

**MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 8th March, 2006 at 2.00 p.m.**

**Present:** Councillor D.J. Fleet (Chairman)  
Councillor R. Preece (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** Mrs. P.A. Andrews, Mrs. W.U. Attfield, A.C.R. Chappell, Mrs. S.P.A. Daniels, P.J. Edwards, J.G.S. Guthrie, Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, R.I. Matthews, J.W. Newman, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Ms. G.A. Powell, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, Mrs E.A. Taylor, W.J.S. Thomas, Ms. A.M. Toon, W.J. Walling, D.B. Wilcox and R.M. Wilson.

**In attendance:** Councillors T.W. Hunt (ex-officio) and J.B. Williams (ex-officio)

**145. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. E.M. Bew, J.C. Mayson, Miss F. Short and A.L. Williams.

**146. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declaration of interest was made:

Councillor	Item	Interest
Mrs. E.A. Taylor	Agenda Item 7, Minute 151 DCCE2005/4065/F <b>Entrance to Meadow Bank Road on Junction with Ledbury Road, Hereford, HR1 2ST</b>	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

**147. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Minutes of the meeting held on 8th February, 2006 be approved as a correct record.**

**148. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS**

The Sub-Committee noted details of the Council's current position in respect of planning appeals for the central area.

**149. DCCE2005/4167/F - LAND TO REAR OF THE SQUIRRELS, FOWNHOPE, HEREFORD, HR1 4PB [AGENDA ITEM 5]**

*Erection of a detached three bedroom bungalow.*

The Principal Planning Officer reported that recommended condition 10 and informative note 2, regarding foul water drainage, should be combined.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. I. Quayle spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, the Local Ward Member, questioned whether advice given in correspondence in February, 2005 that tandem development could result in 'unacceptable loss of amenity' was still relevant. In response, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the issue was still relevant but the scheme withdrawn in 2005 was different in that it was an outline planning application with limited details; whereas this proposal was a full application with detailed plans. The Development Control Manager highlighted the potential drawbacks of tandem development and how these could be mitigated.

In response to a question, the Principal Planning Officer briefly explained the planning history of the site.

Councillor Mrs. Pemberton outlined the difficulties associated with the unmade access track. The Principal Planning Officer noted that the Traffic Manager had not raised any objections and it was felt that there was sufficient parking and turning space.

A number of Members noted the objectors' concerns about the foul drainage system and the potential impact on amenity. In response, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the drainage method to be used had yet to be determined and commented that the applicant intended to use a cesspool system only if all other options had been exhausted.

Concerns were expressed that commercial waste removal tankers, and other vehicles, would have difficulty reaching the site given the condition of the access lane and the limited parking and turning areas available. Furthermore, it was felt that the 'fall-back' position of a cesspool system was undesirable and it was noted that such a system would be contrary to Unitary Development Plan policy CF2. Some Members commented that the development also represented an unacceptable form of backland development.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the number of parking spaces could be protected through a condition. He emphasised that the cesspool system was the least favoured option. He commented that the consultant's report, commissioned by the applicant, suggested that a larger storage tank could be installed in order to reduce the number of visits made by waste removal tankers.

The Development Control Manager noted that the three options to the Sub-Committee were to accept the application, defer the application to ascertain which method of drainage was feasible, or refuse the application on the grounds of the concerns raised. He noted that there was no objection from the Traffic Manager but the Sub-Committee might consider that there was a judgement to be made on the functional need for a particular form of access.

Given the comments of other Members, Councillor Mrs. Pemberton felt that the application could not be supported on the information provided and, therefore, proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the drainage and functional access arrangements were unacceptable.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**That (i) The Central 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. Unacceptable proposal for foul water drainage.
2. Insufficient vehicular access for commercial waste removal tankers.

- (ii) If the Head of Planning Services 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.

[Note: Following the vote on the above resolution, the Development Control Manager advised that the application would not be referred to the Head of Planning Services.]

**150. DCCE2006/0045/F - ETHOS AT LITTLE TARRINGTON FARM, TARRINGTON, HEREFORD, HR1 4JA [AGENDA ITEM 6]**

*Change of use of agricultural storage building to fair trade retail outlet.*

Councillor Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, the Local Ward Member, commented on the value of the retail outlet to the local community. She noted concerns about highway safety and advised that Highways and Transportation had agreed to repaint road markings near to the access road junction and to seek the removal of overgrown shrubs around the visibility splay. Therefore, subject to the recommended conditions, she supported the application.

A number of Members spoke in support.

**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. **This permission shall enure for the benefit of J.M. and C.A. Samwells only and not for the benefit of the land or any other persons interested in the land.**

**Reason: The nature of the development is such that it is only considered acceptable in this location having regard to the scale and nature of the use.**

3. **The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the hours of Mon – Sat 10am and 5pm and Sun 10am – 1pm.**

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

**Informative:**

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

**151. DCCE2005/4065/F - ENTRANCE TO MEADOW BANK ROAD ON JUNCTION WITH LEDBURY ROAD, HEREFORD, HR1 2ST [AGENDA ITEM 7]**

*Erection of delivery pouch box (single).*

The Principal Planning Officer reported that the Traffic Manager was no longer concerned about the proposal following the revised siting of the delivery pouch box.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. M. Jones spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, a Local Ward Member, felt that the proposed placement of the delivery pouch box was inappropriate as it would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the locality.

Mr. Jones was invited to respond and he explained the health and safety considerations behind the proposal.

A number of Members supported the proposal but felt that the appearance of the delivery pouch box would be improved if painted green. Officers confirmed that this could be stipulated through a condition.

**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. 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. The pouch box hereby approved shall be painted a dark green colour, the details of which shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation.**

**Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area**

**Informative:****1. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP.****152. DCCE2005/4076/F - GRASSED AREA AT THE ENTRANCE TO CLIVE STREET, HEREFORD, HR1 2SB [AGENDA ITEM 8]**

*Erection of delivery pouch box (single).*

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. M. Jones spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, a Local Ward Member, felt that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of local residents. Some Members concurred with this view.

Other Members felt that the proposal would have minimal impact on the street scene.

Questions were asked about the extent of consultation undertaken by the applicant and it was suggested that local residents should be involved more. Mr. Jones was invited to respond and he explained that the location was driven by the identified needs of postmen.

In response to a suggestion that the application should be deferred to investigate other locations, the Central Team Leader advised that this application had to be considered on its own merits and that relocation some distance away would warrant a fresh application.

In response to a suggestion about screening the delivery pouch box, the Development Control Manager advised that there would be maintenance issues which would be out of proportion with the limited scale of the proposal.

The Chairman noted that the application was one of fifteen similar proposals submitted for locations throughout Hereford.

Councillor Mrs. Lloyd-Hayes felt that the structures were unattractive and that more consideration should be given to the locations in order to mitigate visual impact.

It was proposed that the external finish of the delivery pouch box should be controlled through a condition.

**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. **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. **The pouch box hereby approved shall be painted a dark green colour, the details of which shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation.**

**Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area**

**Informative:**

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

**153. DCCE2006/0221/F - 21 SALISBURY AVENUE, HEREFORD, HR1 1QG [AGENDA ITEM 9]**

*New bedroom over garage and new pitched roofs to replace flat roofs.*

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. D.H. Peden spoke in

objection to the application and Mr. A.R. Herbert spoke in support of the application.

Councillor W.J. Walling, a Local Ward Member, felt that the site was constrained and noted the concerns of the residents of the adjacent property about loss of light and privacy.

Councillor Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, a Local Ward Member, noted that there were similar extensions to dwellings in the area and felt that it would be difficult to refuse planning permission as a result.

Councillor Mrs. E.A. Taylor, the other Local Ward Member, felt that the proposal would enhance the dwelling.

**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. **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. **E18 (No new windows in specified elevation) (north east).**

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

5. **E19 (Obscure glazing to windows).**

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

**Informatives:**

1. **N03 - Adjoining property rights**
2. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP.**

**154. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting was 5th April, 2006.

The meeting ended at 3.26 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN**