

MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday 27 May 2009 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor JE Pemberton (Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, WU Attfield, DJ Benjamin, ACR Chappell, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, MAF Hubbard, RI Matthews, AT Oliver, SJ Robertson, AP Taylor, AM Toon, DB Wilcox and JD Woodward

In attendance: Councillors TW Hunt and RV Stockton

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Legal Practice Manager reported that Council had not elected a Sub-Committee Chairman or appointed a Vice-Chairman at the Annual Meeting on 22 May 2009. However, it did delegate authority to the Group Leaders to nominate to the offices and the Group Leaders were to meet for this purpose on 29 May. Therefore, it was necessary for the Sub-Committee to elect a Chairman for this meeting.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor JE Pemberton be elected Chairman for this meeting.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors AJM Blackshaw, SPA Daniels, H Davies, GFM Dawe, MD Lloyd-Hayes, GA Powell, NL Vaughan and WJ Walling.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

6. DCCW2009/0384/F - Upper Hill Farm, Breinton, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 7PH
Councillor PJ Edwards; Personal.
Councillor DW Greenow; Personal.
Councillor MAF Hubbard; Personal.
8. DCCW2009/0160/F - Land at Brook Farm, Marden, Herefordshire, HR1 3ET
Councillor KS Guthrie; Personal.
Councillor MAF Hubbard; Personal.
Councillor AM Toon; Personal.
10. DCCE2009/0755/RM - 22 Folly Lane, Hereford, HR1 1LY
Councillor SJ Robertson; Prejudicial; Left the meeting for the duration of the item;
Reason: Applicant's agent was known to the Member through architectural work and parish council.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2009 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS

The Sub-Committee received an information report.

6. DCCW2009/0384/F - UPPER HILL FARM, BREINTON, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 7PH

Change of use of barns to 2 nos. houses.

Councillor RI Matthews, the Local Ward Member, drew attention to the comments of Breinton Parish Council, particularly with regard to the access arrangements. He considered that the Sub-Committee would benefit from a site inspection as the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCCW2009/0384/F be deferred for a site inspection.

7. DCCW2009/0575/F - WARHAM COURT FARM, BREINTON, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 7PF

Provision of one dung midden as a replacement for those previously approved under application DCCW2008/0335/F.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mrs. Morawiecka spoke in objection to the application and Mr. Wheeler spoke in support of the application.

Councillor RI Matthews, the Local Ward Member, commented on a number of issues, including: recent building developments at the farm; the close proximity of the midden to a clean water pond and the potential for contamination, possibly to the River Wye; concerns about compliance with conditions on previous applications; the appearance of the retaining structure; and the need for adequate mature landscaping to mitigate visual impact. Given these and other considerations, Councillor Matthews proposed that a site inspection be held as the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

In response to a question about potential pollution of the adjacent clean water pond, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the development was constructed to ensure that all run-off fell back towards the buildings and was collected in a holding tank before dispersal, in accordance with the Defra Code of Practice.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCCW2009/0575/F be deferred for a site inspection.

8. DCCW2009/0160/F - LAND AT BROOK FARM, MARDEN, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3ET

Change of use of land from agriculture to a site for the accommodation of seasonal agricultural workers in mobile homes and demountable portable buildings stationed continuously on the site and not removed at the end of the agricultural season (retrospective).

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Ternouth spoke on behalf of Marden Parish Council, Mr. Fraser spoke in objection to the application, and Mr. Gregory and Mr. Woodman spoke in support of the application; in accordance with the Council's Constitution, SO 5.11.2, the Chairman permitted five minutes speaking time for each speaker category.

Councillor KS Guthrie, the Local Ward Member, commented on a number of issues, including:

- ◆ It was noted that the applicants had undertaken consultations with the local community but Councillor Guthrie was disappointed that this application did not go far enough to reduce the scale and impact of the accommodation.
- ◆ She did not feel that the need for seasonal workers at this site in such numbers and throughout the year had been demonstrated.
- ◆ Attention was drawn to the comments of Marden Parish Council, particularly comments about the similarity of this proposal to the refused scheme.
- ◆ Improvements to the quality of accommodation were to be commended but serious concerns remained about the proposals.
- ◆ Although it had been indicated that a 'whole farm' approach would be undertaken, development at the farm would be the subject of a number of planning applications.
- ◆ Concerns were expressed about the impact on Brook Farmhouse and its setting.
- ◆ The Parish Council considered that the scheme failed to meet the functional needs test of PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas).
- ◆ Concerns were expressed about the access arrangements and impact on the local road infrastructure.
- ◆ Comments were made about the limited monitoring of the site in the past and the need for assurances regarding this going forward.
- ◆ Councillor Guthrie felt unable to support the application and proposed that it be refused as being contrary to PPS7, E9, E12, LA2 and LA3, due to the scale of the development and adverse impact on the village of Marden.

The Principal Planning Officer responded as follows:

- Attention was drawn to the recommended conditions which would mitigate the impact of the development, such as lighting and landscaping, and it was suggested that additional condition could be included to limit the maximum number of workers at the site.
- The applicants had changed their approach to communication significantly; it was noted that fewer letters of objection had been received about this proposal compared to previous applications.
- The Enforcement Team was aware of the site and would continue to monitor it.
- The Traffic Manager had no objections subject to conditions.
- Applications would be required for other developments at the site, this application was limited to provide accommodation for seasonal workers for a temporary period of five years.

A number of Members supported the Local Ward Members' comments.

Councillor MAF Hubbard noted the need to support agricultural enterprises in the county but was concerned about the lack of clarity regarding the numbers employed at the site. He commented that migrant workers were a vulnerable minority group and there could be wider implications if on-site facilities could not be provided.

In response to a question from Councillor PA Andrews, the Principal Planning Officer

confirmed that the increase in mobile homes from 150 to 164 would enable a reduction in occupancy levels (to 4 per unit) and would reduce the number of 'pods' from 100 to 48. Councillor Andrews recognised the need to accommodate workers but considered that temporary planning permission should be granted for a three-year period only and strictly limited to those people working at Brook Farm and nowhere else.

Councillor PJ Edwards welcomed the improvements to the company's communication practices but did not feel that the planning policy concerns had been overcome by this application. It was noted that the continued use of the land as a caravan site had been refused in November 2007 but activity had not ceased on site and the current application had not been received until January 2009. He questioned why more land was required for the accommodation if the number of workers was being reduced. He said that the scale of the development was too great and felt unable to support the application. He also commented on the need to consider appropriate enforcement action.

Councillor DW Greenow commented on the management changes at the company and, whilst acknowledging the concerns of local residents, noted the need to support thriving enterprises in the county. He felt that a three-year permission might not provide sufficient time for the company to achieve its stated aims; the need for effective enforcement of conditions was emphasised. He suggested that a restriction to prevent temporary workers from working elsewhere might generate more disturbances on occasion due to increased downtime activities.

Councillor RI Matthews noted other speakers' comments about the economic arguments but emphasised the need to consider the impact on local residents.

Councillor AM Toon felt that the size of the workforce needed to be clarified, felt that comments should have been sought from West Mercia Police, considered that a three-year permission would provide enough time for reorganisation, and commented on concerns about workers from Brook Farm being transported to other sites.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the next application on the agenda, in respect of fixed polytunnels [DCCW2009/0161/F below refers], would reduce the amount of traffic on the adjoining public highways, subject to planning permission being granted.

The Development Control Manager advised that the workforce needed to be close to the farmed area and alternatives, such as removing the mobile homes at the end of the agricultural season, were considered to be more disruptive than stationing the structures at the site continuously.

Councillor AT Oliver suggested that the maximum number of workers accommodated at the site should be limited to 752 persons, i.e. 164 mobile homes x 4 occupants, plus 48 pods x 2 occupants.

Councillor DB Wilcox felt that the standard of accommodation needed to be improved and wished to see the complete phasing out of the pods; he suggested that this should form part of any planning permission granted. He felt that the proposals suffered from a lack of a comprehensive masterplan under which the vision of the company could be stated clearly, targets could be set and progress monitored. Comments were made about the potential impact of refusal on the local economy and Councillor Wilcox considered that a temporary three-year permission would provide the opportunity for the company to address the concerns identified. He added that Marden needed to be satisfied with the longer-term plans for the site.

The Principal Planning Officer said that a three-year permission might be feasible and explained that some of the delays in the submission of the application resulted from the applicants changing their planning and legal consultants.

Councillor ACR Chappell commented on the retrospective nature of the application and noted that even a three-year permission was a long time for residents to endure if the development was unsuitable.

RESOLVED:

That

(i) **The Central Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application subject to the reasons for refusal set out below (and any further reasons for refusal felt to be necessary by the Head of Planning and Transportation) provided that the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:**

1. Contrary to PPS7, E9, E12, LA2 and LA3, due to the scale of the development and adverse impact on the village of Marden.

(ii) **If the Head of Planning and Transportation does not refer the application to the Planning Committee, officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be instructed to refuse the application, subject to such reasons for refusal referred to above.**

[Note:

Following the vote on this application, the Development Control Manager advised that, although the resolution was contrary to the officers' recommendation, he was not minded to refer the matter to the Head of Planning and Transportation given the reasons put forward by Members.]

9. DCCW2009/0161/F - LAND AT BROOK FARM, MARDEN, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3ET

Application (part retrospective) to erect fixed (non rotating) Spanish polytunnels over arable (soft fruit) crops grown on table tops.

The Principal Planning Officer provided details of updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda as follows:

- Land Drainage advice had been received which confirmed that the polytunnels were believed to have little effect on any increase in rainfall runoff and velocity of the flow due to the rainfall management on the site.
- It was reported that this advice was compatible with the information received from the Environment Agency and the River Lugg Land Drainage Board.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Ternouth spoke on behalf of Marden Parish Council, Mr. Fraser spoke in objection to the application, and Mr. Gregory and Mr. Woodman spoke in support of the application; in accordance with the Council's Constitution, SO 5.11.2, the Chairman permitted five minutes speaking time for each speaker category.

Councillor KS Guthrie, the Local Ward Member, made a number comments, including:

- ♦ Consultation by the company had raised expectations that there would be a substantial reduction in the land covered by polytunnels and local residents were disappointed with this application.
- ♦ Marden Parish Council had identified that the site area proposed was 40% larger than that refused on appeal and considered that the proposed scheme would have a

considerable impact on the character and environment of the village.

- ◆ The letters of objection had highlighted the incongruous visual impact of the polytunnels which could not be mitigated adequately through landscaping.
- ◆ Reference was made to PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) and the need to ensure that the quality and character of the countryside was protected and, where possible, enhanced.
- ◆ Councillor Guthrie considered that the application should be refused as being contrary to E8, LA2, LA3, S2, S7, DR1, DR2, DR4, E6, E10 and E13, due to the unacceptable visual impact and adverse impact of the scale of the development on the character of the area.

Councillor DW Greenow sympathised with views of local residents but noted that the removal of particular fields from the previously dismissed appeal had reduced visual impact and had moved the activities of the operation further away from the village.

Councillor AT Oliver commented on the need to consider the application on planning grounds and noted the benefits of table-top production, particularly in terms of production efficiency and opportunities to create wildlife corridors. The importance of protecting the countryside was acknowledged but the need for a working and sustainable rural economy was also emphasised.

Councillor PA Andrews noted that the refusal of the previous application [DCCW2009/0160/F above] could have an impact on this proposal.

Councillor ACR Chappell commented that new farming techniques often caused disruption to communities when introduced but the wider economic benefits also had to be taken into consideration. He also made comments about retrospective planning applications and the need for representations to focus on planning matters.

Councillor PJ Edwards felt that the scale and the intensity of the proposal were unacceptable, particularly since the area to be covered was greater than that refused on appeal. He also commented on the potential impact on the highway network and noted that the possible removal of unauthorised polytunnels elsewhere was not directly relevant to the determination of this application.

In response to questions from Councillor AM Toon, the Principal Planning Officer highlighted the areas of unauthorised polytunnels which would need to be removed and advised that a permission for five years, rather than the recommended ten years, was not considered reasonable given the investment costs required to enable the development.

The Principal Planning Officer explained the Inspector's comments in respect of the dismissed appeal and the relevance to this application. The Development Control Manager highlighted the policy considerations and why officers did not consider the harm to be such that planning permission should be refused.

Councillor Guthrie re-iterated local concerns about the need to protect the countryside and the cumulative impact of development at Brook Farm on the village of Marden.

Councillor RI Matthews noted that, as he had not been present for the whole of presentation and discussion on the application, he was unable to vote on this item; the Herefordshire Council Code of Conduct for Members and Officers Dealing with Planning Matters, paragraph 37 refers.

A motion to refuse the application failed and the resolution below was then agreed.

RESOLUTION:

That temporary planning permission shall be granted for a period of 10 years subject to the following conditions:

1. **F20 (Temporary permission and reinstatement of land).**

Reason: In order to clarify the terms under which this permission is granted and in accordance with Policies DR1, LA4 and E13 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

2. **The polythene shall be removed by 31st October each year and not replaced until or after 1st March in the following year unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policy LA2 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

3. **G04 (Protection of trees/hedgerows that are to be retained).**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area and to ensure that the development conforms with Policies DR1 and LA5 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. **G05 (Pre-development tree work).**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area and to ensure that the development conforms with Policies DR1 and LA5 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

5. **G11 (Landscaping scheme - implementation) – April 2010.**

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

6. **Within three months of the date of this decision, a full habitat management and enhancement scheme (based upon the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan dated December 2008) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for written approval. This shall include mitigation and protection measures for protected species and in particular great crested newts. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and continued thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.**

Reason: To ensure the protection of European and nationally designated sites and to comply with Herefordshire Council's Unitary Development Plan Policies NC2 and NC3.

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

To comply with Herefordshire Council's Policies NC8 and NC9 in relation to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and to meet the requirements of PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and the NERC Act 2006.

7. **To ensure the footpaths and bridleways remain unobstructed appropriate signage, details of which shall first be submitted for approval in writing of the local planning authority, shall be placed in positions to be agreed and thereafter**

maintained to the satisfaction of the local planning authority while polytunnels remain on the land.

Reason: In order to protect the Public Rights of Way.

8. No polytunnels shall be erected within 2 metres of the centre line of a public right of way or 3 metres in the case of a bridleway.

Reason: In order to protect the Public Right of Way in accordance with Policy T6 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

9. The Public Right of Way shall be maintained strictly in accordance with the submitted drawings L09A, L09B and L09C unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to protect the Public Right of Way in accordance with Policy T6 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

10. All surface water shall be limited to the relevant Greenfield run-off rate, with attenuation for the 1% plus climate change storm event, in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (Ref:P:\SAD multi (5540)) PolyTunnels\Marden Nove 08\FRA vO.1doc), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flood risk and ensure sustainable disposal of surface water run-off.

11. H30 (Travel Plans).

Reason: In order to ensure that the development is carried out in combination with a scheme aimed at promoting the use of a range of sustainable transport initiatives and to conform with the requirements of Policy DR3 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

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

[Note:

At the conclusion of the item, Councillor ACR Chappell suggested a motion to request the Secretary of State to review the policy of 'retrospective' planning applications. The Legal Practice Manager commented that policy issues were outside the remit of this Sub-Committee and suggested that the motion be referred to the Head of Planning and Transportation with a view to a report being made to the Planning Committee or another appropriate body.]

10. DCCE2009/0755/RM - 22 FOLLY LANE, HEREFORD, HR1 1LY

Proposed dwelling with integral garage and alterations to existing access.

Councillor AP Taylor, a Local Ward Member, said that he had reservations about the access arrangements but supported the officer recommendation of approval.

Councillor AT Oliver noted that the report, under paragraph 5.1, stated that no response had been received from Hereford City Council but he understood that a representation had been

submitted in April.

RESOLVED:

That approval of reserved matters be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. B03 (Amended plans).

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

2. C01 (Samples of external materials).

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

3. F08 (No conversion of garage to habitable accommodation).

Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking arrangements remain available at all times and to comply with Policy H18 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. F14 (Removal of permitted development rights).

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

5. H06 (Vehicular access construction).

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

6. H09 (Driveway gradient).

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

7. H13 (Access, turning area and parking).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

- 1. HN05 - Works within the highway.**
- 2. HN10 - No drainage to discharge to highway.**
- 3. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**
- 4. N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**

- 11. DCCW2009/0568/F - VILLAGE INN, MORETON ON LUGG, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 8DE**

Conversion and alterations of public house to five flats.

The Principal Planning Officer provided details of updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda as follows:

- A letter of objection had been received from the occupants of 8 Ordnance Close and was summarised as:
 - *We were told there would be no further development in the village, as there is no GP Surgery, School and limited public transport.*
 - *Concern about increase in volume of traffic, and on street parking.*
 - *The number of flats is over-development of the site.*

Councillor KS Guthrie, the Local Ward Member, drew attention to the comments of Moreton-on-Lugg Parish Council; relating to the delivery times for materials and equipment; the need for improvements to the access; and the suggestion that a Local Housing Needs Policy be included as part of a Section 106 Agreement. Councillor Guthrie also drew attention to local residents' concerns about the potential impact of additional traffic.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that: it would not be reasonable to restrict hours of delivery further, particularly given the fall back position of the permitted use; no objections had been received from the Traffic Manager; and, although this development would be liable for Section 106 contributions, from 1 April 2009 the requirement had been relaxed for residential schemes for five dwellings or less, subject to the planning permission being limited to 12 months.

In response to questions, the Senior Planning Officer advised that: concerns about the proximity of the working agricultural unit were noted but it was not considered that the proposed units would suffer any significant deficit in the levels of residential amenity; the Environmental Health and Trading Standards Manager had confirmed that no complaints had been received about farming activities from existing residents; the recommended conditions included a condition to require details of boundary treatments; the location of the extraction equipment associated with the takeaway was explained and it was noted that the Environmental Health and Trading Standards Manager was satisfied that there would not be an adverse impact on the residential units; and rights of access across private land were civil rather than planning matters.

RESOLVED:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

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

2. **B01 (Development in accordance with the approved plans).**

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

3. **C03 (Matching external materials (general)).**

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development so as to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of Policy DR1 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

4. G09 (Details of boundary treatments).

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

5. H05 (Access gates).

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

6. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted an area shall be laid out, consolidated, surfaced and drained within the application site for the parking of 6 cars, and for those vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in a forward gear. These areas shall thereafter be retained and kept available for those uses at all times.

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway to conform with the requirements of Policy T11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

7. H26 (Access location).

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

8. I16 (Restriction of hours during construction).

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

9. I33 (External lighting).

Reason: To safeguard the character and amenities of the area and to comply with Policy DR14 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

10. I37 (Details of shields to prevent light pollution).

Reason: To minimise light overspill and to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties so as to comply with Policy DR14 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

11. L01 (Foul/surface water drainage).

Reason: To protect the integrity of the public sewerage system and to comply with Policy CF2 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

12. L02 (No surface water to connect to public system).

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment so as to comply with Policy CF2 of Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

Informatives:

1. **N01 - Access for all.**
 2. **N19 - Avoidance of doubt - Approved Plans.**
 3. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**
12. **[A] DCCE2009/0555/F AND [B] DCCE2009/0556/L - TARRINGTON COURT, TARRINGTON, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4EX**

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

The Principal Planning Officer provided details of updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda as follows:

- Amended plans had been received which reduced the roof pitch and removed the overhang on the proposed stable building. Amended plans had also been received for the conversion of the coach house, showing only one of the dormers as full sized.
- It was reported that these amendments had been requested by the planning officer and, therefore, the recommendation remained that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Hodges spoke in objection to the application and Mr. Jago spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman, speaking in her capacity as the Local Ward Member, commented on local tensions regarding development at this site, particularly as this application was in part retrospective. In view of the concerns highlighted in the representations received, the Chairman proposed that a site inspection be held as the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCCW2009/0384/F be deferred for a site inspection.

13. **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

24 June 2009
22 July 2009
19 August 2009

The meeting ended at 5.23 pm

CHAIRMAN