

**MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday 22 July 2009 at 2.00 pm**

**Present:** Councillor JE Pemberton (Chairman)  
Councillor GA Powell (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, DJ Benjamin, ACR Chappell, GFM Dawe, PJ Edwards, KS Guthrie, MAF Hubbard, MD Lloyd-Hayes, RI Matthews, AT Oliver, SJ Robertson, AP Taylor, AM Toon, NL Vaughan, WJ Walling, DB Wilcox and JD Woodward

**In attendance:** Councillors TW Hunt (ex-officio) and RV Stockton (ex-officio)

**26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors WU Attfield, AJM Blackshaw, SPA Daniels, H Davies and DW Greenow.

**27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

31. DCCE0009/0950/F - Land off Bullingham Lane, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 7RY  
Councillor ACR Chappell; Prejudicial; Reason: Chair of Governors at St. Martin's Primary School.  
Councillor AT Oliver; Prejudicial; Reason: Lives nearby.
34. DCCW2008/2946/F - Church House Farm, Wellington, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 8AZ.  
Councillor KS Guthrie; Prejudicial; Reason: The applicant is an acquaintance.

**28. MINUTES**

Referring to Minute 20 [DCCW2009/0384/F - Upper Hill Farm, Breinton, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 7PH], Councillor DB Wilcox drew attention to comments he was reported to have made about the need for future maintenance of the access lane and considered that this matter should have been included in the list of conditions. The Democratic Services Officer highlighted that the resolution included reference to the need for clarification regarding the outstanding matters identified by the Sub-Committee and that planning permission would be subject to further conditions considered necessary by Officers. Councillor RI Matthews, the Local Ward Member for the application site, advised that discussions were ongoing and the issue of maintenance would be raised.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2009 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

**29. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS**

The Sub-Committee received an information report.

**30. [A] DCCE2009/0555/F AND [B] DCCE2009/0556/L - TARRINGTON COURT, TARRINGTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4EX**

*Retention of arch and rebuilding of wall. Conversion of existing hay loft to flat in Coach House. Build stable block.*

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided as follows:

- A further e-mail had been received from the applicants stating that, based upon information on Tarrington within the 'Royal Commission of Historic Houses of England 1932', the nearby arch at The Vine was in place in the late 18th Century and the moat around Tarrington Court was much larger than first thought which may have prevented the main access being to the north.
- The Officer comments noted that there remained no definitive historical information to identify the original access arrangements.

The Chairman, speaking in her capacity as the Local Ward Member, drew attention to a number of points:

- Although consideration of the applications had been deferred at the last meeting for further negotiations with the applicants and the Sub-Committee had emphasised a need to ensure that the Local Ward Member was involved, she had not been involved in any discussions or meetings that had taken place. It was noted that the report stated that the applicants '*wish the applications to be determined in their present form*'.
- The Chairman expressed concerns about the retrospective nature of the works carried out and commented on discrepancies in the timing of the works. She also expressed concerns about inconsistencies and supposition in the comments of the Senior Conservation Officer.
- The Chairman did not feel that an e-mail and letter received from the applicants added any additional relevant information material to the determination and disputed a suggestion that an area adjacent to the wall was historically a village pound. It was acknowledged that planning policies did not specify that public views of a listed building must be maintained but the Chairman considered the design of the arch to be poor and, along with increase in the height of the wall, did not complement the setting of Tarrington Court.
- It was noted that the Sub-Committee could not make 'split decisions' on elements of planning applications and, therefore, the Chairman proposed that the applications be refused.

Councillor PA Andrews noted that the proposals had resulted in differences of opinion in the locality but she felt that it was the mixture of features that made villages interesting and considered these applications to be acceptable.

Councillor PJ Edwards felt that the arch was incongruous and noted that the applicants had not chosen to amend the proposals in response to the concerns expressed at the last meeting. He considered that the applications should be refused as being contrary to policies S7 (Natural and historic heritage) and HBA4 (Setting of listed buildings). He added that the arch was a poor substitute for the traditional Herefordshire gate that it replaced.

In response to questions and comments, the Principal Planning Officer advised that:

- The works in respect of the rebuilding of the wall had stopped following the enforcement investigation.

- There was evidence of a moat on the inside of the wall but details, such as the size and depth, were unclear.
- The applicants had assumed that letters/emails of support in respect of a previous application had been carried over to this application. Therefore, once the position had been identified, additional correspondence had been received following the site inspection which largely duplicated that received in 2008.
- The proposals had to be considered on their own merits, particularly given the lack of definitive evidence regarding the design and position of the original entrance. Attention was drawn to the comments of the Conservation Manager.

In response to a question from Councillor WJ Walling, the Northern Team Leader commented on the risk to developers of enforcement action being taken to remedy authorised works if retrospective planning permission was refused.

Councillor RI Matthews noted that there was some confusion about the planning history and order of events but Members had to consider the proposals before them and he felt that the arch represented an improvement and complemented the area.

Councillor MAF Hubbard drew attention to images of the entrance before and after the recent works and he considered that the arch did have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building.

Councillor KS Guthrie, referring to the comments of the Conservation Manager, questioned how the wall could be reinstated to its presumed original height without documentary evidence and supported the views of the Local Ward Member.

The Chairman commented on research undertaken by local residents in respect of the original entrance.

Councillor AP Taylor noted that the gateway was likely to have been in situ when the building was listed.

Councillor ACR Chappell felt it unlikely that there would have been a single approach to the house in the past and, although noting the retrospective nature, considered the applications to be acceptable.

#### **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 and Transportation) provided that the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:**

**The recently constructed stone wall and associated arch along with the proposed raising in height of the remaining wall with particular regard to their scale, massing, location and design will adversely affect the setting of Tarrington Court. As such the development is contrary to Policies S7 and HBA4 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007.**

- (ii) If the Head of Planning and Transportation 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 this application, the Northern Team Leader advised that, although the resolution was contrary to the officers' recommendation, he was not minded to refer the matter to the Head of Planning and Transportation given the reasons put forward by Members.]*

**31. DCCE0009/0950/F - LAND OFF BULLINGHAM LANE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 7RY**

*Proposed amendment of 39 previously approved residential dwellings and their associated parking to 51 residential dwellings to plots 99-137 & 505-517 creating an additional 12 dwellings and their associated parking.*

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and the following updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided as follows:

- Amended plans had now been received which addressed the previous concerns in the report.
- The Highways Agency had indicated, shortly before the meeting, that it did not have any objections to the application, although written confirmation of this position was awaited.
- It was recommended that, once all other matters were resolved, the requirement for the supplemental Section 106 Agreement be dealt with by condition.

Councillor ACR Chappell and ATO Oliver, Local Ward Members, had declared prejudicial interests but, in accordance with the Constitution [Appendix 12, Members Code of Conduct, Part 2, paragraph 12 (2)], wished to exercise the opportunity to speak for up to three minutes before withdrawing from the meeting. Councillor Chappell commented on the need to ensure that contributions towards enhanced educational infrastructure were received. Councillor Oliver commented on the limited sustainability measures and amenity space, felt that the density of over 50 dwellings per hectare was unacceptable, and noted existing problems with parking and traffic movement which could be exacerbated by this development.

Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes expressed concerns about the narrowness of the road network and potential highway safety implications, the high density of development proposed, and the quality of the design approach. Therefore, Councillor Lloyd-Hayes proposed that planning permission be refused.

Councillor PJ Edwards commented on the planning history of the site and the significant increases in unit numbers and density since the masterplan for the redevelopment of Bradbury Lines was first presented. He also commented on the consequential impact on parking and traffic routes through the estate and on the quality of life for local residents. He said that a further increase in density was not acceptable and that the proposal was contrary to policy H15 (Density).

In response to questions and comments, the Principal Planning Officer advised that

- The whole of Phase 3 was required to meet the Eco Homes standard of Very Good and, although this standard had been replaced by the Code for Sustainable Homes, the developers sought to maintain this or a similar standard with the new dwellings; a condition for this purpose had been recommended accordingly.
- There had been several Section 106 Agreements across various applications and these had, in essence, been complied with and contributions paid; it was noted that

a payment was required upon occupation of the 501st dwelling and this was expected in the next few months.

- The Unitary Development Plan gave the estimated capacity of the estate as 600 dwellings.
- The narrowness of the road network was intentional as it incorporated 'Home Zone' elements, aimed at reducing traffic speeds. Furthermore, the parking ratio for phase 3 was above that required by the Unitary Development Plan
- The amount of public open space, approved as part of the original outline planning permission, exceeded policy requirements.
- It was acknowledged that the density of the site was above the upper limits of that recommended by policy H15 but it was not considered that the higher density would be visibly higher than that on the other parcels of land.
- The design approach and layout followed that established by Phase 3 and was supported on that basis.

Councillor SJ Robertson commented that the total number of dwellings on the estate equated to a small village and did not consider that further dwellings could be accommodated without further detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Councillor AM Toon felt that the density should not increase further than that established through Phase 3 and that the upper limits of policy H15 might be considered acceptable in town centre locations but this site was located on the southern edge of the city.

Councillor Lloyd-Hayes re-iterated concerns about density, highways, layout and amenity considerations.

Councillor DB Wilcox noted that the density had increased over various phases of development and the layout was largely determined, however he did not consider it appropriate for the density level to increase beyond that already established.

Councillor RI Matthews noted the pressure being placed on local authorities to increase housing numbers but also noted the need for caution against potential over development and detrimental impacts on existing residents.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the adjustment to the housing mix resulted from current market conditions which had reduced demand for larger four and five bedroomed units. Given that the final layout and appearance would be similar to nearby dwellings, the proposal was considered consistent with the character of the wider development.

Councillor GA Powell commented on the planning history of the site and the impact of various planning permissions on density, highways and play areas.

Councillor Toon commented on possible occupancy levels at the care home and the allocation of land for this purpose did not justify an increase in density elsewhere.

#### **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 and Transportation) provided that the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:**

**The proposal by virtue of the increased density would result in an unacceptable residential environment with particular regard to residential amenity and parking provision and is therefore contrary to policy H15 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007.**

- (ii) **If the Head of Planning and Transportation 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 this application, the Northern Team Leader advised that, as the resolution was contrary to the officers' recommendation and had the potential for an award of costs at appeal, he was minded to refer the matter to the Head of Planning and Transportation as the Sub-Committee's view might not be defensible if challenged.]*

**32. [A] DCCE0009/0936/F AND [B] DCCE0009/0937/C - GRIMWORTH COTTAGE, HAMPTON BISHOP, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4JN**

*Demolition of existing house and construction of two new houses.*

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the applications.

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

The Chairman commented that the application site was in the Tupsley Ward, although it was close to the boundary with the Backbury Ward.

Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes, a Local Ward Member, supported the applications and welcomed the retention of mature trees and hedgerows, although noted that some had to be removed to facilitate the access, and the high standard of sustainable measures proposed. Councillors WJ Walling and AP Taylor, the other Local Ward Members, also supported the applications.

The Chairman drew attention to the comments of Hampton Bishop Parish Council, including that *'there is a policy of no new builds in Hampton Bishop due to frequent flooding'*. However, the Chairman said that she was not aware that this particular site had a history of flooding problems.

In response to questions, the Principal Planning Officer advised that:

- The possible route of an outer relief road had been identified to the east of the application site but this route was not protected in the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.
- A condition could be included to require the buildings to be constructed to achieve Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, to ensure that the measures proposed by the applicant were achieved.

The Northern Team Leader noted that Policy DR1 enabled the authority to require measures for the conservation of energy and water. Councillor Walling commented that the applicant's proposals appeared to be ahead of the field in this area in any case.

**RESOLVED:**

In respect of DCCE0009/0936/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. **B01 (Development in accordance with the approved plans).**

**Reason:** To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

3. **F14 (Removal of permitted development rights).**

**Reason:** In order to protect the character and amenity of the locality, to maintain the amenities of adjoining property and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. **F16 (No new windows in specified elevation).**

**Reason:** In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

5. **F17 (Obscure glazing to windows).**

**Reason:** In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

6. **D09 (Details of rooflights).**

**Reason:** To ensure that the rooflights are of an appropriate form and minimise the potential disruption to the appearance and continuity of the roofs in the interests of the safeguarding of the special architectural or historical interest of the building and to comply with the requirements of Policies HBA1 and HBA3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

7. **D10 (Specification of guttering and downpipes).**

**Reason:** To ensure that the rainwater goods are of an appropriate form in the interests of the safeguarding of the special architectural or historical interest of the building and to comply with the requirements of Policies HBA1 and HBA3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

8. **G09 (Details of boundary treatments).**

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity, to ensure the development has an acceptable standard of privacy and to conform to Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

9. **G10 (Landscaping scheme).**

**Reason:** In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

**10. G11 (Landscaping scheme - implementation).**

**Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**11. H03 (Visibility splays).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**12. H05 (Access gates).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**13. H06 (Vehicular access construction).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**14. H08 (Access closure).**

**Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic using the adjoining County highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**15. H09 (Driveway gradient).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**16. 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 and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**17. H27 (Parking for site operatives).**

**Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**18. H29 (Secure covered 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 and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**19. The recommendations set out in the ecologist's report dated July 2009 should be followed in relation to the identified protected species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

**Reason: To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation (Natural**



Habitats, & c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and Policies NC1, NC5, NC6 and NC7 of the Herefordshire Councils Unitary Development Plan.

20. Prior to the new dwellings being occupied, an ecological and wildlife enhancement strategy shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and implemented as approved and maintained thereafter unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with Herefordshire Council's Unitary Development Plan Policies NC6, NC8 and NC9 in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of PPS9 Biodiversity and Geographical Conservation and the NERC Act 2006.

21. I56 (Sustainable Homes Condition)

Reason: To promote the sustainability of the development hereby approved in accordance with Policies S1 and H13 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and PPS1 Supplement 'Planning and Climate Change'.

**Informatives:**

1. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.
2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

In respect of DCCE0009/0937/C:

That Conservation Area Consent be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. DO1 (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. D13 (Signing of contract before demolition).

Reason: Pursuant to the provisions of section 17(3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and to comply with the requirements of Policy HBA2 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

3. D17 (Notification of Commencement).

Reason: In order to ensure compliance with Section 7 and 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and to comply with the requirements of Policy HA1, HBA2 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

**Informatives:**

1. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.
2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

33. DCCE0009/0993/F - PLOUGH INN, LITTLE DEWCHURCH, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 6PW

*Erection of 7 no. dwellings comprising 5 no. open market houses, 2 no. affordable houses and a new vehicular access.*

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided as follows:

- An ecological survey was carried out in 2007/2008 but was not submitted with the application. This had now been provided and it did not reveal the presence of any protected or other species of note. The Conservation Manager (Ecology) therefore raised no objections subject to conditions requiring a strategy for ecological and wildlife enhancement and the ecological recommendations to be implemented.
- An amended plan had been provided identifying the required visibility splay but the Traffic Manager requested that this be illustrated on a survey plan to identify any constraints to achieving the visibility.
- The landscape officer was satisfied with the revised landscape proposals subject to minor changes to some of the proposed species and location of planting.
- A condition was recommended requiring the general market dwellings be designed and constructed to achieve Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes along with conditions covering the ecological requirements.
- It was suggested that the delegated recommendation be changed to also include the issuing of planning permission subject to the additional information and minor changes requested by the Traffic Manager and Conservation Manager (Landscape) being provided.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Spreckley had registered to speak in support of the application but decided not to speak on this occasion.

Councillor GFM Dawe, the Local Ward Member, expressed a concern that contributions towards highway and sustainable transport initiatives might be diverted outside the parish and questioned whether clause 5 of the draft Heads of Terms could refer specifically to initiatives within Little Dewchurch. In response, the Northern Team Leader commented that such a specific reference might limit the types of initiatives that could be supported and the Legal Practice Manager suggested that the wording be changed to 'within the vicinity of Little Dewchurch' instead. Councillor Dawe said that application was contentious in the locality, particularly given the density and potential urbanisation of the area, but also noted that elements in support of the proposal included sustainability measures, affordable housing, and the fact that the application site was allocated for development within the Unitary Development Plan.

Councillor AT Oliver questioned whether there was sufficient room for vehicles to pass at the access without conflict, commented on the need to restrict traffic speeds through the village, suggested that reference to North Hereford Park and Ride be amended, and suggested that rainwater harvesting be incorporated into the development.

Councillor PJ Edwards said that he supported environmental initiatives but questioned the appropriateness of pressing a small development to include advanced rainwater harvesting measures. He suggested that residential amenity and reduced carbon footprint could be enhanced through additional landscaping between the houses. Councillor PA Andrews agreed that rainwater harvesting could place a substantial burden on a small development and she supported the application, adding that suitable development was needed in villages in order to provide accommodation for local families.

Councillor MAF Hubbard welcomed the comment of the Housing Development Officer that *'it would be proposed in the first instance that they [the tenure of the affordable housing] would be for rented'*.

In response to questions and comments, the Principal Planning Officer advised that

- The access would be to an adoptable standard, with room for vehicles to pass simultaneously and with a pavement either side.
- The Code for Sustainable Homes was based on a points system, therefore the lack of full rainwater harvesting provision could be mitigated through other sustainable initiatives (including water collection butts); he added that the sustainability of some rainwater harvesting solutions was debateable given the additional carbon footprint associated with the operation of pumping systems.

Councillor AM Toon drew attention to the draft Heads of Terms and suggested that reference to North Hereford Park and Ride be amended to South Hereford Park and Ride, and that reference to The Hereford Academy be deleted given the status of that school and reported capacity. She commented on the need for evening bus services in rural areas, particularly to provide access for young people into and from Hereford City.

Councillor DB Wilcox commented that Section 106 Agreements could not be too parochial as transportation matters, such as bus services or interconnectivity between settlements, inevitably involved wider areas and there was a risk that funding might be lost if obligations were too specific. The Legal Practice Manager noted that the draft Heads of Terms only gave an outline of the proposed planning obligation agreement.

In response to a question from Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes, the Principal Planning Officer explained that the Traffic Manager had sought further clarification regarding the access visibility splay. Councillor Lloyd-Hayes welcomed some design elements, such as bay windows, and said that it was essential that monies towards educational infrastructure/facilities at Little Dewchurch CE Primary School were secured.

In response to a question from Councillor Dawe about timings, the Principal Planning Officer drew attention to paragraph 9 of the draft Heads of Terms which indicated that *'All the affordable housing units shall be completed and made available for occupation prior to the occupation of more than 50% of the other residential units on the development'*.

The Legal Practice Manager summarised the actions to be taken in respect of the Heads of Terms as: reference being made to off site highway works and improved sustainable transport infrastructure being 'in the vicinity of Little Dewchurch'; the amendment from North, to South Hereford Park and Ride; and the deletion of the reference to The Hereford Academy. Furthermore, additional conditions would be included in respect of the Code for Sustainable Homes and ecological requirements.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 1. The Legal Practice Manager be authorised to complete a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 covering the matters detailed in the Heads of Terms, as amended by the Sub-Committee above, and any additional matters that he considers necessary and 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 subject to the**

**additional information and minor changes requested by the Traffic Manager and Conservation Manager (Landscape) being provided:**

**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. B03 (Amended plans).**

**Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans and to comply with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 3. C01 (Samples of external materials).**

**Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 4. F14 (Removal of permitted development rights).**

**Reason: In order to protect the character and amenity of the locality, to maintain the amenities of adjoining property and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 5. G09 (Details of boundary treatments).**

**Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, to ensure the development has an acceptable standard of privacy and to conform to Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 6. G10 (Landscaping scheme).**

**Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 7. G11 (Landscaping scheme - implementation).**

**Reason: In order to maintain the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy LA6 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 8. H03 (Visibility splays).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 9. H05 (Access gates).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

- 10. H06 (Vehicular access construction).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**11. H09 (Driveway gradient).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**12. 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 and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**13. H21 (Wheel washing).**

**Reason: To ensure that the wheels of vehicles are cleaned before leaving the site in the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**14. H27 (Parking for site operatives).**

**Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**15. H29 (Secure covered 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 and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**16. I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

**Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy DR13 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**17. I22 (No surface water to public sewer).**

**Reason: To safeguard the public sewerage system and reduce the risk of surcharge flooding so as to comply with Policy DR4 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**18. I51 (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 so as to comply with Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**19. I56 (Sustainable Homes Condition).**

**Reason: To promote the sustainability of the development hereby approved in accordance with Policies S1 and H13 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan and PPS1 Supplement 'Planning and Climate Change'.**

**20. K4 (Nature Conservation - Implementation).**

**Reason:** To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and Policies NC1, NC5, NC6 and NC7 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

**21. K5 (Habitat Enhancement Scheme).**

**Reason:** In order to ensure that diversity is conserved and enhanced in accordance with the requirements of PPS9, the NERC Act 2006 and Policies NC6, NC7, NC8 and NC9 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

**Informatives:**

- 1. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
- 2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**

**34. DCCW2008/2946/F - CHURCH HOUSE FARM, WELLINGTON, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 8AZ**

*Residential development of 20 houses comprising 13 open market houses and 7 affordable houses (amended access).*

The Chairman noted that this was a significant development in a small parish, that the Case Officer and the Local Ward Member were unable to attend this meeting, and considered that the Sub-Committee would benefit from a site inspection; on the grounds that the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered. Other Members supported this.

**RESOLVED:**

**That consideration of the application be deferred for a site inspection.**

**35. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

19 August 2009  
16 September 2009  
14 October 2009

The meeting ended at 4.30 pm

**CHAIRMAN**