigned and clear divisions drawn between what is essential to the management needs of the farm and the accommodation required for family habitation. The reduction in size is by 25%.

c) The accommodation will also provide facilities for visiting fishers.

d) Planning permissions exists for a fishing pool, NC2003/1304/F. The landscaping for the pool has been agreed and commenced with the removal of an overhead electricity line.

e) It is appreciated that, strictly speaking, the pool and fishing activities cannot be considered farming but they do come under the heading of tourism and recreational activities. Once constructed and stocked, this side of the farm enterprise will generate employment and further income, not only from fishing but also from bed and breakfast accommodation.

f) It is appreciated that the formula for which the size of any farm dwelling is calculated is imprecise and that the calculation is loosely based on the profit generated from the farming activities being sufficient to pay a mortgage for the size of the dwelling proposed.

g) It is, in our opinion, inequitable to make a judgement on this kind of application by assessing what is commensurate with the needs of the holding. What about long-term management plan for the farm, the family requirements, the finances of the farm and those of its owners?

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application has been submitted following the refusal of DCNC2004/2689/F where it was considered the proposed farm dwelling was of a size not commensurate with the agricultural needs of the holding. An appeal has been lodged against that decision and awaits determination.

6.2 Planning permission has been granted for temporary living accommodation on this agricultural unit, NC2002/2371/F refers, and subsequent approval under NC2003/0670/F. The permissions were granted for the applicant to establish an agricultural functional need in accordance with the requirements of PPG7, now PPS7. Notwithstanding the applicant's opinion at (g) above, the PPS requires any dwelling for agricultural purposes to be commensurate in size with the established functional requirements of the holding. The PPS does not provide a definition of commensurate. However, the PPS continues, "dwellings that are unusually large in relation to the agricultural needs of the unit, or unusually expensive to construct in relation to the income it can sustain in the long-term, should not be permitted". As a rule of thumb, officers consider that farm dwellings should not exceed 120 sq m, a floor area that has been upheld on appeal elsewhere. It is the requirements of the farming enterprise, rather than those of the owner or occupier, that are relevant in determining the size of the dwelling that is appropriate to a particular holding. The dwelling proposed in this application has a total floor area of 245m². The garage/carport is some 64m². The applicant has not given any justification as to why a dwelling of the size proposed is essential to the agricultural needs of the enterprise. The fishing lake does not form part of the agricultural needs.

6.3 Given the limited size of the holding, a little over 22 hectares, it is not considered the dwelling is commensurate in size to the agricultural needs of the enterprise. The matter of commensurate size is important not only as a means to prevent inappropriately large dwellings in the countryside, but to ensure the affordability of the dwelling, an important factor in ensuring the long term retention of housing for the agricultural community.

6.4 In terms of siting, and Policy A.43 the proposal is considered acceptable in that it will be located adjacent to farm buildings.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed dwelling, in view of its overall size, is not considered to be commensurate with the functional need of the farming enterprise and, as such, the future occupation of the property, in accordance with the occupancy condition, would be compromised due to the relatively high value of such a property. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to the advice set out in Annex A of Planning Policy Statement 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, and Policy A43 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire).**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

13 DCNC2005/0062/F – NEW BUILD FAMILY CENTRE AT REAR OF TOP GARAGE, PANNIERS LANE, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4QU

**For: Hope Family Centre per Property Services
Herefordshire Council Franklin House 4 Commercial
Road Hereford HR1 2BB**

Date Received:
10th January 2005

Ward:
Bromyard

Grid Ref:
64469, 53876

Expiry Date:
7th March 2005

Local Member: Councillors P J Dauncey and B Hunt

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The site is located on the west side of the A465, Hereford road, and on the north side of Top Garage. There is a high conifer hedge to the north, beyond which is Touchwood and Cliff Morris Haulage Yard. Bromyard High School is further along.
- 1.2 This application proposes to relocate a single storey building that will accommodate family rooms, creche and offices to be used in connection with Hope Family Centre, an organisation that provides assistance to disabled people. Access off Panniers Lane and parking for 8 vehicles, including a disabled persons bay is also proposed.

2. Policies

2.1 Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Landscape Policy 1 – Development outside settlement boundaries

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC9 – Development criteria

2.3 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

DR1 - Design

LA5 – Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows

CF5 – New community facilities

2.4 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

3. Planning History

MH94/0499 - Restaurant and bedroom block. Refused 2.8.94.

Appeal allowed 6.3.95.

MH94/1172/O - Restaurant. Approved 25.10.94.

NC2003/2440/F - Family centre. Approved. 2.12.03.

DCNC2004/1515/F - Variation of condition 3 – relocation of access. Approved 12.7.04.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 Welsh Water: No objection.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager: No objection.

5. Representations

5.1 Bromyard and Winslow Town Council: “My Council objected to the siting of the building proposed as shown on the submitted layout plans on the grounds that being so close to the neighbouring dwelling to the north east and having regard to the intended use of that building the development proposed would harm the amenities of that neighboring dwelling.”

5.2 Avenbury Parish Council: support this application.

5.3 Letters of objection has been received from:

Eleanor Morris, Touchwood, Panniers Lane, Bromyard
CT Morris, Touchwood, Panniers Lane, Bromyard

a) The windows and entrance of the building look directly into my garden and the children's play area is less than 6ft wide bordering directly onto my garden and my own children's play area.

b) No provision has been made for fencing to keep the users of the Family Centre away from private residential land and to prevent nuisance and trespass.

c) It will cause substantial impact on the quiet enjoyment of our home.

d) There is no provision for landscaping.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application is for the relocation of the Hope Family Centre building approved under NC2003/2440/F. The building will be some 10m further north of the approved

position. Given that planning permission has already been granted for a family centre building in this locality, there is no objection to the principle of relocation of this building.

- 6.2 The building will be located close to a very high conifer hedge, which provides screening between the site and adjoining properties. The hedgerow also provides protection of residential amenity between the proposal and adjoining dwelling.

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 - A12 (Implementation of one permission only)**

Reason: To prevent over development of the site.

- 3 - D01 (Site investigation - archaeology)**

Reason: To ensure the archaeological interest of the site is recorded.

- 4 - G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 5 - G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 6 - G09 (Retention of trees/hedgerows)**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

Informative:

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

AREA SUB-COMMITTEE

Further information on the subject of this report is available from «CONTACT» on «CONTACT_TELNO»

14 DCNW2004/3221/F - SITE FOR MOBILE HOME FOR AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT OF LIVESTOCK (TEMPORARY) AT LAND AT WOONTON, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mr J Mills per McCartneys, The Ox Pasture, Overton Road, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 4AA

Date Received:
28th September 2004

Ward:
Castle

Grid Ref:
35862, 51886

Expiry Date:
23rd November 2004

Local Member: Councillor J Hope

Introduction

Members will recall this application from the Northern Area Planning Committee held on the 5th (deferred for sites inspection) and 26th January 2005. This application is returned with the siting of the proposed mobile home returned to its original position as submitted following it's revision to a site to the rear of the main buildings upon the advice of the Conservation Manager.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site comprises a 0.02 hectare plot of land to the south of the two farm buildings found in this location. Mr Mills currently resides at Lower Wootton Farm where 37 hectares are farmed. Six years ago Mr Mills purchased a further 34 hectares and it is in relation to this land and the associated farm buildings that permission is now sought for the mobile home. The land associated with this application has previously been laid to arable crops. It is now intended to develop the livestock enterprise on this site.
- 1.2 The proposal is for a mobile home to be located to the east of the agricultural buildings currently found on site. The application was originally submitted for this location adjacent to the existing farm buildings but this was amended due to concerns over the impact on the landscape and visual amenities of the locality. Following the last Northern Area Planning Committee held on the 26th January 2005 the location has reverted to the original site adjacent to the main buildings.

2. Policies

2.1 National Policies

PPG1 - General Policy and Principles
PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

H16A - Development Criteria
H20 - Residential Development in Open Countryside
CTC9 - Development Criteria
A4 - Development Considerations

2.3 Leominster District Local Plan

A1 - Managing the District's Assets and Resources
A2(D) - Settlement Hierarchy
A9 - Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
A12 - New Development and Landscape Schemes
A24 - Scale and Character of Development
A41 - Protection of Agricultural Land
A43 - Agricultural Dwellings
A70 - Accommodating Traffic from Development

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Deposit Draft)

S1 - Sustainable Development
S2 - Development Requirements
S7 – Natural and Historic Heritage
DR1 - Design
H7 - Housing in the Countryside Outside Settlements
H8 - Agricultural and forestry dwellings and dwellings associated with rural businesses
T11 - Parking Provision
LA2 – Landscape character and areas least resilient to change

3. Planning History

NW01/3362/F: Agricultural building – Approved, 13th March 2001

NW01/0067/F: Extension to agricultural building – Refused, 3rd May 2001

NW98/0357/N: Agricultural building – Approved, 25th September 1998

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency – Raised no objection

4.2 Welsh Water raised no objection

Internal Council Advice

4.3 Traffic Manager - Raised no objection to the proposed development

4.2 Conservation Manager – Raises an objection to the proposed location.

5. Representations

5.1 Almeley Parish Council raised no objection to the original siting. No response was forthcoming to the revised location.

5.2 Neighbours - Three letters were received in relation to the original siting of this dwelling:

- Hibbert, J. Hall Mote, Woonton
- Shayler, D & E. Crispin, Woonton
- Bloss, P. Sunnybank, Woonton

The comments raised can be summarised as follows:-

1. Harm to landscape caused by siting;
2. Current lack of use of farm buildings on site;
3. Availability of alternative properties;
4. Lack of demonstrated need for the dwelling at this location;
5. Long term plan for a permanent dwelling;
6. Suggestion of two dwellings being needed.

Two letters, from Crispin, Woonton were received in response to the revised siting to the rear of the farm buildings raising the following points:

1. Siting is not as desired by Mr Mills but rather that of the Landscaping Officer;
2. Loss of view;
3. Loss of privacy.

In response to the reversion to the original siting a further letter of correspondence has been received from Sunnybank. This correspondence reiterated the points made regarding harm to the landscape. All consultation responses received in relation to the original consultation on this proposal are again valid due to reversion to the original site.

In relation to the comments made by Crispin, Members will recall from the Northern Area Planning Committee meeting held on the 26th January 2005 that it was confirmed that all objections to the proposal would be withdrawn if the original siting was reverted to.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

Principle of Development

6.1 It is suggested that the most appropriate way to consider an application such as this is first to establish the acceptability of the proposal in relation to the five areas of consideration specified under Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. These are:

- Existing functional need
- Requirement for full time worker
- Establishment and profitability of the unit
- Availability of alternative accommodation
- Satisfaction in relation to other planning requirements

The above issues are reflected in the adopted Leominster District Local Plan, Policy A34 and the emerging Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan, Policy H8.

- 6.2 In relation to points 1, 2 and 4, supporting information has been submitted. The need for this mobile home is justified by the new operations to be undertaken in the farm buildings adjacent to the application site. In this instance a new farm enterprise is intended for this site and the operation in question, namely livestock, requires someone resident on site to ensure the welfare of said livestock. Clearly an arable operation requires no on site resident but such livestock welfare cannot be guaranteed by off site provision in this instance. The need for a resident on site is accepted in this case with no dwellings within the financial reach of a farm worker identified as available in a location that could serve this new operation. The confusion over the two dwellings suggestion is confirmed as a grammatical error; only a single dwelling is requested in this location. Although the financial stability of the wider farm operation can be demonstrated, the financial viability of this new operation cannot. PPS7 specifies that in such circumstances temporary dwellings will be entertained. Clear evidence of a currently sound financial footing has been provided and the investment in the farm buildings on site demonstrates the intention to develop this enterprise.
- 6.3 Point 5 will be considered in the section of this report subsequent to this.

Other Issues

- 6.4 The other issues considered to be associated with this application revolve around the siting and access. The design and scale are clearly not matters for consideration due to the application type.
- 6.5 Considering first the access arrangements, these are considered acceptable with the dwelling accessed via the existing field access point serving the existing farm buildings.
- 6.6 Turning to the matter of siting, the original proposal was influenced by the applicants desire to accommodate his neighbours wishes, together with the restrictions of the site which is limited by covenant and under grounding piping. Unfortunately the proposed siting was prominent and considered harmful to the landscape of the wider locality. The revised siting to the rear of the main farm buildings was considered to address this problem. The original siting has, however, now been reverted to and the Conservation Manager has maintained the objection to this position. The site is in a prominent, isolated position, some 75 metres back from the main road. There is only a low roadside hedge along the southern side of the A480 in the vicinity of the site, which does not provide much of a screen. Siting a home in this position, unrelated to the A480, is uncharacteristic of the settlement pattern along the A480 and would detract from the landscape character of this area. It is considered that this position will be intrusive in the landscape and detrimental to its character and appearance.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1 - The proposal, by virtue of its siting, would represent an intrusive and incongruous feature considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the landscape and as such is considered contrary to PPS7, Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan policy CTC9, Leominster District Local Plan policies A9 and A24, and Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) policies S1, S2, S7, and LA2.**

Informative:

1 - N15 (Reasons(s) of Grant of PP)

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

15 DCNW2004/3562/F - PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL BARN AT TUNNEL LANE NURSERY, TUNNEL LANE, ORLETON, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4HY

For: Tunnel Lane Nursery per Mr D Lee, Oilmill Studios, Brampton Bryan, Bucknell, SY7 0EW

Date Received:
15th October 2004

Ward:
Bircher

Grid Ref:
49735, 66549

Expiry Date:
10th December 2004

Local Member: Councillor S Bowen

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site comprises 1.2 hectares of land and buildings (including a tied bungalow) used as as Plant Nursery. The site lies in open countryside approximately 0.6 km to the south east of Orleton and on the south side of Tunnel Lane (C1046).
- 1.2 In addition to the tied bungalow the nursery benefits from a number of timber framed greenhouses and sheds and associated hardstanding and storage areas. Ground levels within the site fall away towards its southern boundary.
- 1.3 The surrounding land is predominantly in use for agricultural purposes although there are properties in relatively close proximity to the west and east of the site. The western and southern boundaries are characterised by a mature mixed deciduous hedgerow offering screening from the surrounding area.
- 1.4 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a new part timber clad office and dry goods working area and part steel framed greenhouse/propogating house. An underground storage area would be created beneath which would be accessed from an open yard area on the eastern side of the building. The total floor area created by the proposed building would be 410 square metres within the underground storage area, 253 square metres with the greenhouse/propogating house and 85 square metres within the office/working area. A total of 748 square metres. In addition to the new build element, the application would involve the demolition of a significant number of the existing sheds and greenhouses. A total of 551 square metres of buildings would be removed.
- 1.5 The proposed building would have a maximum length and width of 27.6 metres and 13.8 metres respectively. The maximum ridge height of the building would be 7 metres with approximately 4 to 6 metres being above the surrounding ground level.
- 1.6 It is proposed to retain the existing boundary planting and supplement it with additional landscaping.

2. Policies

National Guidance

PPG4 – Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms
PPG7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

Hereford and Worcester Country Structure Plan

Policy CTC9 – Development Requirements
Policy CTC10 – Trees and Woodland
Policy A3 – Agricultural Buildings
Policy S3 – Retail Development Outside Town Centre
Policy S5 – Retail Development Outside Urban Areas

Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)

Policy A1 – Managing the District's Assets and Resources
Policy A2(D) – Settlement Hierarchy
Policy A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
Policy A10 – Trees and Woodland
Policy A12 – New Development and Landscape Schemes
Policy A24 – Scale and Character of Development
Policy A34 – Village Based Neighbourhood Shops and other Small Scale Commercially Based Local Services
Policy A35 – Small Scale New Development for Rural Businesses within or around Settlements
Policy A70 – Accommodating Traffic from Development

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

S1 – Sustainable Development
S2 – Development Requirements
S7 – Natural and Historic Heritage
DR1 – Design
DR2 – Land Use and Activity
DR13 – Noise
LA2 – Landscape Character and Areas Least Resistant to Change
LA5 – Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
LA6 – Landscaping Schemes
E7 – Expansion of Existing Businesses
E11 – Employment in Smaller Settlements and Open Countryside
E13 – Agricultural and Forestry Development

3. Planning History

93/339 - Extension to existing bungalow forming new bigger kitchen and new bedroom. Approved 26th July 1993
87/678 - Extension to dwelling. Approved 4th January 1988
15454 - Erection of bungalow. Approved 12th August 1963
14645 - Erection of agricultural workers dwelling. Approved 13th May 1963

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required

Internal Consultee Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager raises no objection

4.3 Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards raises no objection.

5. Representations

5.1 A total of 6 letters of objection have been received from the following persons:-

CE & JD Mason, Hewell, Tunnel Lane, Orleton, SY8 4HY (3 letters)
The Occupiers, Hewell Cottage, Tunnel Lane, Orleton, SY8 4HY (1 letter)
Mr & Mrs D Thomas, Hewell Farm, Tunnel Lane, Orleton, SY8 4HY (2 letters)
Mrs Hyde, 24 Mortimer Drive, Orleton, SY8 4JW (1 letter)

The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:-

- Dimensions of two storey building inappropriate for the size of the nursery business
- Building more accurately described as an industrial unit
- Possible intention to establish non-agricultural use for storage and assembly, sales and distribution of cast iron and metal goods
- Any permission should restrict the use of the building to purposes associated with the established nursery building
- Tunnel Lane not suitable for HGV use
- Additional traffic both commercial and private cars detrimental to highway safety
- Concern regarding run off and flooding of lower lying adjacent fields
- Noise and disturbance associated with activities inside and outside the building
- Scale of buildings detrimental to visual amenity, applicant has already removed trees and hedgerows. Any permission granted should require provision of effective screen hedging.
- Building too close to allow retention of hedgerow
- Building should be set in from existing hedgerow boundaries
- Existing access points should be retained and not removed without consent.
- Doubt regarding the validity of statements relating to HGV movements
- Concern that business may have been run down deliberately in an attempt to justify a change of direction
- Statement that building is underground since much of the building will be visible above ground
- Clear evidence of need should be provided
- Summary of storage requirements is a serious cause for concern
- Storage areas would be better located on site of existing greenhouses
- If planning permission granted the following provisions should be made
 - a) maintenance of an effective screen along western and southern boundaries
 - b) building should be no closer than 4 metres from boundary to ensure hedgerow survived
 - c) use is restricted to horticultural in support of established nursery building
 - d) no further expansion of the building be permitted
 - e) that soakaway should meet technical requirements on size and permeability

5.2 A total of 4 letters of support have been received from the following persons:-

Mr R Gare, Kingsfield, Kingsland
T P Brown, The Bay Horse, Orleton
Mr & Mrs Thomas, Hewell Farm, Tunnel Lane, Orleton (retraction of initial concerns)
Mr B Sykes, Church House, Milbrook Way, Orleton

Comments can be summarised as follows:-

- Current owners have made a lot of improvement but there is still a lot that needs doing
- Amended design for building appears suitable
- Owners will tidy up the area and enhance the business
- Old greenhouses were becoming unsafe

5.3 The latest response from Orleton Parish Council can be summarised as follows:-

Parish Council continues to support rural enterprise but still have the following reservations about this application:

- Previous and recent removal of hedgerow - potential for creating larger accesses
- Overall scale and height of proposal has not been addressed
- Underground element questionable
- Doubts regarding the validity of HGV movements - only recollection of very occasional lorry in the past
- Only access to site for HGV's would be via The Maidenhead crossroads - an accident black spot
- Would roads and bridges support such traffic
- Council would support a nursery on site with planning permission tightly drawn to ensure it remains a nursery facility to the village

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:-

- a) the principle of the proposed development and its intended use
- b) the visual impact of the proposed building
- c) the implications for the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- d) traffic and access issues and
- e) surface water drainage

Principle and Intended Use

6.2 The application site lies in open countryside where development proposals are strictly controlled by Policy A2(D) of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire). However the policy defines a series of exceptional circumstances which include development associated with the efficient running of agricultural or forestry enterprises and small scale employment generating uses that comply with other more detailed policy requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

- 6.3 The nursery business is a long established one on the site and in this respect the application does not offer an opportunity to challenge the principle of such the use at this rural location. The key issue in this context is the acceptability of the expansion/rationalisation of the existing operation and to ensure that its scale remains appropriate to its location as required by Policy A35.
- 6.4 It is acknowledged that the site occupies an isolated location, which is remote from the nearest settlement and not conveniently accessed by pedestrians but this is a long prevailing arrangement and in this instance would not rule out the consideration of this particular proposal based upon the specific merits of the case.
- 6.5 In response to serious concerns raised locally, the applicant has sought to clarify the intended use of the site and more specifically the proposed building, which through negotiation has been significantly adapted in order to seek to reduce its perceived scale and industrial appearance. The result is a largely glazed and partly timber clad structure which is considered to be more in keeping with the existing character of greenhouses and sheds on the site.
- 6.6 The “underground” section of the building would be used for a range of storage uses associated with the requirements of the nursery. This would include an area for storing sterilized soil since the current makeshift arrangements do not guarantee a weed free environment; an area for the bulk storage of peat, wood chippings, moss, pots, baskets, troughs, trays and seed; a working area for potting and assembly of hanging baskets which would also accommodate the pumping and control machinery for the water storage and irrigation system for the nursery and an area for secure storage of plant and equipment. It is submitted by the applicant that these requirements are not adequately catered for by the existing range of buildings on the site. This is acknowledged by the agreed intention to dismantle and remove structures with a combined floor area of approximately 551 square metres.
- 6.7 The proposed building with a gross floor area of 748 square meters would involve an increase of 197 square metres of operational workspace, which is not considered to be of a scale that is inappropriate for such a use in this location.
- 6.8 Restrictions upon the use of the building, the demolition of existing structures and the inherent control over future development would bring about the type of limitations referred to in consultation responses and in the light of these, it is accepted that there is a justification for the building as proposed and that subject to the satisfaction of other detailed policies, the principle is an acceptable one having regard to Policies A2(D) and A35 of the Local Plan.

Visual Impact

- 6.9 The site and surroundings comprise an attractive, although undesignated area of open countryside, characterised by agricultural use and scattered farm holdings and dwellings. The site itself despite the recent removal of hedgerows and trees (works not requiring formal consent) maintains a reasonable level of screening along its boundaries. The applicant intends to retain all of the existing planting along the southern and western boundaries with the intention of supplementing the existing boundary with additional planting where necessary.

- 6.10 It is considered that this will certainly reduce the impact of the proposed building in views from the south and west. The sloping nature of the site is such that the building would not be readily visible from the public highway to the north and east. Furthermore despite the apparent height of the building (a maximum height of some 7 metres) it would be set into the sloping land such that its height above ground level would range between approximately 4 and 6 metres. The positioning and relative height of the building compares favourably with existing greenhouses on the western boundary of the site and in its revised form which includes timber cladding, glazing and the introduction of breaks in the ridgeline the appearance is considered for less industrial and more in keeping with the nursery context.
- 6.11 It is therefore considered that with appropriate conditional controls, the revised building could be successfully integrated into the local landscape without significant detriment.

Residential Amenity

- 6.12 It is not considered that the applicants proposals would result in any activities that would be beyond what would be considered normal for a modern nursery business. It is possible that the ambitions of the applicants would attract more customers to the site but this in its own right is not a material planning consideration since the site has a well established use as a plant nursery with a retail element and the level of use in reality is not an issue that the Local Planning Authority can control. Furthermore it is advised that the primary intention would be to supply local retail outlets rather than focus on improving direct sales.
- 6.13 No objection is raised by the Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards Officer and therefore subject to a restriction on nursery related use the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Access and Parking

- 6.14 The applicant does not involve any alterations to existing accesses to the site or the expansion of existing parking areas, both of which would require planning permission in their own right. Whilst there appears to be some dispute about HGV activity associated with the previous owners, it is mentioned that only 2 HGV deliveries would be made per month.
- 6.15 The information provided by the applicant has been considered by the Traffic Manager who raises no objection to the proposal. Reference to weight restrictions on the local road network is not a matter that carries any significant weight to a planning recommendation but clearly the applicant will need to ensure compliance with other regulatory requirements.

Drainage

- 6.16 The applicant has proposed the installation of a holding tank that will collect surface water with the aim of recycling this into the nursery's irrigation system. Any additional surface water will be catered for by a new soakaway system. In the light of local concerns relating to the potential flooding of adjacent land on appropriate conditions is proposed to maintain control over the system.

Conclusion

- 6.17 It is considered that the modernisation of the existing facilities is required to enable the well established nursery to secure future viability and that the scale and appearance of the revised multi-purpose building is acceptable in this rural location. The concerns of local residents and the Parish Council are acknowledged but with conditional restrictions is considered that the issues raised, where relevant to planning legislation, can be dealt with by way of conditions.

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 - **A08 (Development in accordance with approved plans and materials)**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans and to protect the general character and amenities of the area.

- 3 - **E10 (Use restricted to that specified in application)**

Reason: To suspend the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order currently in force, in order to safeguard the general character and amenities of the area.

- 4 - **F20 (Scheme of surface water drainage)**

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

- 5 - **There shall be no floodlighting or external lighting installed at the site without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of protecting the visual amenity of the area.

- 6 - **F48 (Details of slab levels)**

Reason: In order to define the permission and ensure that the development is of a scale and height appropriate to the site.

- 7 - **G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 8 - **G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

9 - G09 (Retention of trees/hedgerows)

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

10 - G19 (Existing trees which are to be retained)

Reason: In order to preserve the character and amenity of the area.

11 - 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.

12 – Prior to the first use of the building hereby approved, the existing storage buildings and greenhouses identified on the schedule and drawing no. 500/10 received on 20th January 2005 shall be demolished and permanently removed from the site.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the visual amenity of the area.

Informatives:

1. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

16 DCNW2004/4206/L - INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND UPGRADING, DEMOLITION OF GARDEN SHEDS AT 1 GLAN ARROW COTTAGES, BRIDGE STREET, PEMBRIDGE, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9EX

For: Mrs E C Francis per Ms G Amos, Boultibrooke, Norton Road, Presteigne, Powys, LD8 2EU

Date Received:
9th December 2004

Ward:
Pembroke &
Lyonshall with Titley

Grid Ref:
39039, 58361

Expiry Date:
3rd February 2005

Local Member: Councillor Roger Phillips.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The property is a semi-detached two-storey Grade II Listed timber framed black and white cottage. Located adjacent to the C1032 public highway, it has a large domestic rear curtilage that runs to the west in the direction of neighbouring semi-detached dwellings of modern construction.
- 1.2 The application proposes internal alterations, and minor external alterations and upgrading of the existing property and demolition of garden sheds in the rear garden area. The main development issues involve removal of a modern fire place to reveal two bread ovens, removal of wood wool slab to internal walls to expose original oak framing replacing flooring onto concrete bases from that of earth, upgrading of party walls in order to meet building regulation requirements, removal of inappropriate windows with replacement windows as well as the introduction of one new window in gable elevation. Insertion of W.C. in store, enclosure of a staircase and insertion of conservation rooflight, formation of attic bedroom with new access stairs and conservation roof light. As well as alterations to the dwelling the application proposes taking down various corrugated garden sheds in the garden and relocation of a timber garden shed.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster District Local Plan

- A1 – Managing the District’s Assets and Resources.
- A2(C) – Settlement Hierarchy.
- A18 – Listed Buildings and their Settings.
- A21 – Development within Conservation Areas.
- A24 – Scale and Character of Development.
- A56 – Alterations, Extensions and Improvements to Dwellings.

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC15 – Conservation Areas

2.3 Unitary Development Plan – Revised Deposit Draft.

S1 – Sustainable Development.

S2 – Development Requirements.

S3 – Housing.

S7 – Natural and Historic Heritage.

DR1 – Design.

HBA4 – Setting of Listed Building.

HBA6 – New Development within Conservation Areas.

2.4 Planning Policy Guidance 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

3. Planning History

NW05/0001/F – Erection of garage and rear boundary fence. Demolition of sheds – not yet determined.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.2 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.1 Conservation Manager raises no objections to the proposed development (for further details please refer to Officer's Appraisal).

5. Representations

5.1 Pembridge Parish Council has no objections to this application.

5.2 A letter of objection has been received from Mr. Duncan James, Combe House, Combe,

Presteigne, Powys. He considers the proposed internal changes will further damage the historic integrity of an important listed building. Particular emphasis is made about concerns with regards to the proposed conversion of the attic room to a bedroom and the impact this will have on the existing structure of the dwelling, the installation of two roof lights and introduction of an additional window into the gable elevation.

5.3 A letter has also been received from the applicant's agent setting out additional information.

5.4 The full text of this letter can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 It is considered that the proposed development generally is acceptable. The proposed new window introduction on the first floor is typical of the fenestration of the property, and enhances the overall balance of window insertion on this side of the dwelling. The internal alterations are also generally acceptable and will complement the overall original character of the dwelling while also showing consideration to modern day living standards and building regulations. The existing attic space to be converted to a bedroom is considered acceptable. Many of the original features of the property are to be retained and enhanced. However the proposed external roof lights on the rear elevation for this proposed bedroom are rather obtrusive and not in keeping with the original building's character and it is recommended that a condition be attached to the decision reducing the roof lights from one to two.

RECOMMENDATION

That listed building consent be granted subject to the following conditions.

1 - C01 (Time limit for commencement (Listed Building Consent))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2 – All development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved plans, except for the roof lights as indicated on the approved plans, on the rear elevation, which will be reduced to one, for which full details of location, design and type will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to any development on site.

Reason: In the interests of the historical importance and character of the existing dwelling's structure.

3 - C07 (Painted finish to windows/doors)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of special architectural and historical interest.

Informatives:

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

AREA SUB-COMMITTEE

Further information on the subject of this report is available from «CONTACT» on «CONTACT_TELNO»

17 DCNW2004/4300/F - SINGLE STOREY REPLACEMENT GARDEN ROOM AND TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT THE HALLETS, ORLETON, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4HJ

**For: Ms S Atkinson & Ms J Fowler per Mr A Last,
Brookside Cottage, Knapton, Birley, Herefordshire,
HR4 8ER**

Date Received:
15th December 2004

Ward:
Bircher

Grid Ref:
49652, 67323

Expiry Date:
9th February 2005

Local Member: Councillor S Bowen.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 A two-storey semi-detached cottage of external stone/render construction under a slate roof within Orleton Conservation Area. The internal accommodation is of small proportions and consists of a living room, kitchen, bathroom and conservatory on the ground floor and bedroom on the first floor. The conservatory and bathroom on the ground floor are single storey extensions added onto the original dwelling.
- 1.2 To the rear is the local primary school car park. There is a similar attached property on the western elevation of the property in front of which pedestrian access is obtained to the property subject to this application. There is no car parking facilities within the curtilage. To the south east of the application site is a single storey dwelling with timber screening between its boundary and that of the dwelling subject to this application.
- 1.3 The application proposes demolition of the existing single storey extensions and erection of a two storey extension to the rear of the property to include a study and kitchen on the ground floor and bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. The existing single storey conservatory on the eastern elevation is to be replaced with a single storey garden room.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster District Local Plan, (Herefordshire)

- A1 – Managing the District's Assets and Resources.
- A2(C) – Settlement Hierarchy.
- A21 – Development within Conservation Areas.
- A23 – Creating Identity and an Attractive Built Environment.
- A24 – Scale and Character of Development.
- A54 – Protection of Residential Amenity.
- A56 – Alterations, Extensions and Improvements to Dwellings.

2.2 Unitary Development Plan – Revised Deposit Draft, (Herefordshire).

S1 – Sustainable Development
S3 – Housing.
DR1 – Design.
DR2 – Land Use and Activity.
DR4 – Environment
H16 – Car Parking.
H18 – Alterations and Extensions
HBA6 – New Development within Conservation Areas.

2.3 Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 – Housing.

3. Planning History

3.1 None recorded on the application site.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager has no objection to the granting of planning permission.

4.3 Conservation Manager has no objections subject to the inclusion of a condition with regards to external construction materials in order to protect the character of the Conservation Area.

5. Representations

5.1 Orleton Parish Council supports this application but feel that consideration should be shown to the adjoining owner with shared access during the building works to be carried out if this application is successful.

5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Mr G R Wall who lives in the adjoining dwelling to the property subject to this application.

His objections to the application can be summarised as:

- No. 2 is a holiday home and therefore the proposal is not essential.
- There is no private access to the property.
- The property is situated in a very confined space with part of the original garden having had a single storey dwelling erected upon it.
- Concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding Conservation Area, adjacent property and school located to the rear of the proposed development site.

Also included with Mr Wall's letter of objection is a copy of a letter from Dr Snape of the Parish Council to Mr Wall advising of the date of the Parish Council meeting, and opining that the level of access through his property may increase.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The development is to replace the existing single storey extensions and construction of a rear two storey extension and single storey side extension. The Head of Conservation in the response to this application has stated: "The proposed extension, in general appears to be quite dominant. It has a similar footprint to the dwelling and the southeast elevation shows it to have similar scale. The southwest elevation does show a staggered roofline, which helps to disguise the size of the extension from the front. In order to soften the appearance on the front elevation it is suggested that the proposed garden room be set back slightly. It is also recommended that the roof lights be omitted, as there is already a considerable amount of light coming through the windows. The proposal does have some appeal over the current 'hotch potch' of additions, therefore would, enhance this part of the Conservation Area to a degree".
- 6.2 The development is rather large in floor area, in comparison to the original dwelling. However the proposal is for the replacement of the existing extensions with development that will have no unreasonable impact of any of the adjoining neighbouring dwellings or school's privacy and amenity. There are no windows proposed looking directly into neighbouring properties except for one window on the southwest elevation which can be subject to a condition. Therefore the proposal is considered acceptable in scale and size.
- 6.3 The location is within a Conservation Area and therefore external construction materials need to reflect the surrounding area. This issue can be addressed through the attachment of conditions to the approval notice.
- 6.4 The proposed development has raised no objections from the Highway Manager who has stated in the highways response "The dwelling has no vehicular access so it would seem unreasonable to refuse permission because of the proposed extension."
- 6.5 In conclusion the proposed development is considered acceptable, it does not invade on adjoining dwellings privacy or amenity and will be no more detrimental to the existing property's built form or the surrounding vicinity than that of the existing extensions that have been added to the original build and therefore the proposed development is in-line with relevant national planning policy and policy in the Leominster District Local 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 - C02 (Approval of details) (A) Roofing material. (B) Exterior Wall Finish. (C) Window Design and Construction.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 3 - Notwithstanding the approved plans no rooflights will be included into the roof of the approved garden room.

Reasons: In order to protect the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding Conservation Area.

- 4 - The first floor window on the southwest elevation will be in obscure glazed and top hung.

Reasons: To protect the privacy of the adjoining neighbour to the south west of the application site.

- 5 - G01 (Details of boundary treatments)

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

- 5 - E01 Restriction on hours of working

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality.

Informatives

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

- 2 - The applicants/developers are respectfully required to show consideration to the adjoining dwelling's amenity during construction and not to obstruct the pedestrian access to the property.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

18 DCNW2005/0036/F - ERECTION OF PERMANENT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DWELLING WITH GARAGE AT THE BOOZIE, UPHAMPTON FARM, UPHAMPTON, SHOBDON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9PA

**For: Mr & Mrs J Roberts per Bryan Thomas,
Architectural Design Ltd, The Malt House, Shobdon,
Leominster, Herefordshire, HR6 9NL**

Date Received:
7th January 2005

Ward:
Pembridge &
Lyonshall with Titley

Grid Ref:
40074, 63485

Expiry Date:
4th March 2005

Local Member: Councillor R Philips

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site comprises a 0.35 hectare plot located to the north east of Uphampton Farm. There is currently a mobile home providing temporary accommodation for the applicant, Mr Roberts. This accommodation was permitted in application DCNW2000/2574/F. This application seeks consent for a two storey detached dwelling house with detached two bay, cart shed style, garaging. The site is outside, but in close proximity to, an area designated as an Historic Park and Garden.
- 1.2 The application requests a permanent agricultural workers dwelling in support of mixed agricultural activities taking place on land with an approximate area of 73 hectares. The enterprise currently consists of broiler chickens, calf rearing, beef cattle, tack sheep, potatoes, and cereals. The dwelling is principally requested in support of the livestock activities on site.
- 1.3 A previous application, DCNW2004/1518/F, was withdrawn due to issues associated with the scale of the dwelling, and the operations on the farm and need for the permanent property. This application requested a dwelling with a floor area of approximately 265 square metres (excluding detached garaging). A revised application (DCNW2004/2850/F) addressed the need issue and reduced the dwelling to approximately 206 square metres (excluding detached garaging). This second application was then reported to the Northern Area Planning Sub Committee on 3rd November 2004. The Sub Committee was minded to grant planning permission contrary to officers recommendation. The reason for granting permission was that members felt the size of the proposed dwelling was commensurate with the need.
- 1.4 The Head of Planning Services subsequently examined the proposal and made the decision to refer the application to Planning Committee for the reason that the decision of the Sub Committee conflicts with critical policy criteria relating to the size of the proposed dwelling. However this application was subsequently withdrawn and this revised proposal submitted for consideration.

- 1.5 This current proposal is for a three bed, two storey dwelling with a floor area of approximately 170 sq metres (excluding a detached garage with garden store).

2. Policies

Government Guidance: PPS7

Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC9 – Development Criteria
A4 – Development Considerations

Leominster District Local Plan

A1 – Managing the Districts Assets and Resources
A2(D) – Settlement Hierarchy
A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
A24 – Scale and Character of Development
A43 – Agricultural Dwellings

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

S1 – Sustainable Development
S2 – Development Requirements
S7 – Natural and Historic Heritage
DR1 - Design
DR2 – Land Use and Activity
H8 – Agricultural and Forestry Dwellings and Dwellings Associated with Rural Businesses

3. Planning History

DCNW2004/2850/F – Erection of permanent agricultural workers dwelling with garage.
Withdrawn 2nd December 2004.

DCNW2004/1518/F Erection of permanent agricultural workers dwelling
Withdrawn, 9th June 2004

DCNW2000/2574/F Site for mobile home for agricultural worker
Approved, 1st March 2001, permission expired 31st January 2004.

DCNW2000/1152/F Livestock Building
Approved, 9th August 2000 - Erected

DCNW2000/0017/F Poultry House
Approved, 9th August 2000

DCNW2000/0007/O Agricultural workers dwelling
Withdrawn, 31st August 2000 - Erected

DCNW2000/0006/F Livestock building

Withdrawn, 20th January 2000

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency raises no objections

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Head of Engineering and Transportation has no objections to the granting of permission.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Shobdon Parish Council have no objections to the proposal subject to an agricultural tie.
- 5.2 No representations have been received in response to full statutory advertisement procedure.
- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

Principle of Development

- 6.1 It is considered that the most appropriate way to consider an application such as this is to first establish the acceptability of the proposal in relation the five areas of consideration specified under Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, Annex I. These are:
1. Existing functional need,
 2. Requirement for full time worker,
 3. Establishment and profitability of the unit,
 4. Availability of alternative accommodation,
 5. Satisfaction in relation to other planning requirements.
- 6.2 The above issues are reflected in the adopted Leominster District Local Plan, policy A34, and the emerging Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan, policy H8.
- 6.3 A temporary dwelling is currently found in situ on the site. It is considered that points one, two and four were effectively considered as part of the temporary permission. A supporting statement has been submitted with this application with all relevant points covered. It is standard practice for a temporary dwelling to be provided where all factors excluding the financial tests have been passed. The interim period allows for this point to be covered, potentially allowing for a permanent dwelling in the future where the long term economic viability can be demonstrated. In this case it is considered that the financial tests have now been met. It is suggested that the principle of an agricultural workers dwelling on this site has been established and can be accepted for the purposes of this application.

6.4 Point 5 will be considered in the section of this report subsequent to this but it is confirmed that the proposed siting is considered acceptable.

Satisfaction in relation to other planning requirements

6.5 The design of this proposal is not considered problematic, the proposal is undoubtedly attractive, however once again the scale is considered to be an issue.

6.6 National and local planning policies require agricultural workers dwelling to be of a commensurate size with the established functional requirement. PPS7 states that:

'It is the requirement of the enterprise, rather than those of the owner or occupier, that are relevant in determining the size of dwelling that is appropriate to a particular holding.'

The need on this holding is for a single dwelling. The scale of this property is an important consideration because the exceptional circumstance in planning policy that allows for dwellings such as this is specific to agricultural/forestry workers. It is therefore important in the long term for these dwellings to be retained for these. Controlling the scale of the properties is fundamental to this. A dwelling of a size such as, even with the reduction in size, this would command a significant market value, even with a tie. An excessive market price, preventing it's occupancy by an agricultural worker is a regular feature of applications seeking the removal of an agricultural workers tie.

6.7 In other respects, specifically residential amenity, landscape impact, and transportation, no objections are raised to this proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be refused for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed dwelling, in view of its overall size, would not be commensurate with the established functional requirements of the holding contrary to Annex 1 of PPS7: The Countryside, adopted Leominster District Local Plan Policy A43, and emerging `Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan Policy H8.**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

19 DCNW2005/0072/O - SITE FOR PROPOSED LOCAL NEEDS HOUSING AT DIS-USED FILLING STATION, ADJOINING THE OLD CARPENTERS SHOP, KINNERSLEY, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR3 6QB

For: Mr & Mrs P Bishop per Mr A Jenkins 12 Broad Street Hay-on-Wye Herefordshire HR3 5DB

Date Received:
10th January 2005

Ward:
Castle

Grid Ref:
33914, 49253

Expiry Date:
7th March 2005

Local Member: Councillor J Hope

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site is located on the western edge of the rural hamlet known as Kinnersley and adjacent to the southern side of the A4112 public highway. The site as a whole is visually unattractive and occupied by a dis-used petrol filling station consisting of the former forecourt with canopy over and adjacent former shop/workshop. The latter two structures are of external brick and concrete block construction under tin roofs.
- 1.2 The site is surrounded on both its southern and western sides by agricultural land. On the eastern side is a single dwelling that is occupied by the applicants.
- 1.3 This outline application proposes to demolish the existing structures on site and redevelop the site for 'local needs housing' with all matters reserved other than means of access. An indicative layout for 4,3, bed roomed dwellings has been submitted.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire).

A1 – Managing the Districts Assets and Resources.
A2(D) – Settlements Hierarchy.
A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape.
A24 – Scale and Character of Development.
A30 – Redevelopment of Employment Sites to Alternative Uses.
A48 - Affordable Housing for Local Needs in Rural Areas.

2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

S1 – Sustainable Development
S2 – Development Requirements
S3 – Housing
DR1 – Design
DR2 – Land Use and activity.

- DR3 – Movement.
- DR4 – Environment.
- DR5 – Planning Obligations.
- H7 – Housing in the Countryside outside Settlements.
- H9 – Affordable Housing.
- H14 – Re- using previously developed land and buildings.
- E5 – Safeguarding employment land and buildings.

2.3 **Supplementary Planning Guidance (Herefordshire).**

Provision of Affordable Housing.

2.4 **Planning Policy Statement 7 : Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.**

Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing.

3. **Planning History**

NW1999/3197/0 – Site for four cottage style houses to replace the existing disused filling station, shop and café. – Refused planning permission and later dismissed at Appeal. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector was concerned about the impact on visual amenity notwithstanding the removal of the existing structures; loss of employment potential and sustainability, as well as housing policies.

4. **Consultation Summary**

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 The Environment Agency has submitted a holding objection to the proposed development until further information is supplied on how foul drainage will be safely disposed of from the proposed development.

Internal Council advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager has no objection.
- 4.3 Housing Manager states that there has been no local housing needs survey carried out in Kinnersley and the 2001 Herefordshire Housing Needs study's extrapolated data suggests a low level of need in Kinnersley, itself a relatively small settlement - of 79 dwellings.
Strategic housing does not support this application, nor will it support a housing needs survey, and would seek to direct any affordable housing in this area towards Almeley, being a more sustainable, and suitable settlement, for such housing.
- 4.4 Head of Policy and Community advises that the property has been registered since March 1999 and that it has been suggested for nine enquires, but on checking these further there were only two or three where the site may have realistically met the requirements. The site is registered both as a 'Development Opportunity' and as an 'Industrial/Warehouse unit'.

5. Representations

5.1 The Parish Council has resolved to make the following comments:

We note that the questions at para 21 of the planning application (Affordable housing) have not been answered. We do believe that low cost/affordable housing would be more appropriate and would receive general approval.

Parking seems to be inadequate. We believe each house would attract at least 2 vehicles.

Dormer windows (bedrooms)? Represent a third storey, which we believe would be out of keeping with the existing property and area.

In principle the parish council does not disagree with the development of this brown field site. Even though we recognise the lack of infrastructure in Kinnersley we do not regard this as a grave disadvantage.

2 letters from parishioners to Herefordshire Council Planning Department have been copied to us - from Mr. D. Scott and Mr. R. Sharp.

5.2 A letter of support of the proposal from Mr. M. Sharp, The Olde Forge, Kinnersley is summarised below :

- The site has been disused for ten years and has an air of dereliction about it.
- Favour towards residential development, as the Community here is somewhat 'fragile' and could, benefit from strengthening through the provision of a small amount of additional housing. If there are any lingering thoughts about a business use, they should be dismissed as I don't believe there is any likelihood of viable proposals and commercial vehicles entering/leaving the site would be more hazardous on this busy and (despite the 50 m.p.h. speed limit!) fast road than private cars.

5.3 A letter has been received from Bill Jackson Estate Agents stating that the premises have been available on offer for lease for over four years and in spite of marketing from the Hereford and Leominster offices, advertising in the Hereford Times and on the website no tenants have come forward for this commercial site at a market rental.

5.4 In support of the proposal the applicants advise that the site has been marketed for commercial use extensively since 1999 and the location is a possibility for no up take in use of the site. The letter also states regarding potential occupants of the proposed development that at this outline planning stage we find it difficult to define who the occupants might be.

5.5 A letter of objection from Mr. D. Scott, The Fron, Kinnersley is summarised as follows:

- Concerns about the application being for 'Local Needs' housing and requirements for such needs in the village.
- Provision of public services and amenities at this location for this form of residential development.
- Queries the application form and how the affordable housing question has been addressed by the applicants.
- Proposed development is out of keeping with the rest of the village.
- Concerns about location in relationship to the surrounding public highways and possible influx of children that such a development may attract.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The application site is located outside the development limits of a recognised settlement, on the edge of a rural hamlet and amounts to re-development of an existing brown field site.
- 6.2 National Planning Policy on housing in rural areas states that local planning authorities should strictly control new house building away from established settlements, this includes affordable housing as Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Housing in Rural Areas states in paragraph 3 on Location of Development:
' Away from larger urban areas, planning authorities should focus most new development in or near to local service centres where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together. This should help to ensure these facilities are served by public transport and provide improved opportunities for access by walking and cycling'.
- 6.3 Policy A48 on Affordable Housing for Local Needs in Rural Areas in the Leominster District Local Plan states:
- 'Exceptionally, within or adjoining rural settlements planning permission may be granted for low cost affordable housing on land that would not normally be released for development where a local need has been justified. Primarily, households occupying such accommodation will be restricted to those which are residents within the ward; have strong family connections; or are employed within the relevant ward'.
- 6.4 Planning Policy A2 on Settlement Hierarchy in the Leominster District Local Plan states in section D, iv, on settlements in the countryside or in villages, hamlets or other groups of houses for which no settlement boundary has been identified that schemes for 'affordable housing' will be for local people and designed to meet an identified local need in accordance with the above-mentioned policy.
- 6.5 Herefordshire Supplementary Planning Guidance on Provision of Affordable Housing in paragraph 5.8 – Exception sites states :
' The Council recognises that these small schemes help to maintain the viability of rural communities. Such development will, however, be subject to strict control as set out in the plan policies. Permission will only be granted where there is clear evidence of need.'
- 6.6 The Council's Housing Manager has stated that there has been no local needs housing survey carried out for Kinnersley and that the 2001 Herefordshire Housing needs study's extrapolated data suggests a low level of need in Kinnersley, itself a relatively small settlement. Therefore Strategic Housing does not support this application and would seek to direct any affordable housing in this area towards Almeley, being a more sustainable, and suitable, settlement, for such housing.
- 6.7 The applicants in their submission have not provided any information on need or on occupants for the proposed affordable housing in this particular location, adjacent to a rural hamlet. Indeed as the Parish Council points out questions about affordable housing on the application form are not fully answered. The one that is states there will be no subsidised housing.

- 6.8 The site is a former fuel filling station and is rather dilapidated in visual appearance and therefore can be classed as a brown field site, and therefore in planning terms re-development at this location is a material consideration. However there is minimal supporting evidence with the submission to indicate attempts made for alternative uses and no evidence for need of the proposed. A letter has been received from Bill Jackson Estate Agents confirming that the site has been advertised for lease for commercial use and that no offer has been forthcoming. The letter includes no evidence to confirm this and does not state that the site has been offered for sale but only for rental.
- 6.9 In conclusion this planning application does not comply with National or Local Planning Policy the site albeit a brownfield site, is located outside a recognised development boundary in open countryside to which no justification has been given for whom the proposed 'Local Needs' housing is intended for. Policy A48 on Affordable Housing for Local Needs in Rural Areas in the Leominster District Local Plan states that 'Exceptionally, within or adjoining rural settlements planning permission may be granted for low cost affordable housing on land that would not normally be released for development where a local need has been justified. The applicants in a letter in response to a request from myself have admitted 'At this outline planning permission stage, we find it difficult to define who the occupants might be'.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. **The proposal development is in open countryside outside any recognised settlement boundary. In the absence of an identified local need the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy A2(D,iv), and Policy A48 Affordable Housing for Local Needs in Rural Areas of the Leominster District Local Plan.**
- 2. **The application does not comply with criteria of Herefordshire Supplementary Planning Guidance on Provision of Affordable Housing in that no clear evidence of need for the proposed development has been submitted with the planning application.**
- 3. **In the absence of adequate exceptional circumstances to justify the form of development as proposed in this application, residential development at this isolated location is regarded as an unsustainable form of development contrary to Policy A1 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire), the emerging Policy S1 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised) Deposit Draft and National Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Housing in Rural Areas.**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

20 DCNW2005/0079/O - SITE FOR DWELLING AS PART OF EQUESTRIAN BUSINESS AT RIDGEWAY PADDOCKS, LUCTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

**For: Mr R. Mathias & Miss C.J. Thomas McCartneys
Corvedale Road Craven Arms Shropshire SY7 9NE**

Date Received:
12th January 2005

Ward:
Bircher

Grid Ref:
43680, 64632

Expiry Date:
9th March 2005

Local Member: Councillor S. Bowen

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The site is in open rural countryside and forms part of an agricultural field/paddock to the south of an existing stable block that is located on 5.66 hectares of agricultural grassland in the ownership of the applicants. The site is located on an elevated site and accessed via a stone track from the B4362 opposite to the entrance to Lucton School, a grade II* listed building, which is located on ground that is lower than the proposed application site. To the rear of the site is mature woodland. A public footpath passes within close proximity to the proposed development site.
- 1.2 This is an outline application with all matter other than access reserved for the erection of a dwelling for the equestrian business presently being operated from the site. An appraisal of the business accompanies the application.

2. Policies

2.1 Leominster and District Local Plan

A1 – Managing the District's Assets and Resources
A2(D) – Settlement Hierarchy
A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
A12 – New Development and Landscape Schemes
A24 – Scale and Character of Development
A41 – Protection of Agricultural Land
A43 – Agricultural Dwellings.

2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

S1 – Sustainable Development
S2 – Development Requirements.
S3 – Housing.
DR1 – Design
DR2 – Land Use and Activity.
H7 – Housing in the Countryside outside Settlements.

H8 – Agricultural and Forestry Dwellings and Dwellings associated with Rural Businesses
LA5 – Protection of Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows.

2.3 Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.

3. Planning History

900619 – Erection of dwelling house for management of thoroughbred horse business. Refused Planning Permission on December 17th 1990.

90618 – Erection of steel framed agricultural building to house horse looseboxes. Refused Planning permission 17th December 1990.

90C617 – Use of land for temporary mobile home pending construction of permanent dwelling in three years time. Refused Planning Permission 17th December 1990.

79/1532 – Siting of one residential caravan for use in connection with a racehorse-breeding establishment. Refused Planning Permission 4th February 1980.

790882 – One dwelling to support a racehorse breeding establishment. Refused Planning Permission 29th October 1979. Later dismissed at appeal on 17th June 1980.

4 Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency has no objections subject to attachment of a condition in relationship to foul drainage works.

4.2 Forestry Commission raises no objection to the proposed development.

Internal Council Advice

4.4 Public Rights of Way Manager raises no objections, and comments that the right of way should remain at its historic width and suffer no encroachment or obstruction during the works or at anytime after completion.

4.5 Traffic Manager raises no objections to the proposed development.

5. Representations

5.1 Lucton Parish Council object to the proposal as there is insufficient information given on the application form.

5.2 No responses have been received from members of the public to this application.

5.3 Ramblers Association raises no objections however they comment about the close proximity of the development site to a public footpath (12 metres), wishing to see warning notices erected advising users of the access track of the presence of the footpath.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7): Sustainable Development in Rural Areas Annex A: Agricultural, Forestry and other Occupational Dwellings states that isolated new houses in the countryside require special justification for planning permission to be granted. It will often be as convenient and more sustainable for such workers to live in nearby houses or villages, or suitable existing dwellings, so avoiding new and potentially intrusive development in the countryside.

The annex further states that if a new dwelling is essential to support a new farming activity, whether on a newly created agricultural unit or an established one, it should normally, for the first three years, be provided by a caravan, or a wooden structure that can easily be dismantled to allow time in order to satisfy criteria on the establishment of the business as listed below.

The PPS7 states five clear tests to establish whether the dwelling is needed at the specific location these tests are:

- Existing functional need
- Requirement for full-time worker – Functional Test
- Establishment and profitability of the unit – Financial Test
- Availability of alternative accommodation
- Satisfaction of the proposal in relationship to other planning requirements.

Existing Functional Need

- 6.2 In their appraisal the applicants have stated that the business has been in operation since Mr Mathias purchased the land, 5.66 hectares in 1986 and breeds thoroughbred horses for National Hunt Racing and that a large amount of money has been invested in both the buying of well bred National Hunt Broodmares and the provision of a safe environment. As well as this, the business also transports thoroughbred horses to and from Ireland. The breeding season lasts from January to June (inclusive).

Requirement for Full-time Worker – Functional Test

- 6.3 The applicants have stated in their appraisal that workers need to be on hand 24 hours a day to watch their horses particularly when mares are giving birth. The report states that there are currently 8 broodmares on site and that this provides full employment for both the applicants as well as one permanent casual worker, along with the section of the business transporting horses to and from Ireland.

Establishment and Profitability of the Unit - Financial Test

- 6.4 The land the business is being operated from was purchased by Mr Mathias in 1986, no indication or evidence is given when the business actually commenced trading and no financial accounts have been submitted in support of the application. The only financial information provided is an anticipated profit and loss account with no dates.

Availability of Alternative Accommodation

6.5 The applicant currently resides at Glencoe, Lucton, this dwelling is located ½ mile from the proposed development site.

Satisfaction of the proposal in relationship to other planning requirements.

6.6 PPS7 and Policy A43 on Agricultural or Forestry Dwellings in the Leominster District Local Plan (which refers to new dwellings in the countryside) both state that if a new dwelling is essential to support a new farming activity, whether on a newly-created agricultural unit or an established one, it should normally, for the first three years, be provided by a caravan or wooden structure that can be easily dismantled or other temporary accommodation, (this itself is also dependant on the previous mentioned criteria requirements as mentioned above).

The proposed development is within close proximity to a grade II* listed building and would be likely to have a detrimental effect upon its setting.

Conclusion

6.7 The application does not meet with criteria of PPS7 on sustainable development in rural areas or Policy A43 on agricultural or forestry dwellings in the open countryside in the Leominster District Local Plan.

6.8 The concerns about security (as mentioned in the appraisal) are not a sufficient reason on it's own for allowing development at this site. The business supports 8 broodmares and therefore supervision of these during birth outside working hours can be arranged through the provision of temporary accommodation on site. No detailed accounts have been submitted in support of the application to prove the business existence, the only financial information submitted in support of the application being an 'anticipated' profit and loss account. The applicants already live within close proximity to the application site, in the settlement of Lucton, half a mile from the site. The proposed development site is within close proximity and prominent to Lucton School, a grade II* listed building to which the development would have a harmful effect on it's setting.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. **It is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy Statement 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas and Policies A2D and A43 of the Leominster District Local Plan.**
2. **The proposed development would be likely to be detrimental to the setting of Lucton School, a grade II* listed building.**

Decision:

Notes:

.....
Background Papers Internal departmental consultation replies.

21A DCNE2004/3080/F - EXTENSION TO EXISTING ANNEXE TO PROVIDE TWO BEDROOM ACCOMMODATION AT ROYAL OAK INN, SOUTHEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE

21B DCNE2004/4327/L – AS ABOVE

For: I P Martin per C A Masefield, Building Design Services, 66-67 Ashperton Road, Munsley, Ledbury, Herefordshire HR8 2RY

Date Received:
20th August 2004

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
37109, 23752

Expiry Date:
15th October 2004

Local Members: Councillors B Ashton, Councillor P Harling and D Rule, MBE

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application for planning permission was deferred by the Northern Area Sub-Committee on 1st December 2004 pending the submission of an application for listed building consent. This has now been submitted and both are to be considered here.
- 1.2 The Royal Oak Inn is Grade II Listed 'L' shaped building with a timber framed frontage and a brick wing which extends to the rear. Access to the car park and rear of the building is gained via an arched carriageway. Buildings surround the premises and are used for mixed purposes being prominently residential but with some retail.
- 1.3 The proposal effectively seeks to extend the brick element of the building with a two storey addition to provide domestic accommodation. It is understood that this is to provide a residential element in connection with the hotel. The application indicates that the proposed extension will be detailed to match the existing brick part in terms of materials and design. Its ridge height is lower to give a further break between old and new and it generally respects the proportions of the building.

2. Policies

Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

H16A – Housing in Rural Areas

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Housing Policy 20 – Possible Nuisances in Residential Areas

Conservation Policy 9 – Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

HBA1 – Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings
HBA4 – Setting of Listed Buildings

3. Planning History

There is no history relevant to this particular site. However the following applications on adjoining sites are of some relevance:

DCNE2004/2156/F – Conversion and extension of former workshop to form single dwelling – Approved 11th August 2004.

DCNE2004/0927/F – Conversion of building to dance studio and one residential unit – Approved 24th May 2004.

4. Consultation SummaryStatutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Archaeological Advisor – No objection subject to condition requiring further site investigation.

4.3 Conservation Manager– No objection subject to conditions.

4.4 Traffic Manager – No objection. Comments that due to town centre location, it is reasonable to waive the usual parking requirements.

5. Representations

5.1 Ledbury Town Council – Recommend refusal. They felt that this would be over-development of the site and considered the access to be dangerous and contrary to highway safety.

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 The proposal is generally considered to be of a satisfactory design and appearance, subject to the use of appropriate materials. This can be addressed by the imposition of conditions requiring their submission prior to the commencement of development.

6.2 The Town Council's comments with regard to highway safety are not substantiated by the Council's Head of Engineering and Transportation, and a potentially more intensive traffic generating use has been permitted in the dance studio referred to above. In light of this and the sites town centre location, it is not considered that a recommendation for refusal on highway safety grounds could be substantiated.

- 6.3 Concerns relating to over-development of the site are similarly difficult to substantiate in light of the surrounding planning history. Whilst the proposal will create a more substantial unit of accommodation a small bed-sit does already exist and in effect there is no increase in terms of additional residential units. The applications are therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

NE2004/3080/F

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 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)**

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

- 3 - C05 Details of external joinery finishes)**

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of special architectural or historical interest.

- 4 - B01 (Samples of external materials)**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

- 5 - D01 (Site investigation – archaeology)**

Reason: To ensure the archaeological interest of the site is recorded.

Informative:

- 1. N15 (Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC)**

DCNE2004/4327/L

That this Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 - C01 -(Time limit for commencement (Listed Building Consent))**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of special architectural or historical interest.

3 - C05 Details of external joinery finishes)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

4 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

5 - D01 (Site investigation – archaeology)

Reason: To ensure the archaeological interest of the site is recorded.

Informative:

1. N15 (Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC)

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

22 DCNE2004/3402/L - REMOVAL OF WINDOW AND INSERTION OF DOORWAY WITH INTERIOR LOBBY TO RESTAURANT AT THE FEATHERS HOTEL, HIGH STREET, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: The Feathers Hotel per Mr N J Teale, Bramble Farm, Naunton Upton Upon Severn, Worcestershire WR8 0PZ

Date Received:
23rd September 2004

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
71068, 37601

Expiry Date:
18th November 2004

Local Member: Councillors P Harling, D Rule, MBE and B Ashton

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The building comprises at late 10th Century timber frame and an adjoining 17th Century element, which house the hotel. It is located centrally within the Ledbury town centre and is a dominant feature of High Street.
- 1.2 The application seeks to remove an existing sash window, replace it with a doorway and to create an internal lobby beyond. The applicant's agent has provided evidence to show that a doorway did exist in the same position as recently as the 1930's and this proposal will reinstate the opening.
- 1.3 The scheme has been amended since its original submission following negotiations. The plans now show a panelled external door reflecting the proportions of the windows and timber framing at ground floor level. A frameless glazed partition is proposed to create the lobby, similar to the detailing used in All Saints Church, Hereford.

2. Planning History

None relevant to this application.

3. Policies

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

HBA1 – Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Conservation Policy 9 – Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 English Heritage - Do not wish to comment in detail on the application but offer the following observations:
a more appropriate design is needed for the external door
consent should be conditional on joinery and threshold details

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Conservation Manager - Expressed initial concerns regarding the original submission and recommended refusal due to the lack of details. The amended plans are a result of negotiations with the Conservation Officer and the application is now considered to be acceptable on the basis of these plans.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Ledbury Town Council - Recommend Refusal. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building thereby being contrary to Conservation Policy 9 of the Malvern Hills District Local Plan and HBA1 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.
- 5.2 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 In its amended form the proposal takes account of the initial concerns expressed by the Conservation Officer and the points raised by English Heritage. The panelling shown for the external door reflects the framing of the building. The proportion of wood panelling and glazing is of the same scale as the existing sash window. The applicants agent has demonstrated that the windows is not an original feature and therefore the alterations do not compromise the framing of the building.
- 6.2 The design approach taken with the internal lobby is to ensure a lightweight and transparent structure that both provides the sub-division required by the applicant, but also maintains the integrity of the internal space. The framing shown in the original submission was considered to unacceptably interrupt this, but the amended plans with a frameless glazed arrangement are considered to be an acceptable solution.
- 6.3 It is therefore concluded that, in its amended form, the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the Listed Building. Consequently it accords with the policies of the Local Plan and the UDP and the application is recommended for approval.
- 6.4 In light of the fact that the application relates to a Grade II * Building, the application will have to be referred to the Government Office for their determination.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 - C01 (Time limit for commencement (Listed Building Consent))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 2 - A09 (Amended plans)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

- 3 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

- 4 - C05 (Details of external joinery finishes)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

Informatives:

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

**23A DCNE2004/3889/F - PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION AT BUDDING COTTAGE, CANON
23B FROME, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2TA**

**DCNE2004/3891/L – REMOVAL OF SINGLE STOREY
LEAN-TO STRUCTURE AND PROPOSED TWO
STOREY EXTENSION AT SAME ADDRESS.**

For: Mr A G Butcher at Same Address

**Date Received:
9th November 2004**

**Ward:
Frome**

**Grid Ref:
63867, 42237**

**Expiry Date:
4th January 2005**

Local Member: Councillor R Manning

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Budding Cottage is a 17th Century timber frame with brick infill building under a clay tile roof. Later alterations have seen a similarly constructed single storey lean-to added to the eastern gable end. The property is accessed via a long private drive and occupies an isolated location in open countryside with no immediate neighbours.
- 1.2 The application seeks to remove the lean-to and replace it with a two storey extension. The plans have been amended since the original submission following negotiation. The extension is of timber frame construction. The south elevation will be entirely glazed between the panelling whilst the north and east elevations are to be weatherboarded. The extension is to be roofed in either zinc or stainless steel.

2. Policies

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

H18 Alterations and extensions
HBA1 Alterations and extension

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Housing Policy 16 – Extensions
Conservation Policy 9 – Alterations and extensions to Listed Buildings

3. Planning History

- 3.1 None relevant to this application

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Transportation Manager - No Objection.

4.3 Public Rights of Way Manager - No Objection.

4.4 Conservation Manager - No Objections in principle to the demolition of the existing lean-to which is of poor quality in relation to the rest of the cottage. Subject to other submission of amended plans there is no objection to the proposal subject to conditions relating to the submission of details relating to materials and joinery details.

5. Representations

5.1 Ashperton Parish Council - No Objection

5.2 CPRE - Object to the application on the basis that it is out of character with the cottage, particularly through the use of inappropriate materials.

5.3 SPAB - Express strong concerns over the demolition of the single storey lean-to as it appears to be of same interest and age.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This application is unusual as it proposes a contemporary extension to a very traditional building. The issues relating to the application are principally those of visual impact on the cottage and whether this extension compliments the original building.

6.2 The Council's Historic Buildings Officer has had pre-application discussions and, subject to the amendments that have now been submitted, does not object to the application subject to the imposition of a number of conditions. Her comments also note that, contrary to the comments from SPAB, the lean-to is of little interest and is of poor quality in relation to the remainder of the cottage.

6.3 Whilst this proposal may not accord with conservation policy of the local plan in its strictest interpretation, it should not restrict a contemporary approach to the alteration and extension of listed buildings. The proposal is generally well proportioned and respects the scale of the cottage. It uses traditional materials in terms of timber framing and weather-boarding. The use of zinc is preferred over stainless steel as this will lose its sheen over time and will colour so that it has a similar appearance to slate.

6.4 It is therefore concluded that on balance the proposal is acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

DCNE2004/3889/F

That planning permission be granted 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 - A09 (Amended plans) (6th January 2005)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 - B09 (Colour of cladding (extension)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of special architectural and historic interest.

5 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

6 - C06 (External finish of flues)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

Informatives:

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

DCNE2004/3891/L

That Listed Building Consent be granted to the following conditions:

1 – C01 (Time limit for commencement (Listed Building Consent)

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2 - A09 (Amended plans) (6th January 2005)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 - B09 (Colour of cladding (extension)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of special architectural and historic interest.

5 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

6 - C06 (External finish of flues)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

Informatives:

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

24 DCNE2004/3988/F - PROPOSED EXTERIOR ACCESS TO REAR VIA STAIRWAY, TWO ROOF LIGHTS AND FLUE ON THE CIDER BARN AT CHURCH HOUSE, RECTORY LANE, CRADLEY, MALVERN, WR13 5LH

For: Mr Davies at above address.

Date Received:
17th November 2004

Ward:
Hope End

Grid Ref:
73593, 47024

Expiry Date:
12th January 2005

Local Member: Councillor R Mills and R Stockton

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The site is located on the southern side of a private lane known as Rectory Lane off the C1162 within Cradley. This application relates specifically to a building known as the Cider Barn, and seeks retrospective consent for the installation of two rooflights and a steel chimney flue. The scheme also includes the provision of an external staircase to provide access to a first floor. The applicant advises that this is to be used for storage and occasional use as a bedroom.
- 1.2 The site falls within the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is also designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value. It also lies within Cradley Conservation Area.

2. Policies

2.1 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC1 – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 CTC7 – Listed Buildings and their Settings
 CTC14 – Conservation of Buildings in Rural Areas
 CTC15 – Conservation Areas

2.2 Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Landscape Policy 2 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 Conservation Policy 11 – The Setting of Listed Buildings

2.3 Unitary Development Plan

LA1 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
 HBA12 – Re-Use of Traditional Rural Buildings

3. Planning History

NE03/0233/F - Change of use and alterations to Cider Barn to half office half residential - Approved 2 April 2003. The applicant appealed against the imposition of two conditions; one to ensure that the resulting accommodation was not sold or let separately from Church House, the other to ensure that it be used for purposes ancillary to its enjoyment. The appeal was dismissed on both counts.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Transport Manager - No objections.

4.3 Conservation Manager - No objections subject to appropriate colouration of the file.

5. Representations

5.1 Cradley Parish Council - make the following comments:

Rooflights - No case for their inclusion.

Flue - Object to this. If minded to approve should be position closer to the ridge. Material should be less obtrusive than stainless steel.

Fire Escape - Scale and materials are inappropriate. It will be used as a primary access and will overlook neighbouring property. It may also compromise vehicular access.

5.2 One letter of objection has been received from S J Ramsden, The Old Rectory, Cradley. In summary, the points raised are as follows:

- There is no justification for the insertion of the rooflights.
- The inclusion of the stainless steel flue is detrimental to the aesthetics of the building.
- The fire escape and balcony are out of scale with the host building. Concern is expressed that it will give independent access and lead to its eventual use as a flat.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 This proposal has three distinctive elements and each of these will be dealt with in turn.

6.2 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on the conversion of rural buildings suggests that dark finished metal flues are worthy of consideration to serve closed stoves. At present the flue is a silver stainless steel fitting, but could be appropriately painted to minimise its visual prominence. A condition to this effect is recommended.

- 6.3 The rooflights are of a conservation style and are discretely positioned. They do not have any significant impact on the appearance of the building as a whole and are considered to be acceptable.
- 6.4 The proposed external staircase and balcony is to be of timber construction, although the application does not give precise details with regard to timber sizes and profiles. This could be the subject of an appropriately worded condition.
- 6.5 Concerns expressed by the parish council regarding overlooking are not raised by the neighbour, who has also objected to the application. The Old Rectory is set further back by some distance than the Cider Barn and it is your officer's opinion that a reason for refusal on these grounds could not be substantiated.
- 6.6 A suggestion is made that this element will ultimately result in the creation of an independent unit. The applicant appealed against conditions requiring that the Cider Barn should not be sold or let separately from Church House and that it be occupied for purposes ancillary to its enjoyment. The appeal was dismissed and it is recommended that they are re-imposed if permission is forthcoming in this instance to satisfy the concerns raised.
- 6.7 On this basis the proposal is considered to be acceptable 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 - Within one month of the date of this approval, the external flue shall be painted a dark matt black colour to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3 - A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

4 - Prior to the commencement of the external staircase, sectional and elevational drawings at a minimum scale of 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

5 - E15 (Restriction on separate sale) (ancillary accommodation) (Church House)

Reason: It would be contrary to the policy of the local planning authority to grant consent for a separate dwelling in this location.

6 - E29 (Occupation ancillary to existing dwelling only (granny annexes))

Reason: It would be contrary to the policy of the local planning authority to grant planning permission for a separate dwelling in this location.

Informatives

1. Reason(s) for the grants of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

**25 DCNE2004/3965/F - RETROSPECTIVE RELOCATION
OF FENCE AT 8 HALLWOOD DRIVE, LEDBURY,
HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2FY**

For: Ms M Johnson at above address.

Date Received:
16th November 2004

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
69955, 37390

Expiry Date:
11th January 2005

Local Members: Councillor B Ashton, Councillor P Harling & Councillor D Rule

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Hallwood Drive is a modern residential estate to the south-west of Ledbury Town Centre. The development is open plan. Front gardens have not been enclosed and other landscaped areas been created to soften the appearance of the area as a whole.
- 1.2 This application is a retrospective application to enclose a strip of land that was part of the landscaping scheme when the development was originally approved. Upon completion of the dwellings, it would appear that the developers transferred ownership of these open areas to those properties which border them. The applicant therefore has legal ownership of the application site.
- 1.3 A strip of land with a width of 1.5m has been incorporated into the domestic curtilage of no.8 Hallwood Drive. In essence the 1.97m fence enclosing its back garden has been moved 1.5m closer to the public highway. The line is demarcated by a concrete kerb which runs parallel to the edge of the road a service strip of approximately 1.5m lies in between and is unaffected by this application.

2. Policies

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Housing Policy 17 – Residential Standards

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

H13 – Sustainable Residential Design

3. Planning History

None relevant to this application.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic manager - no objection.

5. Representations

5.1 Ledbury Town Council - recommend refusal. Members felt that this would set a precedent. Other applications would follow, resulting in the loss of green space within the site, thereby dramatically changing the original layout.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 The land that this application seeks to incorporate as domestic curtilage did form part of the original landscaping scheme. The fact that ownership of the area has been transferred to no.8 is not material to the application. Whether its loss will compromise the character and appearance of the area as the Town Council suggest, is however.

6.2 The area of land in question is only a very small strip and in its own right is difficult to argue that it changes the overall open nature of the development as a whole. The cumulative impact if repeated is important and the opportunities for this to occur elsewhere has been considered. These are limited to only one or two other properties within the locality. A similar application reference DCNE2004/4078/F, at no. 51 Hallwood Drive, follows this report. However, each application should be treated on its merits.

6.3 The applicant has indicated a willingness to undertake new planting to soften the appearance of the fencing, and this can be dealt with by condition. It is also recommended that the colour of the stain used is similarly controlled to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

6.4 It is therefore concluded that the proposal is acceptable and consequently the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be permitted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 - Within one month of the date of this permission the fence hereby approved shall be stained with a colour details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. There shall be no change in colour without the further written approval of the local planning authority.**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities if the area.

- 2 - **Within 3 months of the date of this approval, a scheme of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All proposed planting shall be clearly described with species, sites and planting numbers.**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 - **G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

Informative:

N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

26 DCNE2004/4078/F - PROPOSED RELOCATION OF BOUNDARY FENCE AT 51 HALLWOOD DRIVE, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2FY

For: Mr C Bell & Mrs D J Swift at same address

Date Received:
26th November 2004

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
69936, 37394

Expiry Date:
21st January 2005

Local Members: Councillor P Harling Councillor B Ashton & Councillor D Rule

Introduction

This application should be read in conjunction with the application reference NE2004/3965/F for the retention of a boundary fence at 8 Hallwood Drive, Ledbury.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 51 Hallwood Drive lies directly opposite to the property described above. The ownership of the landscaped area has similarly been conveyed to the property and the applicants wish to enclose it with a 1.8m fence and take it within their domestic curtilage.

2. Policies

Malvern Hills District Local Plan
Housing Policy 17 – Residential Standards

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)
H13 – Sustainable Residential Design

3. Planning History

None relevant to this application.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager - no objections.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Ledbury Town Council - recommend refusal. Members felt that this would set a precedent. Other applications would follow, resulting in the loss of green space within the site, thereby dramatically changing the original layout.
- 5.2 One letter of objection has been received from Melanie Orgee, 49 Hallwood Drive, Ledbury. In summary she considers that the proposal will be detrimental to the amenity of the area and will be detrimental to highway safety.
- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 This application relates to a larger area of land than the retrospective application also being considered. However the issues of enclosure of the land and the impact of this on the appearance of the residential area are the same and it is your officers opinion that this proposal will not cause such harm to the character and amenity of the area to warrant refusal.
- 6.2 The objection referring to the potential for the scheme to be detrimental to highway safety is not substantiated by the Council's Traffic Manager. The site falls within a residential area where traffic speeds are low and vehicles are expected to be manoeuvring in the public highway.
- 6.3 The applicant has similarly indicated a willingness to undertake landscaping. If members are minded to approve this application, it is recommended that a suitably worded condition is imposed.
- 6.4 On balance this application is considered to be acceptable and it is therefore 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 - Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the proposed fence and colour shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The colour shall not be changed without the written approval of the local planning authority.**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 - G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

4 - G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

27 DCNE2004/4186/F - EXTENSION TO EXISTING UNIT AT UNIT 16, COURT FARM BUSINESS PARK, BISHOPS FROME, WORCESTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, WR6 5AY

For: W J Holden & Associates Michael Latchem & Associates 9 Aylestone Drive Hereford HR1 1HT

Date Received:
7th December 2004

Ward:
Frome

Grid Ref:
66483, 48560

Expiry Date:
1st February 2005

Local Member: Councillor R Manning

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Court Farm Business Park is a well established industrial estate located on the eastern fringes of Bishops Frome. It is accessed via an unclassified road which passes an existing residential development known as Summerpool and in turn emerges onto the B4214 which runs through the centre of the village.
- 1.2 This application relates specifically to unit 16 and seeks to add an extension to it. The premises currently has a floor area of 410m square, and the application adds a further 340m square, giving a combined floor area of 750m square.
- 1.3 The building is of a standard industrial/commercial design, a portal frame steel building faced in profile sheeting. It has a dual roof pitch with a central valley running north/south. The proposal seeks to continue this with an additional to the south elevation, but also seeks to add a secondary element with a lower roof pitch to the west.
- 1.4 The scheme utilises an area presently used for car parking. A previous application was withdrawn following concerns that the resulting development would allow insufficient parking. This is effectively a revised scheme following negotiation with the Council's Highway Department. At present the premises has 17 car parking spaces and 1 lorry space. The proposal increases this to 39 spaces and maintains the lorry space.

2. Policies

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Employment Policy 10 – Expansion on Industrial Sites

Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

Policy E6 – Industrial Development in Rural Areas

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

Policy E6 – Expansion of Existing Businesses

3. Planning History

NE2004/1945/F - Proposed extension to unit 16 - Withdrawn 21st October 2004 following concerns over parking provision.

4. Consultation SummaryStatutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency - No objection subject to condition.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager - No objection subject to the provision of cycle parking facilities

5. Representations

5.1 Bishop's Frome Parish Council - Councillors believe that the existing access road to the Business Park is inadequate and that the application should be refused until such time as the road is improved.

5.2 One letter of objection has been submitted by Summerpool Residents Association. The Association represents 36 households and they comment that the access road to the Business Park passes through a residential area and that is inadequate to accommodate the volumes of traffic. Their submission includes a traffic survey carried out on three separate days in early January 2005.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 No objection has been raised to the design or layout of the proposed extension and it is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

6.2 The key consideration is that of traffic generation and the adequacy of on site parking provision. The Highways Department have been involved in negotiations with the applicants agent with regard to the latter of these two points and are now satisfied with the arrangements to be made. These will improve parking provision on the business park more generally, rather than being solely generated by an application for what is a modest extension in the context of its surroundings.

6.3 The proposed extension is predominantly for additional warehouse space (247m sq) with some further officer space (93m sq). Whilst this allows the current occupants of the building to expand, it is unlikely that it will result in such a significant increase in traffic movements over and above those currently generated and as shown by the traffic survey undertaken by local residents.

- 6.4 The concerns raised by the objectors in terms of the adequacy of the existing road network and its ability to serve the Business Park is noted, but to refuse this application on such grounds would be difficult to substantiate given the relatively minor increase in traffic movements that it would create.
- 6.5 The application is considered to be acceptable in all other respects and accords with Development Plan policy. It is therefore recommended that this application is approved.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be recommended 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 - A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

- 3 - B03 (Matching external materials (general))**

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

- 4 - F27 (Interception of surface water run off)**

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

- 5 - G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 6 - G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

- 7 - H16 (Parking/unloading provision - submission of details)**

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

- 8 - H29 (Secure 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.

Informative:

- 1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

28 DCNE2005/0083/F - NEW DWELLING ON THE SITE OF EXISTING DOUBLE GARAGE AT THE GARDEN OF MELROSE HOUSE, 141 THE HOMEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE. HR8 1BP

For: Mr Evans at above address.

Date Received:
11th January 2005

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
71009, 37998

Expiry Date:
8th March 2005

Local Member: Councillor Ashton, Councillor Rule MBE & Councillor Harling

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site is part of the garden of 141 Homend, but actually fronts onto Homend Crescent. It is currently occupied by a double garage which sits hard against the road frontage, the surrounding area is of a residential nature.
- 1.2 The site slopes steeply to the west and overlooks 141 Homend and the town beyond. It has a width of approximately 8 metres and a length of 30 metres to the boundary shown to divide it from 141 Homend, a further 21 metres is shown as curtilage for number 141.
- 1.3 The application is for the erection of a dwelling. Its design is influenced by the characteristics of the site. Its road frontage elevation appears as a typical dwelling with a pitched roof to a height of 8.4 metres, cill and header detailing above windows and brick quoins and string course. It is set slightly forward in comparison to the dwelling to the south, but this is not significant in terms of its appearance in the street scene.
- 1.4 A gabled wing extends to the rear and this has a more contemporary appearance. To a large extent this is a result of the changing ground level. The plans suggest a difference of 2.5 metres within the length of the proposed dwelling. This allows the gabled wing to be effectively three storey. Its height from the lowest point is 10.3 metres, but it will have a lower ridge height than the element facing onto Homend Crescent. The design seeks to maximise views across the town and includes balconies at first and second floor levels, the lead for this taken from the neighbouring dwelling.

2. Policies

Malvern Hills District Council Local Plan

Housing Policy 17 – Residential Standards
Conservation Policy 2 – New Development in Conservation Areas

Unitary Development Plan

H13 – sustainable Residential Design
HBA6 – New Development within Conservation Areas

3. Planning History

- 3.1 NE04/2246/F - Erection of a dwelling - Withdrawn 22 September 2004. The application was withdrawn following concerns expressed over the design of the dwelling by the Council's Conservation Officer.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager - Given that the study could be used as a bedroom, the development would require space for three cars. However, given PPG13 advice, it would be unreasonable to refuse, especially given the town centre location. In mitigation, it would be prudent to require covered secure cycle parking.
- 4.3 Chief Conservation Officer - This design is a major improvement on the previous application and therefore would be considered acceptable, subject to conditions.
- 4.4 Archaeological Advisor - No objection subject to condition.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Ledbury Town Council - Recommend refusal. Members felt that this was development of a very narrow site and would have an adverse effect upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring property, contrary to Housing Policy 17 of the Malvern Hills District Council Local Plan and H13, 10 and 14 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 5.2 One letter has been received from Mr Bardsley, The Views, Homend Crescent, Ledbury. He considers that the proposal is too close to the road and should be set further back.
- 5.3 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The design of the proposed dwelling has been entirely influenced by the constraints of the site. It makes the best use possible of its narrow frontage and is of a design, which makes a positive contribution to the street scene. Whilst it is set slightly forward of the building line of the neighbouring dwelling, this is not a reason to refuse the application. The area has no definite line along which buildings are set, nor is there a dominant form of architecture and therefore the proposal sits quite comfortably in a mixture of styles.

- 6.2 The proposed dwelling is orientated in an east/west plane, identical to the neighbouring property. The wing projecting to the rear runs along the southern boundary, allowing space between the two, and projects to a similar point. This element will not be overly dominant nor will it cause any undue loss of privacy and therefore the proposal will not cause any demonstrable harm to residential amenity. Similarly, the proposed dwelling is sufficiently distant from the rear elevation of 141 Homend and, with the significant change in ground levels, the fenestration and balconies on the west elevation will not result in a significant degree of overlooking.
- 6.3 In conclusion, the proposal is considered to accord with the identified Development Plan policies and on this basis the application 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 - A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

3 - B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 - C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards)

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

5 - C05 (Details of external joinery finishes)

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

6 - H29 (Secure 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.

7 - F16 (Restriction of hours during construction)

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

8 - The applicant or his agents or successors in title shall ensure that a professional archaeological contractor undertakes an archaeological watching brief during any development to the current archaeological standards of and to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is investigated.
Informatives

N15 – Reason(s) for Grant PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

29 DCNE2005/0108/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS TO FRONT, REAR AND SIDE OF DWELLING AT BRAMLEIGH, NEW STREET, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR8 2EY

For: Mr & Mrs G Williams per Mr R Pritchard The Mill Kenchester Hereford HR4 7QJ

Date Received:
14th January 2005

Ward:
Ledbury

Grid Ref:
70299, 36870

Expiry Date:
11th March 2005

Local Members: Councillor P Harling, Councillor B Ashton & Councillor D Rule

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Bramleigh is a modern detached dwelling and is positioned at the junction of New Street and Ledbury by-pass, opposite the Full Pitcher public house.
- 1.2 It is of brick construction with a concrete tile roof. A gabled wing projects from the front elevation and this is clad with a timber frame facade. It sits in a well sized curtilage, is set back from the road frontage. A detached double garage is positioned to the front of the dwelling.
- 1.3 The application seeks to add three separate two storey extensions. The first is to the front elevation and adds a second gable of similar proportions to the first. This will infill the gap between the house and garage, and will be physically attached thereto. The second is to the side elevation and will provide a ground floor utility room and first floor en-suite bathroom. Finally, an addition is to be made to the rear elevation. All three are shown to be finished in brick with a tile to match the existing roof.

2. Policies

Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Housing Policy 16 – Extensions

Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

H18 - Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

- 3.1 None relevant to this application.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager - no objection.

5. Representations

5.1 Ledbury Town Council - Recommend refusal. Members considered the site to be of insufficient size to accommodate the proposed extensions constituting overdevelopment which is contrary to Housing Policy of the Malvern Hills District Local Plan and Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) Policy 18 paragraph 3.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 The main focus of the extensions proposed are to the front and side of the dwelling. This will result in the closure of space between the house and garage and the southern boundary. Whilst this results in the closure of external access to the rear, it does not have any significant impact in terms of over development of the plot. Much of the proposal lies directly behind the garage and it will be viewed in this context. Given that the extension to the front is attached to the garage, it is recommended that a condition is imposed to prevent its conversion to domestic accommodation without the submission of a further application. This would remove parking spaces and may create an unacceptably large unit of accommodation.

6.2 The extension to the rear lies on the shared boundary with the adjoining property. The two dwellings are separated by a detached double garage and are well spaced. The extension will not appear overbearing and has no windows in the side elevation. Therefore it will not result in any demonstrable loss of privacy.

6.3 It is therefore concluded that the proposal is of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing dwelling. The extensions will not result in a cramped form of development and therefore the scheme accords with the identified Development Plan policies. Consequently the application 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 - A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans)

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

3 - B02 (Matching external materials (extension))

Reason: To ensure the external materials harmonise with the existing building.

4 - E09 (No conversion of garage to habitable accommodation)

Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking arrangements remain available at all times.

5 - E17 (No windows in side elevation of extension)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

Informative:

N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.

