

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday 19 September 2012 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, AN Bridges, EMK Chave, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, J Hardwick, JW Hope MBE, MAF Hubbard, RC Hunt, JA Hyde, Brig P Jones CBE, JLV Kenyon, JG Lester, RI Matthews, GR Swinford and PJ Watts

In attendance: Councillors PJ McCaull and PM Morgan

56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors BA Durkin, FM Norman, MD Lloyd-Hayes and G Lucas.

57. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)

In accordance with paragraph 4.1.23 of the Council's Constitution, Councillors E Chave, JA Hyde and JLV Kenyon attended the meeting as substitute members for Councillors FM Norman, BA Durkin and MD Lloyd-Hayes.

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

8. S121611/F - MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ. Councillor DW Greenow, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor knows the applicant's father.

8. S121611/F - MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ. Councillor MAF Hubbard, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor knows the applicant's mother.

8. S121611/F - MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ. Councillor RI Matthews, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor knows the applicant's parents.

9. N121446/CD - LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE.

Councillor Brig P Jones CBE, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor is Chair of the Governors for the Mortimor College which has links to the Junior School.

9. N121446/CD - LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE.

Councillor EMK Chave, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor was a supply teacher for the primary school prior to 2010.

9. N121446/CD - LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE.

Councillor RC Hunt, Non-Pecuniary, The Councillor is a Governor at the Junior School.

59. MINUTES

The Committee requested that minute number 51, paragraph 6, be amended to read:

“..., the known available brownfield sites such as *some of* the Edgar Street Grid...”

RESOLVED: That subject to the amendment as set out above, the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 August 2012 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman advised the Committee that the Planning Committee due to take place on 7 November 2012 would be an extended meeting. He also read out a letter from Mrs Butler, a resident who had attended a recent planning committee, thanking the committee for the way that they had considered an application which she had objected to.

The Head of Neighbourhood Planning advised the Committee that the decision and the minute in respect of Pennoxstone Court, Kings Caple, had now been quashed by the High Court and that the application was therefore undetermined, and would therefore be referred back to the Planning Committee.

61. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

62. N121446/CD - LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr Downey, representing some of the residents of Hereford Road, spoke in objection to the application.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, Councillor RC Hunt, one of the local ward members, commented on a number of issues, including:

- The site visit had been beneficial to members in addressing concerns on the site.
- The school was important for Leominster and had the full support of the local residents in principal, however there were a number of concerns that needed to be addressed.
- The school will only accommodate the current number of pupils in the primary and junior schools, where would additional pupils be accommodated when numbers increase.
- The government advice was set out in paragraph 2.2 and required the Council to be proactive in respect of planning for possible pupil numbers.
- Flat roofs had caused problems in the past, could the committee be assured that the proposed roof would be fit for purpose with a long life expectancy.
- The coloured tiles proposed for the main entrance needed to blend in and had to be considered carefully.
- The area was prone to flooding and the flood issues did not seem to have been considered fully by the land drainage engineer.

- Parking would continue to be an issue on Hereford Road, needed to look into additional parking. Existing School land at George Street could be considered for additional parking. This could be covered by a Section 106 agreement.

Councillor PJ McCaull, the other local ward member added that:

- The schools clearly needed to be replaced and they had been allowed to depreciate during the 4-5 years that the application had been in discussion.
- There will be double the amount of children using the one vehicular entrance to the school from Hereford Road.
- Vital to retain some of the land for additional parking.
- There was a significant amount of groundwork required to make the site suitable for development.
- The proposed application was seriously lacking in sustainable features.
- The design of the proposed school was of concern with reference made to the impressive design of the nearby Mortimer College.
- There was a concern in respect of run-off water which needed to be addressed in order to alleviate any flooding concerns in the area. The small pool which had been proposed was not going to be able to take all of the water.
- The applicants should consider a large underground water storage tank which could then be reused on the site.
- The report mentioned that the roof was suitable for solar panels, these should be installed during the build.
- The current proposals did not account for increased pupil numbers as a result of residential developments proposed for Leominster.

The Democratic Services Officer read out a letter received from Councillor FM Norman, who was unable to attend the meeting, voicing her concerns in respect of the application and requesting that it be refused.

Members noted that they had a duty to determine the application before them and that it was not their responsibility to act as the applicant in amending major factors of the application. They did however have a number of concerns which they felt should be addressed before they could determine the application.

The primary concerns were in respect of the proposed access to the school and the impact that a single access would have on the residents of Hereford Road. Members noted that a Travel Plan had not been submitted with the application and they were of the opinion that this was a matter that needed to be addressed prior to a permission being granted. In addition to the access issues Members had concerns regarding parking provision. It was considered that land at George Street, which would become vacant when the existing school was demolished, should be allocated for extra parking provision. It was noted that this could be achieved through a Section 106 Agreement.

The concerns in respect of the site as a whole were also discussed. The Committee noted that there would be a considerable amount of groundwork required before the site would be fit for development. The nature of the land, regarded as Grade 1 Agricultural Land by a number of sources, also gave the Committee concern. One Member questioned whether the site was in the correct location and whether it would be more suitably located nearer to the residential areas of Leominster.

The issue of surface water was also considered. Members noted that the previous 12 months had seen a number of areas throughout the County flood which had never been

susceptible to flooding previously. The Committee requested that the applicant consider this fully when making provision for surface water run-off.

A further area which the Committee considered at length related to the lack of sustainable energy sources throughout the site. The Committee noted that the flat roof had been described as suitable for photovoltaic solar panels but were concerned that these had not been proposed to be installed during the construction phase. They also noted their concern in respect of the proposed 'windcatchers' which were considered to not be effective. The applicant was requested to consider fully any appropriate renewable energy sources which could be effectively incorporated into the development. Members were of the opinion that the Council should be leading the way in respect of sustainable developments.

A motion to refuse the application was seconded, however, following further discussion the mover and seconder of the motion withdrew it in favour of deferring determination of the application for further discussions with the applicant.

One Member of the Committee noted the concerns of the Committee but drew their attention to the current infant and junior school, which in his opinion, were in desperate need of replacing. He was concerned that any delay could jeopardise the project and requested that it be approved.

Members continued to debate the application and continued to express their concerns in respect of any future expansion of the school. They noted that Government guidance required local authorities to plan for the future when determining school sizes. They requested clarification as to whether the school would be able to expand with future increased pupil rolls.

After noting the concerns of the Committee, the Development Manager (Northern Localities) advised that a deferral of the determination of the application would send a clear message to the applicant. In response to questions asked during the debate he advised that the school did have provision to be expanded should there be a future need; that there would be a school travel plan to encourage cycling and walking; that the land identified at George Street could be investigated for access and parking; and that technical developments meant that flat roofs were no longer problematic.

In response to a further question, the Principal Planning Officer advised that both the existing infant and junior schools were located in the area of the town that the proposed school would be in and that housing in Leominster was spread throughout the town.

Councillors RC Hunt and PJ McCaull were given the opportunity to close the debate. They reiterated their opening remarks and thanked the Committee for debating the application thoroughly.

RESOLVED:

THAT the determination of the application be deferred pending further discussions with the applicant.

63. N121318/F - THE BARRACKS, CHURCH LANE, MUCH COWARNE, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4JG

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet. She advised the Committee of one amendment to paragraph 5.3 of the report as six letters of support had been received not four.

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

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, Councillor PM Morgan, the local ward member, commented on a number of issues, including:

- The applicant was a local agricultural worker who wished to build a home close to where he currently lived with his family.
- The proposed accommodation was modest in size.
- The conservation manager had objected to the application.
- The existing building was an historic building of local importance and dated back to the hop growing era.
- The local history society was in favour of retaining the building.
- The site should not be considered as open countryside, there were a number of dwelling sin close proximity.
- The proposed application would result in a sustainable development.
- Issues relating to ecology and water quality could be addressed through conditions.

Members discussed the application and were broadly in support of it. However they did have a number of concerns which they felt could be adequately addressed through appropriate conditions.

A motion to approve the application, citing Unitary Development Plan Policies HBA12, HBA13, S1, S2 and DR2, was moved and seconded.

The Head of Neighbourhood Planning advised Members to consider the three reasons for refusal listed in the officer's recommendation. He advised that reason two had been addressed by the Committee; that reason one needed to be addressed and that reason three could be addressed through a delegated approval subject to Habitat Regulations being met.

Members discussed the concerns regarding the second reason for refusal and stated that they were of the opinion that the current building was of historic value and was worthy of being retained therefore the application was in accordance with UDP Policies HBA12 and H7. They requested that a condition be added to require the applicant to adhere to a scheme of construction to ensure the existing external walls were retained.

Members continued to discuss conditions which they wished to see attached to the planning permission. As well as the previously mentioned condition addressing a scheme of construction they also requested that an agricultural tie be added as well as the removal of permitted development rights.

The Head of Neighbourhood Planning requested that the condition in respect of the removal of permitted development rights be amended to allow solar panels to be installed at the site.

The mover and seconder of the original motion amended the motion to include a reference to the three proposed conditions as well as any further conditions deemed necessary by officers.

Councillor Morgan was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated her opening remarks and requested that the application be approved.

RESOLVED

THAT subject to further consideration of the watercourse matters, in relation to the Habitat Regulations, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation of Officers (in consultation with the Chairman and Local Ward Member) be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. F27 Agricultural occupancy**
- 2. F14 Removal of permitted development rights**
- 3. A Scheme of Construction to be submitted for approval ensuring a conversion and not new build**

and any further conditions considered necessary by officers.

Reasons for Approval: The application complies with UDP Policy H7, as a re-use of a rural building, in accordance with policies HBA12 and HBA13, as the building is considered by the council to have historical benefits in relation to the hop picking that was undertaken in the area. The scheme of conversion ensures that this historical reference is retained through the conversion.

64. S121611/F - MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr Burridge, a neighbouring resident, spoke in objection to the application and Mr Coppock, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, Councillor RI Matthews, the local ward member, commented on a number of issues, including:

- The views of the parish council should be taken seriously.
- The nearest residents live just 30 metres away from the site.
- Conditions had been recommended to address noise, therefore there was clearly a concern in respect of noise emanating from the site.
- The cars manufactured by Raw Striker used a motorcycle engine, this would be noisy during testing.
- Air tools used in the manufacturing process would also be noisy.
- Need to look at paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and protect an area of tranquility.
- Need to refuse the application in accordance with paragraph 7 of the NPPF based on appropriate land uses.
- There were also concerns in respect of the narrow highway to the site.
- There was also a well-used bridlepath 30 metres away from the site.
- The applicant had a site currently which he did not need to leave.
- 29 local residents objected to the application.

Members opened the debate by voicing their concern in respect of the application. They had reservations regarding the proposed usage on an area of land close to dwellings and an equine centre. It was considered that the proposed usage was an industrial use

which would be better suited to one of the many industrial estates within the County. It was noted that the kit cars would need to be tested which would result in noise outside of the manufacturing unit.

Some Members however had a differing opinion and felt that the application should be approved. They felt that small businesses in the County should be encouraged and noted that the usage did not constitute a car factory and was solely a unit for assembling already prepared parts. The requirement of a complete noise attenuation scheme was discussed with consideration being given to deferring the determination of the application until a scheme had been fully considered and agreed with officers.

The Committee noted that the application was finely balanced. They continued to discuss their concerns regarding odour, noise, and an inappropriate use of the land. They also noted that the applicant intended relocating his existing workforce and did not intend to recruit additional employees from the local community.

Councillor Matthews was given the opportunity to close the debate. He reiterated his opening remarks and made additional comments, including:

- The neighbouring site had been used for equine use for approximately 20 years.
- There were a number of valid reasons to refuse the application, primarily impact on the amenity of the neighbours and highways.

A motion to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation was lost. A motion to defer the determination of the application, pending the receipt of a full noise attenuation scheme, was also lost.

Members continued to discuss the application and, at the request of the Head of Neighbourhood Planning, they confirmed the reasons why it should be refused. They noted that the application was finely balanced but, in their opinion, the application was contrary to HBA12, due to its close proximity to residential dwellings and an established equine usage; E10, as the site was not appropriate for a semi industrial usage; DR2, as the land use and activity was not suitable due to the location; and DR13, as the showroom access would be using the same narrow highway which could result in noise issues for nearby residents. They also expressed their concerns in respect of noise, with particular reference given to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 123, and odour.

The Development Manager (Northern Localities) advised Members that the policies referred to could be defensible. He added that Members may also wish to consider policies E8 and E10 of the UDP as well as paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The mover and the seconder of the motion to refuse the application accepted the proposed amendment.

RESOLVED

THAT the application be refused as it is contrary to Unitary Development Plan Policies HBA12, E8, E10, DR2, DR13 as well as paragraphs 7 and 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

65. N121131/FH - THE COTTAGE, WOODEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE HR8 2RS

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet. He drew Members attention to a letter in the update sheet

submitted by Mrs Jones, one of the neighbouring residents who had objected to the application, who had been unable to attend the meeting.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr Rumsey, a neighbouring resident, spoke in objection to the application and Mr Ingleton, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, Councillor PM Morgan, the local ward member, commented on a number of issues, including:

- The application was finely balanced.
- The proposed extension would make an extremely small cottage suitable for a family home.
- The existing cottage was too small at present and needed to be extended.
- Once extended the dwelling would only have three bedrooms.
- Members attended a site inspection and were therefore able to judge the impact on the neighbouring residents.
- There were conflicting views from the Council's Conservation and Landscape Officers.
- A pitched roof would result in a much larger footprint.

Members noted the quality of the workmanship that had been undertaken in restoring the existing cottage, they also noted that at present it was not fit for a family home and was in need of an extension. It was appreciated that the extension was contemporary with some members of the opinion that the cottage would benefit from an extension which was more in keeping with the original cottage.

The Committee commented on the proposed plans and noted that from the front of the dwelling the extension would not be seen, this therefore satisfied them that the original cottage would remain the dominant feature.

The issue of overlooking was discussed with Members of the opinion that any overlooking would be minimal. The Principal Planning Officer also advised that there were only ground floor windows facing the neighbours dwelling therefore reducing any issues of overlooking further.

Members continued to discuss the application, some were of the opinion that the proposed development was an ideal blend of contemporary and traditional design whilst others felt that the proposal was out of keeping with a traditional country village and would be more appropriate in an urban setting.

The issue of the scale of the extension was discussed at length. Members noted that the proposed extension would result in a 131% increase with some of the opinion that this was unacceptable. However other Members noted the scale of the existing dwelling and appreciated that a larger extension would be required to result in a home fit for a family to live in.

The Principal Planning Officer addressed a number of issues which had been raised by the Committee during the debate. He advised that the agreed floor plans meant that the extension could not be used as a separate dwelling; that an extension with a pitched roof would have to have a considerably larger footprint than that proposed; and that the extension was designed so as to not impact on the structure of the original timber frame cottage

Councillor Morgan was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated her opening remarks and requested that the application be approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in full accordance with the external materials specified upon the Planning Application Form received 16th April 2012, the Design & Access Statement received on 16th April 2012 and the approved plans referred to in condition 3 below and shall thereafter be maintained with those materials.**

Reason:- To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policies DR1, H18, LA2 and HBA8 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007;

3. **B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans**
4. **The two car parking spaces shown upon drawing number Drg No. 1411-Bloc2 (Scale 1:500) received 16th April 2012 shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and thereafter be retained and maintained for the parking of two motor vehicles, free of obstruction;**

Reason:- To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision to prevent parking on the public highway, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy T11 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007;

5. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town And Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended, including the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order (no.2) (England) Order (2008) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development normally permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 and Classes A and C of Part 2 of schedule 2 of Article 3 of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 shall be carried out without the express consent of the Local Planning Authority;**

Reason:- To prevent an overdevelopment of the site, to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policies DR1, H18, LA2 and HBA8 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007;

Reason for Approval

1. **The Local Planning Authority resolved to grant full conditional planning permission in this case despite the floor space increase of the extension being significant compared to the original cottage for the following reasons:-**
 - a) **The extension would not adversely affect the principal / front elevation of the original cottage;**
 - b) **The extension would visually appear as distinct / separate to the original cottage and its overall height would be some 42cm lower than the ridge height of the original cottage**

- c) The contemporary design of the proposed extension is considered to represent an innovative quality approach;
- d) The extension would not be readily visible or visually harmful to the landscape when viewed from public vantage points;
- e) The extension would not result in any undue loss of daylight and / or sunlight to habitable rooms of neighbouring houses; and
- f) The extension would not result any undue loss of privacy to occupiers of neighbouring houses;

As such, the extension was not considered to conflict with the purpose / objectives of policies S2, DR1, H18, S7, LA2, HBA8 and T11 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan 2007.

66. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

The meeting ended at 1.07 pm

CHAIRMAN

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 September 2012

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

N121318/F - CONVERSION OF RURAL BUILDING TO ONE DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AT THE BARRACKS, CHURCH LANE, MUCH COWARNE, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4JG

For: Mr Day per Mr Linden Alcock, Palace Chambers, 3 King Street, Hereford, HR1 9BW.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Representations

The following email has been received from Martin Hewitt who is Church Warden and Chairman of the Much Cowarne History Group;

I feel that the Paunceford Court Hop-Pickers Barracks near the church might not be an Elizabethan half timbered building, and may be poorly built but it is the only building that tells of the huge hop-yard empire that the Pudge Family had at Cowarne Court and Bishops Frome. In its own way it is an historic building. The building has been an eyesore for many years and from what I have seen of the plans, Francis Day is aiming to sympathetically convert the building to a higher degree than I think is necessary, but still keep the look of its original function.

I am afraid I can't be at the Planning Committee meeting on the 19th September because I am on holiday that week. I have farmed at Panks Bridge Farm, Much Cowarne for 43 years. I am a Church Warden and also Chairman of the Much Cowarne History Group. I am writing in support of the planning application by Francis Day who I have known since we moved here in 1969. I feel that Francis Day as a partner in a local firm that is very active in the community should be given every opportunity to stay in the parish.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

S121611/F - CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL TO B2 GENERAL INDUSTRIAL - RE-USE OF EXISTING BUILDING WITH EXTENSION TO FORM WORKSHOP FOR KIT CAR ASSEMBLY AT MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ

For: Mr Bulmer per Mr Alex Coppock, Studio 1, Grange, Shelwick, Hereford, HR1 3AW.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Representations

Note that there was one letter of support submitted in response to the application that had been omitted from the report. This was from T C Lewis – 81 Ecroyd Park and these comments are summarised as follows:

No objection as in today's economic state any firm offering employment no matter how small or large, should be encouraged for the sake of the local community. This project would bring extra trade to shop etc. Noise would not be an issue, as well within permitted hours and would be minimal anyway. Provided speed not an issue down Mill lane then wish project well.

A petition with 56 signatories has been received that states:

'Please sign and support this petition against the use of planning application 121611/F for Mill Farm Building, Mill Lane, Credenhill, Hereford or signatures that signed original petition that does not live in the area and who it does not concern.'

Internal Consultees

Further to the details being submitted (as per paragraph 6.10 / 6.11 of the report) the Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on these details and is now content that these address the issues.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Following the details submitted by the applicants revised conditions are recommended to ensure that the appropriate works are undertaken in accordance with these details. Whilst the EHO is satisfied that these methods are appropriate, we would require details of the ventilation systems, noise levels (Before and after) before we could discharge these conditions. Likewise. Whilst the methodology is sound, we would require manufactures details of the systems to ensure that they are sufficient.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

No change to recommendation

N121446/CD - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AT LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Herefordshire Council per Amey Property Services, Explorer 2, Fleming Way, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 9GT

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Conservations Manager – Landscape

The application does not demonstrate how landscape character has influenced the site selection or design. The existing school site, to the southern hedgerow boundary, is within the Urban landscape character of Leominster. The proposal is to extend the school site further south into the character type principal settled farmlands. This land for the proposed extension is classified as being of high landscape sensitivity within the council's Urban Fringe Sensitivity Analysis (Jan 2010).

The open spaces around the site will create a multifunctional framework, including sport, play, relaxing, parking, movement, growing food, drainage, learning, wildlife habitats and creating a sense of place.

The application could be improved through presentation of a strong landscape design framework and supporting management plan. This should balance the site opportunities and constraints and ensure that the natural environment is fully integrating into the way the school is planned, design and managed for the long term.

Further clarification is required on the detailed treatment of the boundaries. In particular:

- Levels along the new southern boundary, gradient of the slopes between the sports pitch, building and existing vegetation to be retained.
- Footpath along east boundary. I do not support the proposal for the new fence to be located approx.. 30mm away from the existing fence. This will create a narrow, hard, unattractive corridor for users of the footpath and will require significant vegetation removal for the installation. Consideration should be given to the security fence being at the top of the new bank / back of the car park bays. It could be set approx.. 1m back from the top of the bank to allow new planting on the school side to soften the appearance for the pupils.
- The details of the new fencing and the existing / proposed hedgerows and trees needs further consideration all around the site. The boundary treatments have the largest impact on the surrounding sensitive landscape, particularly where it adjoins open countryside.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The location of the development and its visual impact are dealt with in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10. It is acknowledged that the proposal will have a visual impact and that a balance has to be struck between this impact, the operational and financial costs of re-developing the existing sites and the benefits derived through the significant improvement of education provision in the town. It is considered that the visual impacts can be mitigated through the imposition of conditions. This is also referred to later in the Landscape Officer's comments.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Condition 8 – Additional sentence to be added to read as follows:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the new school is first brought into use.

Condition 9 – Additional sentence to be added to read as follows:

The approved Management Plan shall be implemented upon the commencement of the development of the site and shall remain in force until all works covered by this permission are complete.

N121131/FH - ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING AT THE COTTAGE, WOODEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE HR8 2RS

For: Mr Ingleton per Mr Stephen Turner, 5 Barbourne Road, Worcester, Worcestershire, WR1 1RS

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

One of the objecting local residents (the occupier of 'Spring Grove Farm') is unable to attend today's meeting due to a long-standing medical appointment. She has therefore asked that her views are relayed to the Planning Committee in full. Her request is that the letter is read out in full today, however, it is considered by Officers that it is best set out in full within this written update report. She states:-

“Thank you for the opportunity to restate my views on this application.

I would emphasize that the months which have elapsed since I submitted a response to the application have not changed my views in any way.

I reiterate that this proposed extension is unsuitable in the environment of the adjoining properties i.e. the hamlet of Woodend.

The proposed extension is totally out of keeping with the original dwelling and those surrounding it, all of which have had improvements and extensions but within the framework of size and style limitations in force. This includes my own property the style and size of which was dominated by the cottage it replaced.

I listened carefully to the arguments put forward by Mr Close on the phone and during his visits. Whilst I respect his professional opinion, I feel that his support for the proposed extension is misguided. It is an extension which is unsuitable to the context of the Black and white cottage and has the potential to affect the neighbouring properties.

Since it is the neighbouring properties which have to live with the outcome of this application I would ask that the views of the residents are taken fully into account. The open Parish Council meeting has communicated its views to you and using this opportunity endorsed them.

I draw your attention to the development of access to the rear of The Cottage. The lane, giving access to all four properties, has no known owner.

The three houses, with access on the lane, have parking for at least two vehicles within their boundaries. Out of respect for our neighbours' rights and safety, we do not park in the lane.

The Cottage has had two pedestrian accesses to the lane but now the hedge has been removed making the lane continuous with the rear garden of the dwelling.

Currently, the end of the lane is being used as a parking area by the Cottage. This lane/garden boundary needs reinstating even if a double gate allows vehicular access.

The Cottage needs more than two parking spaces since there are already two vehicles based there. . The presence of a third vehicle tends to obstruct:-

- a) the turning area thus forcing any subsequent vehicle to reverse blindly round the bend into the B... road.
- b) the gateway to my property which has a Wayleave requirement of 24 hour access to the electricity supply for the immediate area.

With each of these comments in mind and, considering the earlier submission, I ask you to refuse the current application.”

OFFICER COMMENTS

None

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

None