

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning and regulatory committee held at Council Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 16 October 2019 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor Alan Seldon (Vice Chairman (in the Chair))

Councillors: Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Toni Fagan, Elizabeth Foxton, Bernard Hunt, Terry James, Tony Johnson, Jeremy Milln, Paul Rone, John Stone, Elissa Swinglehurst and Yolande Watson

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Hardwick and Councillor Millmore.

33. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor Swinglehurst substituted for Councillor Millmore.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 7: Application 191288 - Land at Oakland's Paddock, Langstone Lane, Llangarron

Councillor Polly Andrews declared an other declarable interest as the applicant's agent's parents lived near to her.

Councillor Swinglehurst declared an other declarable interest because she knew the applicants and the objectors.

(It was also noted that several Members knew the applicants agent for application 191288 as he had formerly worked for the Council as a planning officer.)

35. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

36. CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lead Development Manager highlighted the publication of a briefing note on phosphate levels in the River Lugg and the implications for planning applications.

37. 191288 - LAND AT OAKLAND'S Paddock, LANGSTONE LANE, LLANGARRON

(Councillor Foxton was not present during consideration of this application. Councillor Swinglehurst fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Development Manager 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 Lodge, of Llangarron Parish Council spoke in opposition to the scheme. Dr P Harries, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mr M Tompkins, the applicant's agent, and Mrs F Farr, the applicant, spoke in support.

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

She made the following principal comments:

- There was a high level of objection from local people to the application. However, a number of letters had also been received in support. The objectors, in the main lived closest to the site and would be most affected.
- Letters in support of the proposal, principally felt that it was consistent with policy, and would breathe new life into the village. The negative impact had been exaggerated. The applicant had been willing to take on board comments and amend the plans. The site was well located – close to the village amenities, well designed and would contribute positively to the village.
- However objectors considered the development would have a negative impact on the character of the settlement, be unacceptable in form, design, scale and location and have a negative impact on neighbouring properties.
- Trecilla Court (House) was understood to be being considered for listing by English Heritage and even without listing was due some regard as an undesignated heritage asset along with the cluster of curtilage buildings. Any potential impact on the grade 1 listed church, St Deinsts and Little Trecilla also needed to be considered and whether or not that impact would be contrary to policy LD4 to protect, conserve and if possible enhance historic assets.
- Those nearest the site felt that the development would have an impact on their residential amenity – either through overlooking or disruption during the build phase. The height of the plot in relation to those properties raised the concern that the ridge and eaves height, in context, would be overbearing. The conservation officer had noted this point.
- There was concern that the application would erode the pattern of dispersed sandstone settlement characteristic of Llangarron through infill and that the edge of the built environment was at Trecilla House and outbuildings.
- Planning permissions had recently been granted for 4 houses in the immediate locality. There was concern that the proposal would make the road dangerous to use and that the cumulative impact on the local road network would be severe. Lack of sufficient parking at the Church and Garron Centre worsened the problem along the narrow and twisting lane restricting visibility and making it difficult to pass.
- Drainage was a concern due to the steepness of the site and, although the land drainage officer had raised no objection, local objectors considered that the development would increase flooding risk, questioned the technical solution and future maintenance.
- The houses were 3 and 4 bed, No2 beds were provided as starter homes. This did not contribute positively to the local housing mix.

- In combination with the proposed site there were 7 houses proposed by the same applicant across the two sites. Because it was below the benchmark there was no requirement for affordable housing or a S106 agreement. Clarification was requested on whether or not some developer contribution could be sought
- There was concern that the engineering of the access road and the balance of the land meant that further development was intended. It was asked whether anything could be done to address this point.
- The loss of a section of roadside hedgerow was to be regretted. While the hedgerow was to be replaced and additional planting was planned it was essential that any screening planting or planting offered in mitigation for this loss was properly conditioned, planted as promised and maintained in perpetuity.
- It was noted regarding the sustainability appraisal of this project that the highest standards of U value in building regulations were exceeded. Locally sourced materials were to be used wherever possible making this, from a sustainability point of view, a good example of carbon conscious construction.
- The parish as a whole had met the minimum housing target. Whilst Llangarron was a settlement considered to be appropriate for proportionate growth in the Core Strategy the policy also stated that proposals would be expected to demonstrate particular attention to the form, layout, character and setting of the site and its location in the settlement and/or result in development that contributes to or is essential to the social well being of the settlement concerned; that they result in the development of high quality, sustainable schemes which are appropriate to their context and make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting and that they result in the delivery of the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular settlements.
- Objectors considered the proposal it failed to meet these criteria and given that the minimum housing numbers had already been exceeded there was no reason for these policies not to carry full weight in the planning balance.
- The site was close to the church, community centre and village hall but overall Llangarron did not have services. There was no shop, school or pub and an infrequent bus service. Local residents feared strongly that their village would be ruined by traffic and loss of tranquillity. They particularly feared further future development of the site.

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

- The Development Manager confirmed that a formal hedgerow survey had not been undertaken. However, the Conservation Manager (Ecology) had no objection to the application.
- A view was expressed that the application was contrary to policy SS4, without the infrastructure required to provide access to services also referencing paragraphs 3.62 and 3.63 of the Core strategy relating to access to services and provision of community infrastructure.
- There was concern that the ground levels would mean the development would have an adverse effect on Little Trescilla a house opposite the development, with nuisance from headlights from cars accessing the development.
- There were no passing places on the lane so the proposed entrance, directly opposite Little Trescilla would become one.
- There was no shop, no pub, no school and a limited bus service.

- The removal of a stretch of hedge was just one example of the environmental damage the application would cause. The environmentally friendly design of the dwellings did not provide sufficient compensation.
- None of the statutory consultees objected to the application.
- The access roads were narrow but that in itself was not sufficient reason to refuse the application.
- The density of development would not have an adverse impact.
- The absence of services was also not in itself sufficient reason to refuse the application.
- A concern was expressed about the impact on the landscape. The Development Manager confirmed that there had not been an archaeological survey or an historic landscape assessment. The Lead Development Manager commented that no constraints on the site were shown on the council's constraints map.
- The development would cause harm but the benefits outweighed that harm.

The Lead Development Manager highlighted that there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. The Core Strategy identified the settlement as one where proportionate housing development was appropriate. He cautioned that he did not consider the reasons advanced for refusal would be sustainable at appeal.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She commented that the decision was a finely balanced one. She suggested that in reviewing the core strategy the sustainability of settlements such as Llangarron should be revisited.

A motion that the application be refused was lost.

Councillor Hunt proposed and Councillor Polly Andrews seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation. The motion was carried with 5 votes in favour, 3 against and 4 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and any further conditions considered necessary by officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers:

1. **C01 - Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **C06 - Development in accordance with the approved plans (drawing nos. P2.003 Rev C, 010 Rev C, 020 Rev B, 100 Rev B, 101 Rev A, 102 Rev A, 103 Rev A, 1396 C06, Rev B, the Sustainability Statement PF 301, the Flood Risk and Drainage Statement March 2019 (as qualified by the email sent 23 May 2019) and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 21 February 2019)**
3. **C13 - Samples of external materials**
4. **C65 - Removal of permitted development rights (Class E)**
5. **CK3 - Landscape Scheme**
6. **CK4 – Implementation**
7. **CAB - Visibility Splays 38 x 2.4m**

8. CAD - Access gates
9. CAE - Vehicular access construction
10. CAH - Driveway gradient
11. CAI - Parking – single/shared private drives
12. CAJ - Parking - Estates
13. CAT - Construction Management Plan
14. CB2 - Secure covered cycle parking provision
15. CBK - Restriction of hours during construction
16. Prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved an Adoption and Maintenance Schedule relating to the future maintenance of the approved foul and surface water drainage arrangement shown on Drawing No. 1396 C06, Rev B shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The maintenance of the drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter
Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment and to comply with Policy SD3 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
17. CCK - Details of slab levels
18. All foul water shall discharge through connection to new plot specific private foul water treatment systems with final outfall to suitable soakaway drainage field on land within each plot; and all surface water shall discharge to appropriate soakaway systems; unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2018), National Planning Policy Framework, NERC Act (2006), and Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy policies LD2, SD3 and SD4.
19. The ecological protection, mitigation, compensation and working methods scheme including the Biodiversity net gain enhancements, as recommended in the ecology report by AVA Ecology dated February 2019 shall be implemented and hereafter maintained in full as stated unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority. No external lighting should illuminate any boundary feature, adjacent habitat or area around the approved mitigation or any biodiversity net gain enhancement features.

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected and habitats enhanced having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Habitats & Species Regulations 2018 (as amended), Policy LD2 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework and NERC Act 2006.
20. CE6 - Efficient use of water

INFORMATIVES:

1. **IP2 - Application Approved Following Revisions**
 2. **I11 - Mud on highway**
 3. **I09 - Private apparatus within the highway (Compliance with the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991, the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Highways Act 1980)**
 4. **I45 - Works within the highway (Compliance with the Highways Act 1980 and the Traffic Management Act 2004)**
 5. **I35 - Highways Design Guide and Specification**
 6. **I47 - Drainage other than via highway system**
 7. **I05 - No drainage to discharge to highway**
38. **191330 - LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF IVY COTTAGE, GARWAY COMMON, GARWAY**

(Erection of a single storey residential dwelling (c3) with garage, private driveway and creation of new access into the highway.)

(Councillor Foxtan joined the meeting part way through consideration of this item and accordingly was not eligible to vote upon it. Councillor Fagan fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Development Manager 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 C Campbell of Garway Parish Council spoke in opposition to the scheme. Dr B McGinley, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mr S Collinson, the applicant, spoke in support.

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

She made the following principal comments:

- The absence of a five year housing land supply was creating pressure for development to take place.
- A site for 8 dwellings was being developed to the north and east of the proposed site. She considered that development to be out of character with the village setting. .
- The Parish Council had been active in securing rights to the common land at Garway. There was a question over an easement that would be required to achieve an access to the proposed development.
- She referenced sections of the National Design Guide 2019 produced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. This expanded on the provision in the national planning policy framework on the importance of high quality buildings and places and considered how well designed places could be achieved in practice and the identity and character of a place.

- The proposal before the committee was out of character for the linear settlement of Garway to the detriment of the built environment.
- There was a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless there were adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- Policy SS6 referred to conserving and enhancing those environmental assets that contributed towards the county's distinctiveness. This included the settlement pattern.
- Paragraph 5.3.29 of the Core Strategy informing Policy SD1 referred to sustainable design and the protection of the built environment.
- There were therefore policies that could be used to protect the built environment and communities in the face of the pressure for development.

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

- The legal advisor to the committee confirmed that the question of whether an easement could be secured to access the proposed development was not a material consideration.
- The proposal was for a backland development in a village that was predominantly linear in character.
- The application was somewhat aspirational in seeking to be environmentally sustainable and could be more positive and definite in that regard.
- Officers confirmed that the National Design Guide was a recent publication linked to references to design within the NPPF and was a material consideration. It was noted that local authorities would be required to produce local design guides supplementing the national criteria.
- Garway was a sustainable village.
- One view was that the design of the dwelling was fine and that there were a range of designs within the village. It was accessed off a long driveway but this was not detrimental. It could hardly be seen from the road. There was a shortage of bungalows. A contrary view was that the design was not in keeping with the character of the village and was contrary to the design guide principles.
- Whilst noting the objections from the parish council, there were no objections from the statutory consultees.
- As set out at paragraph 6.20 of the report the harm identified in many of the objections was limited and did not warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- A concern was expressed about the proposed drainage arrangements and it was suggested that further detail should be sought.

The Lead Development Manager reiterated that weight could be given to the design guide within the context of the core strategy and the NPPF. He noted that the Government was consulting on new future homes standards. Current policy was that backland development was acceptable provided it created no harm to adjoining development. That was the case with this application. He suggested that in view of comments made relating to securing access that officers should be authorised to grant planning permission subject to clarification to ensure that the visibility splays did not cross common land.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated that the view in the draft NDP was that development should be linear, not backland

development. This was consistent with the National Design Guide's comments on the character and identity of a place and local distinctiveness. Policies SD1, SS1 and SS6 provided grounds for refusal of the application.

Councillor Hunt proposed and Councillor Andrews seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance the printed recommendation with provision to ensure that the visibility splays did not cross common land. The motion was carried with 8 votes in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and any other further conditions considered necessary by officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers, and subject to officers being satisfied that the visibility splays did not cross common land:

1. **C01 - Time limit for commencement (Full Permission)**
2. **C06 - Development in accordance with the approved plans (drawing nos. CLL19.01 02, 03, 04 and 05 and 19-02-02 01 D)**
3. **C13 - Samples of external materials**
4. **CE6 - Efficient use of water**
5. **All foul water shall discharge through connection to new private foul water treatment system with final outfall to suitable soakaway drainage field on land under the applicant's control; and all surface water shall discharge to appropriate soakaway systems; unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2018), National Planning Policy Framework, NERC Act (2006), and Herefordshire Local Core Strategy policies LD2, SD3 and SD4.

6. **Before any work commences and, equipment or materials moved on to site, a detailed Arboriculture Method Statement and Plan (based on guidance in BS5837:2012) should be submitted and approved by the local authority and shall be implemented and remain in place until all work is complete on site and all equipment and spare materials have been finally removed. Any loss or impacts to any hedgerow or trees resulting from the construction phase should be compensated for by new planting of native species hedgerows/trees with a full specification and 5 year establishment-management plan supplied. All trees and woody shrubs proposed for planting should only be of locally characteristic, native species.**

Reason: To safeguard all retained trees during development works and to ensure that the development conforms with Policies LD1 and LD3 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. **No external lighting should illuminate any of the adjacent habitats; boundary or enhancement features.**

Reason: To comply with Herefordshire Core Strategy policies LD1 LD2 and LD3 and the Dark Skies initiative (DEFRA-NPPF 2013/18)

8. **Within 3 months of completion of the approved works evidence (such as photos/signed Ecological Clerk of Works completion statement) of the**

suitably placed ecological enhancements as recommended in the report by Pure Ecology dated February 2019 should be supplied to and acknowledged by the local authority; and shall be maintained hereafter as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. No external lighting should illuminate any enhancement or boundary feature.

Reasons: To ensure that all species and habitats are protected and enhanced having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017), National Planning Policy Framework (2018), NERC Act (2006)

9. CK3 - Landscape Scheme
10. CK4 – Implementation
11. CAB - Visibility splays (2.4 X 39.8m - Southbound, 2.4 x 43.5m northbound)
12. CAE - Vehicular access construction
13. CAH - Driveway gradient
14. CAI - Parking - single/shared private drives
15. CAL - Access, turning area and parking
16. CAT - Construction Management Plan
17. CBK - Restriction of hours during construction
18. CBN - Drainage in accordance with approved plans

INFORMATIVES:

1. IP2 - Application Approved Following Revisions
2. I11 - Mud on highway
3. I09 - Private apparatus within highway
4. I45 - Works within the highway
5. I05 - No drainage to discharge to highway
6. I47 - Drainage other than via highway system
7. I35 - Highways Design Guide and Specification

39. 190032 - LAND TO THE WEST OF B4361, LUSTON, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed development of 8 houses and garages.)

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

40. 182607 - LAND NORTH OF THE CORNER HOUSE, TEMPLE LANE, LITTLE HEREFORD CROSSING

(Proposed creation of 4 new dwellings.)

(Councillor Hunt was not present during consideration of part of this application and accordingly did not vote upon it. Councillor Stone fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Development Manager 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 E Molloy, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

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

He made the following principal comments:

- He referenced the objections from 15 local residents and Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council. He noted that although a representative of the Parish Council had been unable to attend the meeting the Parish Council had submitted additional representations in objection to the proposal as set out in the schedule of updates.
- The proposal was contrary to policy BLH5 3a of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
- Neighbours would be adversely affected by the access, traffic, gradient and light pollution.
- Suitable surface water run-off procedures had not been proposed.
- The need to use cess pits would lead to increased traffic movements to empty them, to the detriment of neighbours.
- The C1053, the access road, was narrow and had been a safety concern to residents for some time. There was no footpath and it was well used by pedestrians. The road was also used by cyclists, riders along with the neighbouring footpaths. The parish council had requested warning signs.
- The proposal would increase the tanker journeys to empty the cess pits – some 190 trips per annum to the detriment of the environment and road safety.
- The report proposed that control would need to be imposed through a section 106 agreement to ensure that the cesspools were emptied at a suitable disposal site. It was questioned how effective this would be and concern expressed about the risk to public health and the environment.
- He questioned whether the amount of surface water run-off was being underestimated, mindful of climate change. There had been instances of flooding.
- The report noted that the applicant must establish the adjacent landowner as they were the riparian of the watercourse and ensure that permission was obtained for disposal of water into this watercourse. It was questioned how this would be actioned.
- The proportionate housing growth target for the area had been achieved.

- He welcomed the proposal that 2 of the 4 proposed dwellings would be bungalows. The proposal did also comply with policy BLH5 of the NDP accepting that it was adjacent to the settlement.
- The economic and social benefits from the development would be modest. There was a successful pub but the church and village hall could only be reached by car or bicycle down the busy A456. It was too dangerous by foot. There were therefore very few local facilities. That was why development had taken place in Brimfield rather than in Little Hereford. The environmental impact would probably be negative, with more light pollution, loss of hedgerow and potentially more flooding.
- The absence of a five year housing land supply strengthened the case for the application. However, regard should be had to the concerns of local residents and the parish council, especially those relating to highway safety and drainage issues.

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

- Severe reservations were expressed about the use of cess pools. The need to empty the pools regularly created a public health risk from the diesel emissions of the tankers. This was contrary to policy SS1. The implications for water quality also appeared contrary to policy SD4.
- The National Design Guide suggested water features should be a feature of development. There were no proposals to capture rain water on a site with drainage and flooding issues.
- A section of the Leominster-Stourport canal would be affected by the proposal. It was also suggested that a body of water would be retained above the site by the canal lining.
- A concern was expressed about the potential impact on the Teme catchment area, given the poor natural drainage.
- The site was low lying. The viability of the drainage proposals was questioned. It was suggested the site was simply not suitable for development.
- The provision of two modest bungalows was a welcome feature.
- Policy SS6 referenced flooding issues and the preservation of the historic environment and heritage assets.
- It was unclear how the site, which was steeply sloping, would sit in the landscape, potentially bringing the proposal into conflict with policy LD1.
- The site was in flood zone 2 with high ground water.
- There were no objections from the statutory consultees, although it was noted that they had suggested a number of conditions.
- Officers had addressed the objections raised by the parish council.
- The report considered the development complied with policy RA2 and was acceptable in principle.

Following discussion and an adjournment the following reasons were advanced for refusing the application: that the proportionate growth in the neighbourhood area meant that there were not exceptional circumstances to justify the use of cess pools; their use did not represent sustainable development and this outweighed the moderate benefit of providing 4 additional dwellings. The proposal was therefore contrary to policies SS1, SD4 the NPPF, LD4 – impact on the historic environment, and SS6 – risk of flooding.

The Lead Development Manager referred to the Transportation Manager's comments in the schedule of updates that the proposal would generate an extra 24 tanker movements a year and noted the further correspondence on this point received from the applicant's agent also included in the update. He observed that sealed cess-pits were proposed.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that the Transportation Manager had recently confirmed that 196 additional tanker movements would be involved. He remained concerned by the tanker movements, the impact of the proposal on road safety, loss of hedgerow, no specific plans for the disposal of surface water, effect on residential amenity and the lack of local facilities and the impact on the canal site. The disadvantages of the proposal outweighed the benefits. If the Committee was minded to approve the application stronger conditions were required for surface water drainage, run-off and sewerage disposal. This included confirmation that permission had been obtained for disposal of water into the watercourse. Traffic calming measures would also need to be in place on the access road.

Councillor Fagan proposed and Councillor Watson seconded a motion that the application be refused on the grounds that the proportionate growth in the neighbourhood area meant that there were not exceptional circumstances to justify the use of cess pools; their use did not represent sustainable development and this outweighed the moderate benefit of providing 4 additional dwellings. The proposal was therefore contrary to policies SS1, SD4 the NPPF, LD4 – impact on the historic environment, and SS6 – risk of flooding.

The motion was carried with 12 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proportionate growth in the neighbourhood area meant that there were not exceptional circumstances to justify the use of cess pools; their use did not represent sustainable development and this outweighed the moderate benefit of providing 4 additional dwellings. The proposal was therefore contrary to policies SS1, SD4 the NPPF, LD4 – impact on the historic environment, and SS6 – risk of flooding and officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers be authorised to detail the reasons for refusal.

41. 184593 - WOODMILL COTTAGE, OCHRE HILL, WELLINGTON HEATH, LEDBURY, HR8 1LZ

(Change of use of existing annex into holiday let accommodation.)

The Senior 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.

The local ward member, Councillor Harvey had been unable to attend the meeting and had submitted a statement. The Planning lawyer read this to the meeting.

This made the following principal points:

- The site is in an exceptional position with far reaching views. It is wholly within the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which demands high standards for care and development within and approaching the designated area.
- Ochre Lane is a footpath not a lane. Residents on the 'Lane' share financial responsibility for its upkeep and the 'Lane' itself runs along the ridgeline of the valley.

- Over the last 30 years there a significant amount of development has been allowed along the 'Lane', some of which breached the ridgeline. This development has had a cumulative effect on the amenity of the 'Lane' and, most recently, has had a significant detrimental impact on the condition and nature of the 'footpath' designated a public right of way.
- The 'Annex' consists of farmyard outbuildings. The plot – had been a working sawmill.
- The parish council and neighbours sharing responsibility for the 'Lane' had raised objections to this application. Their grounds were set out in the officer report. In particular, the parish council maintained that the application was in opposition to policy WH 12.1 of the adopted NDP – which is concerned with noise nuisance. The parish council also noted that the site falls outside the agreed settlement boundary for the village.
- Neighbours object to the way in which previous development on the 'Lane' has been undertaken in what they consider to be an inconsiderate manner. They fear that yet further development will perpetuate the inconvenience and disruption to which they have already been subjected for some considerable time.
- Concerns had been expressed by neighbours about increased maintenance costs of the land and how these would be shared between residents. However, the report noted that this was not a planning matter. The application did not increase the footprint of the existing building – it simply requested permission for change of use.
- There was some economic benefit from the creation of visitor accommodation within the AONB.
- The property was within easy walking and cycling distance of Ledbury and is close to a bus route and bus stop.
- As reflected in the schedule of updates, the application was not for holiday lodges but for holiday let.

In the Committee's discussion of the application it was suggested that the proposed use was more satisfactory than other potential uses.

There was discussion of whether condition 12 could be amended to restrict letting to April to October. The consensus was that this would be too restrictive.

Councillor James proposed and Councillor Polly Andrews seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation with the amended condition 12 as set out in the update sheet. The motion was carried with 14 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and any other further conditions considered necessary by officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans [Location Plan and Drawing Number Clack 3i revision**

received 28th June 2019], except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission.

Reason. To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policy WH6 of the Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. During the construction phase no machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside the following times: Monday-Friday 7.00 am-6.00 pm, Saturday 8.00 am-1.00 pm nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and to comply with Policy SD1 of Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. This permission is for change of use only and detailed plans of any proposed alterations or additions to the building shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before development is commenced.

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to consider any future aspects of the development given the building's siting within the Malvern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to secure compliance with Policies SD1 and LD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The building which is the subject of this application shall be used for holiday accommodation only and for no other purpose including any other purpose within Class C of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: Having regard to Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policy WH1 of the Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, the local planning authority are not prepared to introduce a separate unit of residential accommodation, due to the relationship and close proximity of the building to the property known as Woodmill Cottage, Ochre Hill, Wellington Heath.

6. Prior to the first use of the development to which this permission relates, an area for car parking shall be laid out within the curtilage of the building, in accordance with the approved plans, which shall be properly consolidated, surfaced and drained, in accordance with relevant details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than for the parking of vehicles.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform to the requirements of Policy MT1 of Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policy WH17 of the

Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. **Development in respect of the change of use shall not begin until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and which shall be operated and maintained during alterations to facilitate the development hereby approved:**
- **Construction traffic access location**
 - **Parking for site operatives within the application site**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the construction of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to conform to the requirements of Policy MT1 of Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policy WH17 of the Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. **Prior to first occupation as accommodation evidence (such as photos/signed Ecological Clerk of Works completion statement) of the suitably placed installation within the application site of at least TWO Bat roosting enhancements and TWO bird nesting boxes should be supplied to and acknowledged by the local authority; and shall be maintained hereafter as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. No external lighting on the newly created accommodation or associated access should illuminate any habitat enhancement or existing boundary feature.**

Reason: To ensure that all species are protected and habitats enhanced having regard to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Habitat Regulations 2017, Core Strategy LD2, National Planning Policy Framework (2018), NERC Act 2006. Dark Skies Guidance Defra/NPPF 2013 (2018).

9. **No alterations in respect of the change of use shall take place until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:**
- a) **a 'desk study' report including previous site and adjacent site uses, potential contaminants arising from those uses, possible sources, pathways, and receptors, a conceptual model and a risk assessment in accordance with current best practice;**
 - b) **if the risk assessment in (a) confirms the possibility of a significant pollutant linkage(s), a site investigation should be undertaken to characterise fully the nature and extent and severity of contamination, incorporating a conceptual model of all the potential pollutant linkages and an assessment of risk to identified receptors;**
 - c) **if the risk assessment in (b) identifies unacceptable risk(s) a detailed scheme specifying remedial works and measures necessary to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed shall be submitted in writing. The Remediation Scheme shall include consideration of and proposals to deal with situations where, during works on site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified. Any further contamination encountered shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the local planning authority for written approval.**

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or suffer from, adverse impacts arising from contamination, to conform to the requirements of Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10. The Remediation Scheme, as approved pursuant to condition no. (9) above, shall be fully implemented before the development is first occupied. On completion of the remediation scheme the developer shall provide a validation report to confirm that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details, which must be submitted and agreed in writing before the development is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme including the validation reporting shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken.**

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or suffer from, adverse impacts arising from contamination, to conform to the requirements of Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 11 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the local planning authority for, an amendment to the Method Statement detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.**

Reason: In the interests of human health and to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or suffer from, adverse impacts arising from contamination, to conform to the requirements of Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 12 Condition 12. The holiday let hereby permitted shall only be used for holiday purposes by tourists only. As such, no person or group of persons shall occupy the accommodation for more than 28 days consecutive days at a time and no same person or group of persons shall occupy the accommodation for more than 156 days in any one calendar year. The owners/operators of the site shall maintain an up- to-date register of the names of all occupiers of the accommodation and of their main home address (i.e. place of residence) and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: Having regard to Policies RA2, RA3 and SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policies WH1, WH6 and WH17 of the Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, the local planning authority are not prepared to allow the introduction of a separate unit of residential accommodation, due to its proximity to Woodmill Cottage and as such, allow for sole use as holiday accommodation”.

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. Negotiations in respect of**

matters of concern with the application (as originally submitted) have resulted in amendments to the proposal. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. It is an offence under Section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to allow mud or other debris to be transmitted onto the public highway. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the need to keep the highway free from any mud or other material emanating from the application site or any works pertaining thereto.
3. Access to the site is via a public right of way and the applicant's attention is drawn to the restrictions imposed by Section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 regarding the prohibition of driving motor vehicles elsewhere than on roads.
4. This permission does not authorise the laying of private apparatus within the confines of the public highway. The applicant should apply to Balfour Beatty (Managing Agent for Herefordshire Council) Highways Services, Unit 3 Thorn Business Park, Rotherwas, Hereford HR2 6JT, (Tel: 01432 261800), for consent under the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 to install private apparatus within the confines of the public highway. Precise details of all works within the public highway must be agreed on site with the Highway Authority. A minimum of 4 weeks notification will be required (or 3 months if a road closure is involved).

Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, Herefordshire Council operate a notice scheme to co-ordinate Streetworks. Early discussions with the Highways Services Team are advised as a minimum of 4 weeks to 3 months notification is required (dictated by type of works and the impact that it may have on the travelling public). Please note that the timescale between notification and you being able to commence your works may be longer depending on other planned works in the area and the traffic sensitivity of the site. The Highway Service can be contacted on Tel: 01432 261800.

5. Drainage arrangements shall be provided to ensure that surface water from the driveway and/or vehicular turning area does not discharge onto the public highway. No drainage or effluent from the proposed development shall be allowed to discharge into any highway drain or over any part of the public highway.
6. The development hereby approved may result in vehicles being driven across or along a Public Right of Way. As a result, notification should be given to the Highway Authority before the permission is implemented. In addition, where public and private rights co-exist, permission should be sought from the landowner in order to obtain lawful authority to drive on the Public Right of Way. For further information, contact Balfour Beatty (Managing Agent for Herefordshire Council) Public Rights of Way Services, Unit 3 Thorn Business Park, Rotherwas, Hereford, HR2 6JT (Tel: 01432 261800).
7. It is the responsibility of the developer to arrange for a suitable outfall or discharge point. It cannot be assumed that the highway drainage system can be used for such purposes.

8. The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirement for design to conform to Herefordshire Council's 'Highways Design Guide for New Developments' and 'Highways Specification for New Developments'.
9. In respect of conditions 9, 10 and 11, the local planning authority would advise that the assessment is required to be undertaken in accordance with good practice guidance and needs to be carried out by a suitably competent person as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. In respect of conditions 9, 10 and 11, the local planning authority advises that all investigations of potentially contaminated sites should undertake asbestos sampling and analysis as a matter of routine and this should be included with any submission when seeking to discharge such conditions. The application was approved in accordance with the Case Officer's recommendation, with an amended condition as reflected in the schedule of updates.

42. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 1.38 pm

CHAIRMAN

PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: 16 October 2019

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

191288 - PROPOSED ERECTION OF FOUR DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND AT OAKLAND'S PADDOCK, LANGSTONE LANE, LLANGARRON,

For: Mr & Mrs Farr per Mr Matt Tompkins, 10 Grenfell Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 2QR

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Members of the Planning Committee will have received a further representation from a local resident (Mrs Hitchen) who is unable to attend the Committee meeting. She has raised issues in relation to the progression of the NDP, reiterating her objection to the principle of development and the cumulative impact of further housing growth on the edge of Llangarron; the adverse impact of additional traffic volumes; the unsafe nature of walking to local facilities on the local road network; the visual impact of the development by reason of the levels and loss of hedgerow; the adverse impact of the development upon the setting of listed (Church of St Deinst) and unlisted (Trecilla Court) heritage assets; the unsuitability of the design and layout

OFFICER COMMENTS

The content of this letter do not add further material consideration and are addressed within the current summary of objections and the Officers appraisal.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

191330 - ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING (C3) WITH GARAGE, PRIVATE DRIVEWAY AND CREATION OF NEW ACCESS INTO THE HIGHWAY AT LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF IVY COTTAGE, GARWAY COMMON, GARWAY,

For: Mr Collinson per Mr Stuart Leaver, Singleton Court Business Park, Monmouth, NP25 5JA

OFFICER COMMENTS

For the avoidance of doubt, the Planning Committee are advised that the Councils Ecologist does not object to the application following the submission of the updated drainage strategy

Following on from the site visit it is confirmed that the existing septic tank is located within the garden that would be retained with Ivy Cottage. The applicant has since confirmed that the intention would be to pump foul waste up to the existing septic tank which would then discharge to an upgraded drainage field in compliance with the Building Regulations. The practicalities of this solution have been assessed as suitable by the Councils drainage

consultant and conditions 5 and 18 combine to secure the implementation of this solution on land within the applicant`s control.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

190032 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF 8 HOUSES AND GARAGES. AT LAND TO THE WEST OF B4361, LUSTON, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Mr Brechtmann per Mr Edward Brechtmann, Kingsland Sawmills, Kingsland, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 9SF

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Subsequent to the publication of the Committee Report, Officers have been made aware that amended plans and supporting information has been sent direct to the Members of the Planning Committee by the Applicant. The additional information includes an amended drainage strategy; a site constraints plan; a village density plan; an amended Design and Access Statement; and a statement commenting on the content of the Committee Report.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The Applicant initially sent an amended drainage strategy and a selection of the additional supporting documents to the Case Officer shortly after the Committee Report was published and asked that these be considered in support of the scheme. Officers advised in response that the supplied amendments constituted a material change to the scheme which necessitated further consultation with relevant statutory bodies, internal colleagues and interested parties; and that there was not adequate time for this to be carried out in advance of the scheduled committee meeting. The Applicant was given the option of withdrawing the application from the agenda so that the additional information can be considered; however they have chosen not to do so. Officers therefore must advise Members that the application should be considered in its current form, and the amendments sent to Members should not be taken into account.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

182607 - PROPOSED CREATION OF 4 NO. NEW DWELLINGS. AT LAND NORTH OF THE CORNER HOUSE, TEMPLE LANE, LITTLE HEREFORD CROSSING,

For: Mrs Kerby per Mr Tom Froggatt, Watershed, Wye Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 7RB

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

In light of comments regarding the movement of tankers to and from the site to empty cess pits, further comment from the Council's Transportation Manager have been requested. His response is as follows:

I have had a look at this and an extra 24 movements a year (0.07 movements a day) is unlikely to be something that we can turn into a valid argument for the severe cumulative impact to the highway network as set out in the NPPF. I have looked at the traffic flow data and this is Circa 100 vehicles per day so in the context of these numbers the increase is minimal, even with the trips associated with the dwellings.

The junction with the A456 is located close to the site, and this junction, whilst not ideal, is capable of handling the traffic as it is currently used to access agricultural businesses and the open countryside.

As a result the change to the drainage strategy does cause additional trips, but not to a point we could object to.

Further correspondence has been received from Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council. Their comments read as follows:

This application does not adhere to policy BLH5 3a in our Neighbourhood Plan and will adversely affect neighbours enjoyment regarding access, traffic, drainage and light pollution for the reasons outlined below.

In addition, despite there not being a 5 year land supply in place, the Neighbourhood Planning Team advise that proportional growth has been achieved. Whilst the application may accord with BLH5 regards its location being within or adjacent to a settlement, given the strong local feeling regarding this application, our original comments stand and this application should be refused.

Despite revised plans, it is clear from comments made by the Land Drainage Officer that suitable surface water run off procedures have not been proposed and permission to connect to the existing watercourse required has not been identified.

We note that cesspits are now considered viable by the Land Drainage Officer, but we would question this viability regarding the frequency they need to be emptied and the impact on neighbours regarding increased traffic movements.

Strict rules upon the occupant to empty their cesspit will need to be a condition of planning given potential environmental implications if this is not adhered to.

The Parish Council are currently considering purchasing road signs through the community commissioning model advising road users that pedestrians, particularly children, are walking down this road frequently. It is a dangerous road and junction. There has been an increase in traffic, farm machinery and lorries due to developments that have taken place further up the lane. Creating further traffic, in particular heavy traffic, at this point as well as a further access would not be in the best interests of local residents and road safety.

Light pollution also remains a concern, given the heightened positioning of the properties, this would adversely affect neighbours in the surrounding properties.

Given the length of time this application has been pending and with the above serious material considerations not having been addressed, this application should be refused.

Further correspondence has also been received from the applicant's agent:

Cesspools have been sized in accordance with Part H of the Building Regulations. As per the land drainage officer comments, Part H states that "typically they require emptying on a monthly basis by a licenced contractor" however the information included within the initial application form – ie. cesspits being emptied on an 8 week cycle – was the result of a conversation I had with a local contractor Mayglothing Waste and we believe that 'monthly'

would be a worse case scenario. Even in this instance, I note that highways have raised no objections.

Surface water run-off can be addressed in accordance with the land drainage comment recommendations, with the 40% climate change rate presenting no problems.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The Parish Council's comment that the proportionate growth target for the neighbourhood area has been achieved is correct. However, Members will be mindful of the fact that the proportionate growth targets should not be viewed as a ceiling on development. The majority of development has either taken place in, or is committed to Brimfield. As far as officers are aware, no other proposals have come forward for open market housing development in Little Hereford. The proposal for four dwellings is considered to be proportionate in the context of its immediate surroundings.

The comments from the applicant's agent comment on the capacity of the cesspits and the frequency at which they will be required to be emptied. The matter is addressed through a combination of condition 12 and the resolution that permission is granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement requiring that a mechanism is put in place to ensure that disposal is appropriately monitored.

The Council's Transportation Manager has provided further comment in respect of additional vehicle movements associated with the emptying of cesspits. It is not considered that this will give rise to cumulative highway impacts such that the application could be refused on such grounds.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

184593 - CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING ANNEX INTO HOLIDAY LET ACCOMMODATION AT WOODMILL COTTAGE, OCHRE HILL, WELLINGTON HEATH, LEDBURY, HR8 1LZ

For: Mr & Mrs Clack per Mr John Kendrick, Procuro, St Owens Cross, Hereford, Herefordshire HR2 8LG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Following the publication of the committee report, a further representation has been received on behalf of four objectors, who are unable to attend the meeting, which has been circulated to members in advance. The representation is fully replicated below:

"We are sorry but unfortunately it is not possible for any of the undersigned objectors to attend this meeting. However, we really want the Committee to know how strongly we feel about this proposed development and if permitted, the effect it will have on residents of Ochre Hill and the local area.

We cannot stress enough the impact such a development will have on us. Over the past three years planning permission has been granted for three additional houses on Ochre Hill which has resulted in considerable disruption and damage to the surface, the hedges and verges of Ochre Hill. It really is not suitable for such constant excess use. Ochre Hill is a footpath and has and is maintained at the expense of residents.

It is not disputed that the residents have vehicle access. However, the number and type of vehicles using Ochre Hill has increased significantly to such an extent that it is hard to see how much longer the surface can be sustained. There is already evidence of cracking. We would stress again that Ochre Hill is entirely unsuitable for the anticipated additional use associated with a holiday let.

Highway Safety is a real concern. Ochre Hill is not a safe footpath. It is unlit, has no footways and is very narrow. Vehicles must travel with care and be mindful of the blind bend and the junction at the bottom of Ochre Hill joining with the public highway.

The anticipated intensive and frequent activities associated with a holiday let would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of current and future occupants of surrounding residential properties. Potential noise and general disturbance are inevitable if the development is permitted.

In addition to the above:

The application site falls outside the Wellington Heath settlement boundary identified in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy and unacceptable in principle.

We believe that the proposed development's location would make it impossible to have the best use of sustainable transport modes. There is limited public transport for the area and it would therefore create a dependence on the private vehicle resulting in potential material harm to the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

The owners of Woodmill Cottage have made reference to the fact that this development will generate employment in the area. However, they confirmed at the Wellington Heath Parish Council meeting held on 21 May 2019 that they would in fact be the sole "employees".

We are especially concerned to note that within Condition 12 of the Planning Officer's reports it refers to "holiday lodges" and not a holiday let. It seems unclear as to the intention of the owners of Woodmill Cottage relating to future developing.

The proposed development has not received one letter of support from any of the residents living on Ochre Hill. Our plea to you is that you consider the adverse impact such a development will have on the day to day lives of us, the residents of Ochre Hill who are not associated with the holiday let.

We would respectfully please ask that you refuse this planning application".

OFFICER COMMENTS

Further to the additional submission made by objectors, such matters have already been addressed in the officers' report for this agenda item between sections 6.1 through 6.24 inclusive, as well as consideration of the planning balance between sections 6.25 through 6.30. Officers believe the proposal is policy compliant as detailed within the report and that the application is a change of use to which the settlement boundary for Wellington Heath, as identified in the NDP, does not apply.

Members' attention is drawn to condition 12, in respect that it does refer to 'holiday lodges' and not to a holiday let. This is a grammatical error on behalf of the officer and condition 12 is revised below, for avoidance of doubt.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Minor change to the list of recommended conditions to fully reflect the associated report.
Condition 12 should read as follows:

“Condition 12. The holiday let hereby permitted shall only be used for holiday purposes by tourists only. As such, no person or group of persons shall occupy the accommodation for more than 28 days consecutive days at a time and no same person or group of persons shall occupy the accommodation for more than 156 days in any one calendar year. The owners/operators of the site shall maintain an up- to-date register of the names of all occupiers of the accommodation and of their main home address (i.e. place of residence) and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Having regard to Policies RA2, RA3 and SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy; Policies WH1, WH6 and WH17 of the Wellington Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, the local planning authority are not prepared to allow the introduction of a separate unit of residential accommodation, due to its proximity to Woodmill Cottage and as such, allow for sole use as holiday accommodation”.

