

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 15 January 2020 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor John Hardwick (chairperson)

Councillors: Paul Andrews, Sebastian Bowen, Toni Fagan, Elizabeth Foxton, Bernard Hunt, Terry James, Tony Johnson, Mark Millmore, Jeremy Milln, Paul Rone, John Stone, David Summers, Kevin Tillett and William Wilding

In attendance: Councillors John Harrington, David Hitchiner and Elissa Swinglehurst

72. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Graham Andrews, Polly Andrews, Seldon and Watson.

73. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor Bowen substituted for Councillor Graham Andrews, Councillor Summers for Councillor Seldon, Councillor Tillett for Councillor Polly Andrews, and Councillor Wilding for Councillor Watson.

74. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

75. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 11 December 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

76. CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The legal adviser reminded the committee of the provision in the Planning Code (5.6.23-24) requiring members to ensure that any material received direct from third parties relating to an application was made available to the relevant planning officers.

77. 190032 - LAND TO THE WEST OF B4361, LUSTON, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Proposed development of 8 houses and garages.)

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

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.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr G Poulton, of Luston Group Parish Council spoke in support of the scheme. Mrs M Albright, the applicant, also spoke in support.

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

He made the following principal comments:

- The proposed density was in keeping with the area and integrated well.
- The provision of an orchard to the north of the site was a goodwill gesture.
- The proposal would create no demonstrable harm.
- There was no demonstrable need for affordable housing. The last housing needs survey had been undertaken in 2009. Two units were currently empty. The possibility of discounted market housing had been dismissed by the Planning officer.
- The developer had approached housing associations about the two semi-detached dwellings proposed but there had been no interest. The other houses could be self-build for which there was considerable demand, or custom build. The housing mix provided a good variety of family homes, including provision for home working reducing commuting, and for extended families. The properties were not large. The proposal related well to neighbouring properties and was well designed.
- Most of the materials for the development would come from within the County and construction would involve a local workforce.
- The developer was providing numerous hedges and trees and a good footpath to the village.
- The developer had worked closely with the Parish Council. The Parish Council supported the proposal. There were no objections from local residents. The proposal did accord with the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
- The proposal would enhance the village and make an attractive entrance to it.
- The Conservation Manager (Historic Buildings) had no objection.
- The Conservation Manager (Ecology) had commented that permission should not be granted until it could be demonstrated that the River Lugg catchment area could accommodate any potential additional phosphate loadings.
- Contrary to the Informative set out in the report the applicant had made every effort to find a way forward.
- He referenced the letters of support at section 5.2 of the report.
- In conclusion, he supported the proposal. If planning permission could not be granted at this stage because of the issue of phosphate discharge into the Lugg catchment he requested that approval be granted subject to that aspect being satisfactorily resolved.

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

- A member expressed support for the views of the local ward member and the Parish Council.
- The proposal for 8 dwellings was acceptable and conformed to the density of development in the locality, avoiding overcrowding. There was support within the local community and no local objections.

- Some concern was expressed that there had been insufficient explanation by the applicant as to why only part of the available site was being developed. The report indicated that the site had been identified for an indicative 11 dwellings. A development of 11 dwellings would have required the provision of 40% affordable housing.
- In relation to the fact the scheme as proposed would not be required to incorporate 40% affordable housing and the assertion that there was no demonstrable need for affordable housing, the Lead Development Manager (LDM) commented that the Housing Development Officer's response set out at paragraph 4.4 of the report indicated support for the provision of affordable housing. Low cost market housing fell within the definition of affordable housing and would have been acceptable on the site. He confirmed that if it transpired that the site had been deliberately split to avoid the requirement to provide affordable housing and there was further subsequent development of the site to provide 11 or more houses in total, depending on the timescale within which that took place, the council would be able to seek to impose a claw back on the developer.
- The LDM confirmed that if the committee was minded to support the application it was proposed that authority to grant planning permission be delegated to officers subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising.
- A member requested that all housing applications should have regard to the orientation of dwellings in order to maximise benefits from solar energy.

The LDM reaffirmed that the application was contrary to the NDP. In carrying out the independent examination of the NDP the examiner had stated the application site was sufficiently large to be developed for 10 or more dwellings and would therefore provide scope for the inclusion of some affordable homes. The adopted NDP reflected this view, with policy LG6 specifying an indicative number of 11 dwellings for the site. The applicants had been advised accordingly but had pursued the application for 8 dwellings. Consideration had to be given to both the local view and the council's needs in terms of housing delivery across the county including the provision of affordable housing.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He considered that the local view was that the proposal was in accordance with the NDP, an indicative number not being an absolute. He reiterated his comments in support of the scale, design and character of the development and its sustainability.

Councillor Stone proposed and Councillor Hunt seconded a motion that the Committee was minded to grant planning permission, subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising, on the grounds that the proposal was compliant with NDP policies LG1, LG2 and LG6 and CS policies RA2 and SD1 and appropriate delegated authority to grant planning permission and attach any conditions considered necessary be given to officers. The motion was carried with 8 votes in favour, 5 against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Committee was minded to grant planning permission, subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising on the grounds that the proposal was compliant with NDP policies LG1, LG2 and LG6 and CS policies RA2 and SD1; and**
- (b) subject to (a) above, the Assistant Director, Regulatory, Planning and Waste be authorised accordingly to grant planning permission and officers**

named in the Scheme of Delegation to officers authorised to detail the reasons put forward for approval by the committee and attach any conditions considered necessary by officers.

(The meeting adjourned between 11.07 and 11.17.)

78. 193156 - LAND TO THE REAR OF THE LAURELS VETERINARY PRACTICE, PONTRILAS ROAD, EWYAS HAROLD, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 161674/O (construction of three dwellings and alterations to the existing access) for appearance, landscaping, and scale.)

(Councillor Bowen fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Bowen, fulfilling the role of local ward member for the application, spoke upon it.

He made the following principal comments:

- The application was required to be considered by the Committee because it was an application by a Councillor.
- The site had outline planning permission and the application before the committee was a straightforward one for reserved matters. Although a better design for the proposed dwellings might be desired the proposed design was acceptable.
- The site was well sheltered by existing hedges.
- The footpath crossing the site would be cleared and made usable.

In the Committee's discussion of the application some reservation and disappointment was expressed that the design did not reflect the local idiom and the opportunity had not been taken to provide dwellings of a better design.

It was suggested that the orientation of the dwellings could have been improved to benefit from solar energy in accordance with the council's aim to reduce carbon emissions.

The Lead Development Manager commented that the materials to be used and the designs were similar to those used in the village. In the review of the Core Strategy further account would be taken of climate change. Building Regulations at national level were being revised and, although these were not a matter for the Committee, he would arrange for a briefing note to be circulated.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He acknowledged reservations expressed about the design but reiterated that the design was acceptable.

Councillor James proposed and Councillor Stone seconded a motion that the application be approved in accordance with the printed recommendation. The motion was carried with 13 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention.

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 approved shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans (drawing nos. AB-01, AB-02a, AB-03a – Received: 06 September 2019) and the schedule of materials indicated thereon.
Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans and to protect the general character and amenities of the area in accordance with the requirements of Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

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, including any representations that have been received. 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.**

79. 192317 - DOCKLOW POOLS, DOCKLOW, NR LEOMINSTER, HR6 0RU

(Erection of a single dwelling and garage for occupation by site manager.)

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.

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

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

He made the following principal comments:

- The application hinged on the need for the applicant to have accommodation on site and what quality of accommodation was required.
- The site provided local employment for many young people in the summer. It provided the only pub and café in the area. It was well-run.
- The applicant was not a publican but his accommodation was within the pub with rented accommodation above. His responsibilities for the site meant he had to be there from 6am until late at night. His presence on site was essential. Whilst, if the new dwelling some 50m away was approved, he may well still be called upon by those using the site, the quality of life for him and in particular his partner would be improved.
- He considered there was a need for the applicant to have the proposed house and to provide it would be compliant with policy RA4. However, the property should be tied to the business.

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

- There were no objections to the proposal and 25 letters in support.
- The proposed site for the dwelling was not in use and unkempt, out of character with the rest of the site. The proposal would round off the development.

- There was an essential functional need. The applicant's existing accommodation on site was inadequate. The proposal was compliant with policy RA4.
- It was suggested that, if approved, consideration should be given to seeking for the dwelling, which would be in the open countryside, to be of exceptional quality or innovative design.

The Lead Development Manager commented that officers had concluded that the existing accommodation enabled the site to be appropriately managed. This was a matter of judgment. If the Committee was minded to approve the application, authority to grant planning permission would need to be delegated to officers subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising. A S106 agreement tying both the existing and proposed accommodation to the business should also be required.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He had no additional comment.

Councillor Hunt proposed and Councillor Millmore seconded a motion that the Committee be minded to grant planning permission, subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising, and completion of a S106 agreement tying both the existing accommodation and the proposed new dwelling to the business, on the grounds that the proposal was compliant with NDP policies LG1, LG2 and LG6 and CS policies RA2 and SD1, and appropriate delegated authority to grant planning permission be given to officers.

The motion was carried unanimously with 15 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED:

- That**
- (a) the Committee was minded to grant planning permission, subject to a positive Habitat Regulations Assessment, and no other material considerations or changes in policy arising, and completion of a S106 agreement tying both the existing accommodation and the proposed new dwelling to the business, on the grounds that the proposal was compliant with NDP policies LG1, LG2 and LG6 and CS policies RA2 and SD1; and**
 - (b) subject to (a) above, the Assistant Director, Regulatory, Planning and Waste be authorised accordingly to grant planning permission and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to officers authorised to detail the reasons put forward for approval by the committee and attach any conditions considered necessary by officers.**

(The meeting adjourned between 12.13 to 12.25 am.)

80. 191286 - STEEPWAYS, FROM ST WOLSTONS ROAD TO NYTHFA PROPERTY, WELSH NEWTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, NP25 5RT

(Proposed development of two dwellings.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Ms S Parkinson, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

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 who believed the development would have a negative impact on the character of the settlement, that it was unacceptable in form, design, scale and location and that it would have a severe impact on the local road network, particularly in the light of the application for a single dwelling close by potentially meaning a cumulative increase of three dwellings.
- For many years Welsh Newton Common had seen minimal growth. The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) noted that the common 'is characterised as a place of beauty and unspoiled nature with a feeling of remoteness and tranquillity reminiscent of days gone by'. Many of the objectors believed that the development for two dwellings would change that character forever and set a precedent.
- The parish as a whole had met the minimum housing target. Whilst it was recognised that Welsh Newton Common was a settlement considered to be appropriate for proportionate growth in policy RA 2 of the Core Strategy the objectors considered that the proposal did not meet the criteria within that policy. Given that the minimum housing numbers had already been exceeded in the parish, there was no reason for these policies not to carry full weight in the planning balance.
- The NDP expressed a clear preference for smaller scale, organic growth with 2/3 bed houses and high levels of sustainability wherever possible and that ridge heights should not exceed 6m. The proposal was in conflict with that policy.
- Objectors considered the design was not in keeping with the 'grain' of the village and would not make a positive contribution to the surrounding environment and its landscape setting as required in policy RA2.
- Many objectors questioned whether Welsh Newton Common should be a RA2 settlement. The post office and shop had recently closed. There were now no services on the common. The bus ran once a week. Broadband was slow.
- The access was via a single track road. This was contrary to Policy MT1 which required that there should be genuine choice as regards movement. Residents had to reverse up sometimes 20 or 40 metres to avoid oncoming traffic. The nature of the lane made it hard to see pedestrians, horse riders or cyclists and a number of letters raised the fear that the congestion would increase to a dangerous extent if this proposal were permitted. Further concern related to the cumulative effect in conjunction with the related application for a single dwelling which one objector stated would push it beyond breaking point. A report had been submitted on behalf of the residents making the case for the impact being 'severe' and in contravention of paragraph 109 of the NPPF and Core strategy MT1 in that regard, by reason of the narrowness, lack of passing places and constraints to forward visibility. She had also been told that, in the past, the nature of the road has been given by the local authority as a reason for refusing planning permission on other sites. Although those decisions were many years ago the road had not changed – if anything it had got worse with the increased levels of car ownership in the village.
- To gain access it would be necessary to cross the common which was identified as a green space in the NDP and accorded a degree of protection. Furthermore the NDP stipulated that new housing should be accessed directly from a made up road and the application site was not directly accessed from the metalled road surface.

- The NDP placed a strong emphasis on protecting and enhancing the high environmental value of the area and the European protected species to be found on the common – particularly Dormice and Great Crested Newts.
- Objectors had raised concern about the potential impact on the habitat and the need to mitigate these impacts successfully. Indeed the benchmark was not simply to do no harm but to arrive at a net environmental benefit/gain. It was important in this context to ensure that the hedgerows were not cut back or cut down and that any new hedgerow planting was successful as a mitigation for hedgerow loss.
- In conclusion the application was strongly resisted by local residents who felt that the qualities that made Welsh Newton Common so special would be destroyed if the proposal went ahead. It did not comply with the preferences expressed in the NDP and it would bring the local infrastructure to breaking point.

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

- Weight should be given to the NDP. The application did not provide economic, social, or environmental benefit. The parish had met its minimum housing target.
- The proposal was out of keeping with the very distinctive, historic character of Welsh Newton Common. The landscape was unchanged from that shown on the 1882 map. It was a very special and rare landscape in the county that should not be damaged.
- The proposal did not promote community cohesion and a sense of belonging as advocated by the National Design Guide because it did not represent organic growth.
- The proposed dwellings were of a size, height and form that was in conflict with the NDP.
- It was questioned whether the access road was a made up road.
- There was conflict between the natural environment and the built development. The pattern of development did not contribute to the local character.
- The settlement lacked facilities and was car dependent.

The Lead Development Manager commented that the area was identified within Core Strategy policy RA2 as an area suitable for proportionate growth. There was a conflict with NDP policies regarding the height and size of the proposed dwellings. However, the NDP had not allocated sites for development. Account therefore had to be taken of the county's lack of a 5 year housing land supply and an assessment made as to whether the harm caused by the development significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits. Officers had concluded that the harm did not outweigh the benefits. The landscape was attractive but it was not designated.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She welcomed the Committee's recognition of the character of the settlement and the weight given in the debate to the NDP.

Councillor Fagan proposed and Councillor Milln seconded a motion that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to NDP policies WNL4 and WNL5 and CS policies, SS6, RA2 and SD1. The motion was carried unanimously with 15 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be refused and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to officers be authorised to detail the conditions and reasons put forward for refusal by the committee on the grounds that the proposal

was contrary to NDP policies WNL4 and WNL5 and CS policies, SS6, RA2 and SD1.

81. 190827 - WOODSIDE STABLES, WELSH NEWTON COMMON, WELSH NEWTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, NP25 5RT

(Proposed new dwelling.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Ms S Parkinson, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

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

She made the following principal comments:

- She commented that many of the points she had made in relation to the preceding agenda item relating to application 191286 also related to application 190827 before the committee. There was, however, a question of degree to take into account given that the proposal was to provide one dwelling rather than two.
- Objectors thought the proposal would increase traffic on the access road.
- The loss of small paddock spaces would alter the character of the village.
- The area was not suitable for development because of the lack of services.
- The proposal did not comply with the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) in relation to the proposed dwelling's size and height.
- The site would be car dependent in conflict with policy MT1 and the NPPF.
- The NDP did mention the potential for development of the site. However, this related to conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings.
- She quoted a letter from an objector which stated that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the common and set a precedent that would be devastating for the common's future.

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

- Most of the points made in relation to the preceding agenda item relating to application 191286 also related to application 190827.
- The proposal was in conflict with the distinct nature of Welsh Newton common.
- The proposed dwellings were of a size, height and form that was in conflict with the NDP.
- It was confirmed that the Parish Council supported the application although it had opposed application 191286.

The Lead Development Manager commented that each application had to be considered on its own merits. There was a conflict with NDP policies regarding the height and size of the proposed dwellings

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She had no additional comment.

Councillor Fagan proposed and Councillor Milln seconded a motion that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to NDP policies WNL4 and WNL5 and CS policies, SS6, RA2 and SD1. The motion was carried unanimously with 15 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be refused and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to officers be authorised to detail the conditions and reasons put forward for refusal by the committee on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to NDP policies WNL4 and WNL5 and CS policies, SS6, RA2 and SD1.

82. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 1.29 pm

Chairperson

PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: 15 January 2020

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

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

Following the publication of the Officer Report, it is understood that a letter was sent direct to Members of the committee by the Applicant on the 13th January 2020.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The letter supplied to Members by the Applicant is extensive and expands upon the case already set out within the supplied Design and Access Statement whilst providing a critique of the Officer Report. In broad terms, it is not considered that the letter raises any additional material points which have not already been addressed in the Officer Report.

The letter does make comment however on the current situation regarding development in the River Lugg catchment of the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Members will be aware of the current situation regarding the failing conservation status of the River Lugg and the implications this is having for development proposals in the catchment which require screening under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. A detailed appraisal of the application in this regard is set out at sections 6.55 to 6.63 of the Officer Report. At the present time, the LPA is unable to positively screen the proposal and must conclude that it has an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Lugg / River Wye SAC. An Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken to this effect and Natural England have confirmed that they agree with its conclusions. The application therefore fails to meet the requirements of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 and is contrary to Policies LD2 and SD4 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and the guidance set out at Paragraphs 174-177 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The letter from the Applicant puts forward the suggestion that if Members are minded not to agree with the non-HRA related reasons for refusal, they could defer a decision on the application pending a solution to the current situation in the River Lugg catchment being found or alternatively approve the application subject to conditions preventing occupation of the dwellings until the situation is resolved. In relation to the latter suggestion, Officers would advise that this would not be appropriate as the obligation to screen the proposal under the Habitats Regulations must be discharged at the point permission is granted and at present it is not possible to carry out a positive assessment in these terms. Any condition limiting the occupation of the dwellings until an unspecified point in time when the Lugg situation has been resolved would also fail to meet the tests of precision required by the NPPF. Therefore if members are minded to otherwise support the application the resolution would need to delegate the decision to officers to approve subject to a positive HRA.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

192317 - ERECTION OF A SINGLE DWELLING AND GARAGE FOR OCCUPATION BY SITE MANAGER AT DOCKLOW POOLS, DOCKLOW, NR LEOMINSTER, HR6 0RU

For: Mr Bozward per Mr Ed Thomas, 13 Langland Drive, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 0QG

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Letter from Applicant

A letter from the applicant has also been submitted directly to members on 13th January 2020. Again, this is replicated below for understanding,

“Having read the officer report, I feel moved to write to clarify one or two points that might otherwise be misunderstood.

The business was established by my parents in the 1970s and has expanded steadily ever since to now comprise 140 acres of land, with 14 coarse fishing pools, 50 chalets, tackle shop and the successful Fisherman’s Arms Public House and Restaurant. I have worked for the family business since leaving school and am now General Manager. I have been involved personally in virtually all facets of the business since childhood, established the tackle shop, overseen and been involved in the construction of the guest accommodation on site and the pub/restaurant. I also oversee pond and grounds maintenance, work shifts in the pub/restaurant, deal with procurement and any and all matters arising on a daily basis. There is nobody else with my wealth of knowledge and experience across the site and various elements of the business.

Since my early 20’s I have been living in ‘digs’ besides and above the pub/restaurant. The officer report describes this accommodation as a ‘dwelling’, which I feel overstates the situation. My partner and I have a ground floor kitchen and living room that is separated from the pub/restaurant by an internal door (which opens directly onto the restaurant) and a bedroom above, adjacent the guest letting rooms. There is no private amenity space or separation from the business, the accommodation being surrounded on other sides by visitor parking.

This was acceptable in my 20’s, but during that period the business and my role within it has expanded very significantly. My circumstances have changed professionally and personally, whereby I now have a partner and a continued necessity to be present on site 24/7, but no suitable accommodation to enable me to do so sustainably. Having given it careful thought, we’ve chosen an unobtrusive site for a modest dwelling on land that is already partially developed and to which access already exists. This site would afford me modest separation from the hub of the business whilst being within sight and sound of all that needs my oversight. It would also give me and the business added security and on a personal level, the ability to start a family.

The officer report suggests that I could purchase accommodation off site and install a site manager in my present accommodation. Firstly, this significantly underestimates the importance of my continuous presence on site 24/7 and secondly, suggests I could find a site manager who would be prepared to live in my current accommodation. I’d question whether this is realistic given the scale of the business.

Finally, as you'll note, the application has met with support from the Parish Council and that adjoining and there are numerous letters of support. I am perfectly content to accept any restrictive occupancy condition and any other conditions that might be necessary. I can assure you the intent behind this application is entirely genuine.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this email.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Members will also note that a letter has been directly submitted from the applicant, justifying why permission should be granted. Officers would reiterate again that the applicant confirms that he is already present on site and demonstrates that accommodation can be provided within an existing building, contrary to point 1 under Policy RA4 of the Core Strategy. Indeed, such matters regarding the principle of development, have already been covered IN sections 6.1 through 6.20 inclusive within the report.

Finally regarding the Phosphates issue if members are otherwise minded to support the application the resolution would need to delegate the decision to officers to approve subject to a positive HRA.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION