

MINUTES of the meeting of Planning Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday 20 July 2011 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor BA Durkin (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, AN Bridges, PJ Edwards, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, RB Hamilton, J Hardwick, JW Hope MBE, Brig P Jones CBE, JLV Kenyon, JG Lester, MD Lloyd-Hayes, G Lucas, RI Matthews, FM Norman and PJ Watts

28. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors BA Durkin, RC Hunt, GR Swinford and JD Woodward.

29. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)

In accordance with paragraph 4.1.23 of the Council's Constitution, Councillors RB Hamilton and JLV Kenyon attended the meeting as substitute members for Councillors BA Durkin and JD Woodward.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

31. MINUTES

Councillor Matthews asked for clarification on the advice given by the locum lawyer at the previous meeting regarding a condition proposed by the Local Ward member in her opening remarks in respect of an application at Haygrove Farm. The locum lawyer advised Members that the condition would not be enforceable and did therefore not meet the government criteria.

In response to a further question from Councillor PJ Watts regarding condition 3 of the resolution in respect of the same application, the Locum Lawyer advised that the condition was necessary and met the requirements of the afore mentioned national guidance as well as national planning policy PPS24.

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

32. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman thanked Members for attending the site inspection that took place on the 19 July.

33. APPEALS

In response to a question, the Development Manager advised Members that there was currently no decision in respect of the application at Braintree Lodge.

The Planning Committee noted the report.

34. DMS/110995/F - 48 HAMPTON PARK ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1TH

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application and updates / additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided; the schedule of committee updates is appended to these minutes. He also advised Members that he recommended that an additional two conditions be added to the recommendation to restrict hours of construction and to address slab levels.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr Rees spoke in objection to the application.

In accordance with paragraph 4.8.2.2 of the Council's Constitution, Councillors JLV Kenyon and MD Lloyd-Hayes, two of the local ward members, commented on a number of issues, including:

- Hampton Grange was a care home for dementia sufferers
- Not aware of any parking issues surrounding the home
- Note the concerns regarding the loss of open space but there is open space at the back of the home overlooking the river.
- The proposal will give the residents the opportunity to look out over the river or at the impressive cedar tree.
- Local Members previously objected to apartments on the site due to the increase in traffic
- Natural England, the conservation manager, the ecology manager, and the traffic manager do not object to the application.
- The proposed development is in keeping with the existing building.
- The neighbouring dwellings are some distance away from the application site.
- No complaints received from local residents regarding the home.
- Statistics prove that there will be an increase in dementia sufferers throughout the County.
- The Council has a duty of care in respect of the elderly within the County.

In response to a question, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the cooking facilities would be located against the western elevation. He suggested that Members may consider it relevant to include a condition seeking details of the extraction equipment prior to development. He added that the proposed bin store would be covered; that there had been no objections from the Council's Environmental Health Team; and that existing issues of noise should be addressed through the Environmental Protection Team and not through the planning process.

Members discussed the application and felt that the Council had a duty of care towards the elderly and the mentally infirm. They did however note the concerns of the local residents and felt that these concerns could be addressed through suitable conditions. They requested that additional conditions be incorporated into the resolution to address landscaping; the provision of a noise attenuation scheme for the bin store; and additional secure cycle storage.

Members noted their disappointment at the loss of open space through the development but felt that there was good reason in this case. They also noted that there was still substantial open space overlooking the river that residents could use.

The Locum Lawyer advised Members that the application fell within the conservation area. He added that Members should pay special attention to the effect the application would have on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In response to a question the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that 20 metres of hedgerow would have to be removed to achieve the required visibility on the junction.

In response to a further question regarding the hours of construction, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that weekend hours would be restricted to 8am to 1pm on a Saturday with no working permitted on a Sunday.

Councillors Kenyon and Lloyd-Hayes were given the opportunity to close the debate in accordance with the Council's Constitution. They reiterated their opening remarks and requested that the Committee approve the application.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A01 Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
- 2. B03 Amended plans**
- 3. B07 Section 106 Agreement**
- 4. C01 Samples of external materials**
- 5. H03 Visibility splays**
- 6. H13 Access, turning area and parking**
- 7. H29 Secure covered cycle parking provision**
- 8. H30 Travel plans**
- 9. L01 Foul/surface water drainage**
- 10. L02 No surface water to connect to public system**
- 11. L03 No drainage run-off to public system**
- 12. G04 Protection of trees/hedgerows that are to be retained**
- 13. G11 Landscaping scheme – implementation**
- 14. G14 Landscape management plan**
- 15. No development shall take place until a Construction and Site Waste Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the approved Plan.**
- 16. F16 No new windows in specified elevation**
- 17. I16 Restriction on hours of working**
- 18. I41 Scheme of refuse storage (commercial)**

19. I40 Details of flues or extractors

20. I51 Details of slab levels

Informative:

1. N15 Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

35. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

The meeting ended at 10.50 am

CHAIRMAN

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 July 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.

DMS/110995/F- Single storey extension to existing building comprising kitchen & workshop and new addition comprising 32 bedrooms & associated facilities at 48 Hampton Park Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1TH

For: Mr Claridge per Mr Ken Pearce, Mortimer House, Holmer Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9TA

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

At paragraph 6.23 the report refers to the supply of Elderly Mentally Infirm bed spaces relative to demand, which is forecast to increase.

Whilst the level of need has not been quantified, the Acting Director of Adult Social Care has confirmed there is little capacity should there be a surge in admissions or a need to move large numbers of patients due to serious incident/safeguarding concerns.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

