HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 9 December 2015 at 10.00 am

Present: **Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)**
Councillor J Hardwick (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: BA Baker, CR Butler, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, EL Holton, TM James, JLV Kenyon, SM Michael, FM Norman, AJW Powers, WC Skelton, J Stone, EJ Swinglehurst and LC Tawn

In attendance: Councillor WLS Bowen

108. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors JA Hyde and A Seldon.

109. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor SM Michael substituted for Councillor A Seldon and Councillor J Stone for Councillor JA Hyde.

110. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 7: 151145 Field adjoining A4112 and Chestnut Avenue, Kimbolton.

Councillor J Stone declared a non-pecuniary interest as Chairman of Kimbolton Primary School Governors..

(With regard to item 8: 151641 – Land to rear of Bramley House and Orchard House of Kings Acre Road, Swainshill, Hereford, Councillor AJW Powers informed the Committee that he was a member of Breinton Parish Council.)

111. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November, 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

112. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

113. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

114. 151145 - FIELD ADJOINING A4112 AND CHESTNUT AVENUE, KIMBOLTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed residential development of up to 21 dwellings along with new access and associated works.)

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, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr W Mears of Kimbolton Parish Council commented that whilst the Parish Council had no objection in principle it did have a number of concerns about the Scheme. Mr J Robinson, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mrs S Churchward, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor J Stone, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- The community consultation referred to at paragraph 1.5 of the report had been organised by the applicants not the Parish Council. It had been well attended.
- In the context of Kimbolton the development was large and potentially significant.
- The Neighbourhood Plan was at an early stage so residents, who were not opposed in principle to development, had not yet had the opportunity to express their views on possible development sites.

The following points were in favour of the development:

- The proposal for up to 21 houses, 40% of which would be affordable, would provide an opportunity for young people and families to live in the village and contribute to the village's sustainability.
- The Primary School was good and the head teacher welcomed the development.
- The development was of a low density.

Less welcome aspects included:

- Whilst the Parish Council was not opposed in principle to development it had outlined a number of concerns in its response at page 31 of the agenda papers. These included sewage management; there was already a pollution problem in the absence of a public sewer.
- The comments of the Conservation Manager (Landscape) who had registered an objection included the statement that: "*The proposed site extends in a north-westerly direction beyond the existing north western housing boundaries. This creates housing creep into the open countryside which makes the proposed site out of scale with the existing village pattern."* The Conservation Manager went on to suggest that a development of 11 houses would be more acceptable.
- There were concerns about the access to the site and the additional traffic. Whilst there was a 30mph speed limit on that part of the A4112 the road was busy and traffic fast at certain times of the day. Traffic calming measures were needed.
- Kimbolton Primary School needed its own hall so pupils did not have to walk to the village hall.
- Footpath and cycleway provision needed to be improved.

- The section 106 agreement needed to be revisited.

In conclusion he observed that paragraph 6.29 of the report concluded that the adverse impacts did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. It was a finely balanced application.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- It was welcome that the density was relatively low. The scheme provided gardens for the houses.

- The road was a through route to Tenbury and very busy at times. The access was satisfactory within the 30mph speed limit but signing should be improved. A speed indicator device should also be considered.

- The site was in the middle of the village with a public house and shop nearby.

- The site did slope up from the road. It was to be hoped that at the reserved matters stage consideration could be given to ensuring that the development did not loom over the village.

- A concern was expressed that the development extended beyond the natural line of the village and would have an adverse impact.

- Any development should be far enough away from the edge of the bank to avoid damaging it.

- There was the potential for water run-off from the site. Consideration should be given to a wet system of drainage using trees.

- Quality of design and low energy housing was to be encouraged.

- The provision of 40% affordable housing was welcome.

- It was regrettable that Grade 2 agricultural land was to be used if brownfield land was available.

- Mitigation to address the concerns of the Conservation Manager (Landscape) about the impact on the landscape appeared possible, for example with more planting and provision of open space, and would be welcome.

- Given concerns expressed about drainage it was asked whether some of the informatives relating to this aspect could be made conditions. The Development Manager commented that conditions 14-16 addressed these points and the informatives related to those conditions.

- If there would not be enough funding under the S106 agreement for a school hall consideration should be given to improving the pavement to the village hall.

The Development Manager commented that the application was for a development of up to 21 houses. If the Committee wanted there to be a smaller development on the site it would have to refuse the current application.

He added:

- It was recognised that a requirement for recycling provision would need to be added into the draft heads of terms.

- The draft section 106 agreement was Community infrastructure levy compliant and no further contribution could be required.

- The provision of gateway features could address concerns about the access and be funded from the proposed S106 transport contribution. Funding to support safer routes to schools requirements could also be considered.

- Drainage would be considered at the reserved matters stage. Soft landscaping could assist with drainage.

- The development was sufficiently distant from the Stockton Cross Inn, a listed building, not to have an impact.

- If the application were refused the applicant could submit an application for up to 10 houses and offer no affordable housing.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that the development did have a lot of advantages. It was on the same side of the village as an existing estate and the access was better than for a number of alternative sites. It was important that drainage concerns were addressed because Kimbolton had suffered from flooding. The Parish Council had asked to be consulted on the S106 agreement. The Parish Council was not opposed in principle to the development so long as it was of benefit to the village. The provision of affordable housing was important to the village's long term sustainability.

RESOLVED: That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act 1990 obligation agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms stated in the report and appended, Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers are authorised to grant [outline] planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary

1. A02 Time limit for submission of reserved matters (outline permission)

2. A03 Time limit for commencement (outline permission)

3. A04 Approval of reserved matters

4. B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans

5. G03 Retention of existing trees/hedgerows

6. G04 Protection of trees/hedgerows that are to be retained

7. G09 Details of Boundary treatments

8. G10 Landscaping scheme

9. G11 Landscaping scheme - implementation

10. H13 (Access, turning and parking)

11. H27 (Parking for site operatives)

12. E01 Site investigation - archaeology

13. The recommendations set out in Section 5 of the ecologist's report from Churton Ecology dated March 2015 should be followed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat protection and enhancement scheme integrated with the landscape scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the scheme shall be implemented as approved.

An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works should be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.

Reasons:

To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policies SS6, LD2 and LD3 of Herefordshire Local Plan –Core Strategy

To comply with Herefordshire Council's Policy LD2 and LD3 in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the NERC Act 2006

14. I20 Scheme of surface water drainage

15. I21 Scheme of surface water regulation

16. I18 Scheme of foul drainage disposal

17. Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential development hereby permitted written evidence / certification demonstrating that water conservation and efficiency measures to achieve the 'Housing – Optional Technical Standards – Water efficiency standards' (i.e. currently a maximum of 110 litres per person per day) for water consumption as a minimum have been installed / implemented shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their written approval. The development shall not be first occupied until the Local Planning Authority have confirmed in writing receipt of the aforementioned evidence and their satisfaction with the submitted documentation. Thereafter those water conservation and efficiency measures shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development;

Reason: - To ensure water conservation and efficiency measures are secured, in accordance with policy SD3 (6) of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031

INFORMATIVES:

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework

2. The following information should be provided in connection with Conditions 14, 15 and 16 above:

Soil infiltration rates to confirm whether the infiltration techniques are feasible for both surface water and foul water discharges;

Groundwater levels if infiltration techniques are found to be feasible on site, as the bottom of a soakaway should be located a minimum of 1m above the recorded groundwater levels;

Detailed surface water drainage design including SUDS source control measures wherever feasible and drainage calculations. The Applicant must provide evidence that the proposed drainage system will not increase risk of flooding to people and properties within and outside of the site for up to and including the 1 in 100 year event with 30% climate change allowance. The Applicant must also provide information on exceedance routes to ensure no increased flood risk to people and properties elsewhere;

• Detailed foul water drainage design;

• Confirmation of who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed package treatment plant and common attenuation storage;

• Confirmation from DCWW that they have agreed to the adoption and maintenance of the surface water drainage system

As discussed above, the Applicant will also need to obtain approval of the Council regarding the proposed combined sewer located within the public highway and ordinary watercourse consent for the new outfall to the watercourse south of the site.

115. 151641 - LAND TO REAR OF BRAMLEY HOUSE AND ORCHARD HOUSE, OFF KINGSACRE ROAD, SWAINSHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 0SG

(Proposed residential development of up to 21 dwellings along with new access and associated works.)

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, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mrs E Morawiecka of Breinton Parish Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr B Jolly, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

Councillor WLS Bowen had fulfilled the role of local ward member for this application on behalf of Councillor RI Matthews. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Bowen spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- He noted that it had been advised that the route corridor for the western relief road did not impact upon the site and that it was not therefore a relevant matter.

- The site had once been an old orchard and if the application were approved he supported the maintenance of an area as traditional orchard.
- The access from the Kings Acre Road was good, but the road from the access to the site needed to be adopted.
- The site had good access to transport links and was sustainable.
- The Parish Council considered that the parish needed smaller housing units than the application proposed.
- The development would have no affordable housing.
- The quality of design would be important.
- The turning head of the access road should be reduced in size.
- It was important that sewerage and water supply issues were addressed.
- The S106 agreement would need to incorporate provision for transport, public open space and a play area.
- He requested that the Parish Council should be fully consulted on any reserved matters application.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The Conservation Manager (Ecology) had suggested that a condition should be imposed requiring a compensatory commitment to re-establish areas of lost trees and manage an area in association with the development as traditional orchard. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed where it was proposed that area should be. She noted that there had been no trees on the development site since 1999. It was proposed to address the points made by the Conservation Manager (Ecology) about enhancing the area through the S106 agreement.
- The concept of the traditional orchard was questioned. Such orchards were not long lived, were not commercially viable and could only be maintained as a community project.
- The proposal was sustainable.
- The provision of private garden space was welcome.
- The absence of any affordable housing as part of the development was regrettable.
- The development could not be considered to be in open countryside. It was in the middle of an area that had already been developed and could be viewed as organic growth.
- In considering the size of the turning head of the access road, it was important to ensure that regard was had to recycling and waste management collection requirements.

- Local demand showed a need for affordable housing and smaller housing units than was proposed.

- The stated density was 15.5 dwellings per hectare. However, 9 houses on 40% of the site was in fact a high density development.

- A Member commented that all the issues raised in the debate were addressed in the Breinton Neighbourhood Plan. The completion of the Plan had been delayed by failings on the part of the Council. The Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), the accuracy of which officers were now questioning, had stated that the site had been rejected due to inadequate access on the advice of the Council. The HELAA also stated that the site was within the preferred corridor for the western relief road. Another application in the preferred corridor for the western relief road had been rejected. The Breinton Neighbourhood Plan would achieve Regulation 16 status early in the New Year. The application should be deferred on the grounds of prematurity.

- The Development Manager commented that the Neighbourhood Plan was a material consideration but could not be given weight at this stage. If the application were to be deferred the applicant would have a right of appeal for non-determination.

A motion that the application be deferred was lost.

Councillor Bowen, acting on behalf of the local ward member, was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that, if approved, it was to be hoped that smaller housing units would be built and a community orchard established. He reiterated the need for full consultation on reserved matters with the Parish Council, local ward Member and the Chairman of the Committee.

The Development Manager commented that the Neighbourhood Plan would be material in processing a reserved matters application and full weight could be given to it. The local ward member and the parish council would be consulted on a reserved matters application. However, it was only if there was dispute that the reserved matters application would be referred to the Committee for determination. The provision of an orchard was covered by condition. The site was clearly outside the western relief road corridor. The former Unitary Development Plan designation of the site as open countryside was no longer material.

RESOLVED: That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act 1990 obligation agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms stated in the report, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers are authorised to grant outline planning permission, subject to the conditions below and any other further conditions considered necessary after consultation with the local ward member, the Parish Council and the Chairman.:

1. A02 Time limit for submission of reserved matters (outline permission)

2. A03 Time limit for commencement (outline permission)

3. A04 Approval of reserved matters

4. A05 Plans and particulars of reserved matters

5. B01 Development in accordance with the approved plans

6. **C01 Samples of external materials**

7. **G11 Landscaping scheme - implementation**

8. **H09 Driveway gradient**

9. **H13 Access, turning area and parking**

10. **H18 On site roads - submission of details**

11. **H27 Parking for site operatives**

12. **H29 Secure covered cycle parking provision**

13. **I16 Restriction of hours during construction**

14. **The recommendations set out in the ecologist's report from Focus ecology dated May 2015 should be followed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Prior to commencement of the development, a habitat enhancement scheme integrated with the landscape scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall incorporate the allocation of a compensatory area of mixed orchard planting commensurate with the composition of the original site trees and the scheme be implemented as approved and managed as a standard tree orchard in perpetuity.**

    An appropriately qualified and experienced ecological clerk of works should be appointed (or consultant engaged in that capacity) to oversee the ecological mitigation work.

    Reasons:
    To ensure that all species are protected having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Policy LD2 of the HErefordshire Local Plan - Core Strategy in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the NERC Act 2006.

15. **L01 Foul/surface water drainage**

16. **L02 No surface water to connect to public system**

17. **L03 No drainage run-off to public system**

18. **Prior to the first occupation of the development a scheme demonstrating measures for the efficient use of water as per the optional technical standards contained within Policy SD3 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and implemented as approved.**

    Reason: To ensure compliance with Policies SD3 and SD4 of the Hereford Local Plan – Core Strategy

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the**

presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework

2. **HN08 Section 38 Agreement & Drainage details**

3. **HN01 Mud on highway**

4. **HN28 Highways Design Guide and Specification**

116. 150052 - LAND OFF GINHALL LANE, LEOMINSTER

(Proposed10 no dwellings with garages.)

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, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr C Thomas, of Leominster Town Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr C Jessop, a local resident, spoke in objection.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor FM Norman, spoke on the application.

She made the following principal comments:

- She noted the link to application 150053 on a directly adjoining site that was the subject of the next item on the agenda.
- Ginhall lane off which the access was proposed was very narrow with a 60mph speed limit.
- In a recent accident a car had ended up upside down right against the house at the junction.
- The site was higher than the lane so there would be high banks on either side close to the existing cottages. The gradient lent itself to water run-off and pooling.
- Traffic from that location fed into Baron's Cross and The Bargates. This was currently a very busy and heavily congested stretch of road. Ginhall lane itself was used as a rat run to avoid the congestion.
- A development of 1,000 homes was planned on the opposite side of the road.
- The site was in an area identified as a strategic green corridor. It formed part of a green approach to the Town where it was hoped that ecology would develop.
- An assurance had previously been given that there would be no access from the Buckfield Estate onto Ginhall Lane, which was a country lane with soft verges used for walking and unsuitable for additional traffic.
- If the application were approved, in terms of S106 contributions the most important requirement was to provide a pedestrian crossing for the Baron's Cross estate.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The Transportation Manager confirmed the accident history of Ginhall Lane up until 2013.

- The access was not acceptable. It was proposed that consideration of the application should be deferred to permit discussions on how to create a safer access through the adjoining site.

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred to permit consideration of a safer access.

117. 150053 - LAND AT, AND WEST OF WEST WINDS, CHOLSTREY ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed cottage and garage.)

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, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr C Thomas, of Leominster Town Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr C Jessop, a local resident, spoke in objection.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor FM Norman, spoke on the application.

She noted the link with the adjoining application 150052, the subject of the previous agenda item. Traffic from the proposed development would have to use congested roads adding to the existing problem. Planning permission had already been granted for a development of 420 houses on the opposite side of the road.

It was proposed in debate that consideration should be deferred to consider the development of a single access to the two sites (application 150052 and 150053).

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred to permit consideration of a single access to the sites the subject of applications 150052 and 150053.

Appendix 1 - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm **CHAIRMAN**

Appendix 1
10:00 am

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 9 December 2015

Morning

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

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

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

151145 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 21 DWELLINGS ALONG WITH NEW ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT FIELD ADJOINING A4112 AND CHESTNUT AVENUE, KIMBOLTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mrs Susan Churchward, Moreton Farmhouse, Moreton Eye, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 0DP

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS
The applicant has provided an updated drainage strategy plan, in the light of the typo identified in the originally submitted plan identified by the Land Drainage Consultant

OFFICER COMMENTS
This revised plan corrects a direction flow arrow.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

151641 - PROPOSED ERECTION OF NINE DWELLINGS AT LAND TO REAR OF BRAMLEY HOUSE AND ORCHARD HOUSE, OFF KINGSACRE ROAD, SWAINSHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 0SG

For: Messrs Griffiths per Mr Robert Jolly, P O Box 310, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR14 9FF

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Members of the Parish Council have raised concerns about the assessment of the site as part of the Hereford Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) that was published in mid-November.

The assessed site (CRE10) is 1.3 hectare site and the assessment is as follows:

No known environmental constraints to development. Suitable for residential use, B1 employment and/or mixed use. The suitability of the site for development would be dependent on the extent/delivery of the proposed western (Three Elms) urban extension due to its current poor relationship with the existing urban boundary of Hereford. The site has a medium landscape sensitivity therefore a sensitive design approach would be necessary. Site lies within the relief road corridor, and may be suitable for development. Once a detailed route is established such sites will be reassessed. Site rejected due to inadequate access on advice of HC.

The Parish Council have also raised concern about lack of reference to policy SS4 of the Core Strategy.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Officers have been able to confirm that the information provided in the HELAA in respect of this site is incorrect. The Route Corridor identified in the Core Strategy does not extend this far west and therefore does not impact upon this site. Historically, the site was within the 'Outer Route' Corridor and this seems to have been carried over into this document.

The HELAA itself does not set policy but provides background evidence on the potential availability of land for housing and economic development. The identification of sites in the HELAA should not be taken as an intention to allocate these sites for housing/economic development or that planning permission will be granted, likewise, just because a site is rejected in this document does not mean that upon further scrutiny and examination, sites would not obtain planning permission.

The application submission relates to less than half of the site identified in this document. The Council's Highways officer has raised no objection subject to conditions and officers are satisfied that this development would not adversely impact on highway safety and this proposal is compliant with the policies of the Core Strategy.

Officers also acknowledge that whilst Policy SS4 is referenced in the Section 2, there is no specific reference to this strategic policy in the appraisal and would take the opportunity to expand on this point.

Policy SS4 states that; *New developments should be designed and located to minimise the impact on the transport network, ensuring that journey times and the efficient and safe operation of the network are not detrimentally impacted. Furthermore, where practicable, development proposals should be accessible by and facilitate a genuine choice of modes of travel including walking cycling and public transport.*

This site has direct access onto the A438 and its bus services, by existing footway, and does offer a genuine opportunity to access means of travel for some journeys other than the private motor vehicle. This is not to say that there will be a reliance of the car – but this is so of any development in the Breinton Neighbourhood Area and it could be that accessing buses and footways will be much more accessible and realistic from this location than some of the more rural areas within the Parish. In the context of Policies RA2 and SS4 this must be a consideration.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

150052 - PROPOSED 10 NO DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AT LAND OFF GINHALL LANE, LEOMINSTER,

For: Mr Owens & Parry per Mr John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The Applicant's agent confirms that the visibility requirements are as recommended by the Council's Transportation Manager, following a speed survey. The agent also confirmed that the Town Council have been informed that grounds of prematurity are not substantive grounds for refusal and that the emergence of the Neighbourhood Development Plan cannot hold up determination of sustainable development. S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny Sec

S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny

Transportation

2 bed - £1966
3 bed - £2949
3 bed – 3932

Open Space

2 bed - £965
3 bed - £1640
4 bed - £2219

Recycling

£80 per dwelling including affordable

Affordable

25% of the dwellings being Affordable units covering the whole site

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

150053 - PROPOSED 25 DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AND CAR SPACES AT LAND AT, AND WEST OF WEST WINDS, CHOLSTREY ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Mr And Mrs Preece per Mr John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The Applicant's agent confirms that the visibility requirements are as recommended by the Council's Transportation Manager, following a speed survey. The agent also confirmed that the Town Council have been informed that grounds of prematurity are not substantive grounds for refusal and that the emergence of the Neighbourhood Development Plan cannot hold up determination of sustainable development.

S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny

Transportation

2 bed - £1966
3 bed - £2949
3 bed – 3932

Open Space

2 bed - £965
3 bed - £1640

4 bed - £2219

Recycling

£80 per dwelling including affordable

Affordable

25% of the dwellings being Affordable units covering the whole site

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION