

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 12 January 2011

## 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.

**DMN/102045/F - Continue to erect, take down and re erect polytunnels rotated around fields as required (Retrospective) at Land at Oakchurch Farm, Church Road, Staunton On Wye, Herefordshire, HR4 7NE**

**FOR: Mr Price per Mr Antony Aspbury, Unit 20 Park Lane Business Centre, Park Lane, Basford, Nottingham, NG6 0DW**

### ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

A request has been received from Mr. Lanigan, Field Cottage, Staunton on Wye, to express his thanks for the way in which Officers and in particular the applicant, during the application processing period, have engaged in consultations with members of the public in respect of polytunnel development within Staunton and the surrounding area.

### OFFICER COMMENTS

It is recommended that an additional condition is attached in order to clarify a time period for clearing existing raspberries off site in accordance with the amended plans submitted by the applicants for a buffer zone in front of Field Cottage.

### CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Add Condition

**Within 1 month of the date of this approval notice, a timetable will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of a schedule of works for removal of the existing raspberry crop on the site of the proposed buffer zone in front of the property known as Field Cottage, and the land re-instatement, as indicated on amended plan ref. number Fig DLA 1290/04 – Rev b. These works will be carried out in full within 4 months of the date of this decision notice.**

**Reason:** In consideration of the amenity and visual impact of the surrounding area and to comply with Polices DR2 and LA2 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development.

**DMN/102047/F - Continue to erect, take down and re erect polytunnels rotated around fields as required (retrospective) at Land at Bishopstone forming, part of Bishops Court, Bishopstone/Bridge Sollars, Herefordshire, HR4 7JQ**

**FOR: Mr Price per Mr Antony Aspbury, Unit 20 Park Lane Business Centre, Park Lane, Basford, Nottingham, NG6 0DW**

#### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

A further letter of objection has been received via email from Dr. Jill Donnelly, a local resident in Bishopstone. Concerns are raised about the close proximity of polytunnels to Dr. Donnelly's dwelling, (field reference number 'E' on the southern tip of the application site). She states that polytunnels situated 30 metres in distance from her dwelling are too close and that they would spoil her views.

#### **OFFICER COMMENTS**

As a result of further negotiation, the applicant has offered a buffer zone alongside the north eastern side of Field number 'E' adjacent to the hamlet known as Bishopstone.

It is recommended that an additional condition is attached to any approval notice issued to ensure that the proposed buffer zone is installed in the event of polytunnel development on this field.

#### **CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

Add Condition

**No polytunnels or associated development will be situated within the north eastern triangular section of the most southerly situated field in accordance with drawing number Fig DLA 1292/04 – Rev a, for a distance of at least 100 metres alongside the buffer zone's easterly boundary with the property known as 'Daren View'.**

**Reason: In consideration of the amenity of surrounding dwellings and to comply with Policy DR2 of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.**

**DMSE/100298/O - Light industrial units B1 use at Land opposite Cattle Market, Netherton Road, Ross On Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 7QQ**

**FOR: Mr Barnett per Mr M F Freeman, Ruardean Works Varnister Road, Near Drybrook, Gloucester, GL17 9BH**

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The applicants have raised concern with the committee report and have provided the following comments which, they consider will assist Members.

Paragraph 6.5 states that “While, a 7m buffer zone is proposed” This is misleading because it fails to mention the fact that there is also a 'Landscape zone' running alongside the 7m buffer zone. This is very important to get across to the members because it provides as previously mentioned above a significant planning gain in that there is an element of landscaping re-introduced which will screen the development and support wildlife and ecology. For clarity the buffer zone is an area which will not be built upon or disturbed by the works. Members need to be aware that the landscape zone is significant in size being up to 13m in width in some areas.

Paragraph 6.6 states that the application “will preclude reinstating the area of trees that were originally on the site”. Whilst this may be true it is misleading in our opinion because it does not mention the fact that the scheme includes replanting of a landscaped area which will create a buffer zone. This is a fundamental planning gain of the application because if the application is not approved then the area will remain cleared and no landscaping will be re-introduced. The application also provides an opportunity for the council to secure this landscaping by condition or TPO to ensure that this remains in the future.

Paragraph 6.8 states that “In relation to functional issues, the proposed infilling raises practical concerns about the future stability of a high steep bank close to a watercourse, particularly before it is vegetated and about the difficulties of maintaining planting on a steep sided bank.” We have submitted evidence from our structural engineers that it is feasible to construct this embankment and any concern from planting this area has been confirmed by our landscape architect who has confirmed that this area can be planted. If anyone is worried about material falling into the buffer zone then as part of the detailed application to follow we can allow for a temporary concrete wall to be installed which can then be craned out of position on the completion of the development. This would satisfactorily deal with the concern raised in this point.

Paragraph 6.9 states “retaining this piece of land and allowing it to naturally regenerate would have a positive outcome – maintaining the spatial character, increasing the amount of screening and providing wildlife habitat” The applicant has purchased the land as a potential development site and will not allow the site to regenerate. They will continue to keep the site cleared of any landscaping until they secure consent for the development. At no stage has it been indicated by the applicant that this is an option for the site and it is misleading to inform the members that this what will happen if the scheme is refused.

Paragraph 6.9 it states “The embankment would require a retaining wall to be constructed along the length of the raised ground” This is not correct and a retaining wall is not required which has been illustrated in the sections that have been submitted to you. The section submitted by Simpson Associates (Engineers) does not specify that a retaining wall is required to support the development?

Paragraph 6.10 states “The section drawing that was submitted with the application does not include a scale so it is not possible to assess whether the proposals are feasible. This is a valid concern but we have submitted sections which are to scale to demonstrate that the development does fit within the site area. It is again misleading to leave this statement in without a conclusion. As you are aware this is only an outline application but we are happy to provide whatever information necessary to demonstrate to you and your ecologist that this works. We feel that we have provided you with sufficient information to deal with this point positively but if you do require further information then you just need to let us know.

### **NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

**DMS/102193/F- Forming of new access and site road. Construction of new packing shed. Erection of 1 no. polytunnels. Placing of 4 no. mobile storage units on site at Land opposite the Bell Inn, Tillington, Herefordshire, HR4 8LH**

**FOR: Wetland Plants per Mr Richard Ball, Ilex, Ashfield Crescent, Ross On Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 5PH**

#### **OFFICER COMMENTS**

Following the discussion at the previous committee the applicant has amended the plans to omit one of the two polytunnels from the proposed scheme (description amended as above). This single polytunnel would measure 9m by 26m with a maximum height of 3.5m. The polytunnel will be cut into the ground and be sited adjacent to the hedge to the east of the site, furthest from the highway.

The amended plan also details the hedge planting along the boundary with the neighbouring property. The conditions previously recommended would still be appropriate.

#### **NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

**DMS/101907/O - Site for erection of affordable home at Land adjacent to Holly Bush, Crafty Webb, Bredwardine, Herefordshire, HR3 6BZ**

**FOR: Mr Minton, Dolvach Farm, Bredwardine Hill, Bredwardine, Herefordshire, HR3 6BZ**

#### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

A further letter has been received from a property (Oak Cottage) that adjoins the application site. Mr and Mrs Howe are unable to attend. They reiterate their concerns and state that the site is outside the settlement boundary of Bredwardine. It has been refused twice before and hopefully will again. It is Kilvert country and as such precedents must not be allowed.

#### **NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**