6 DCSE2004/2155/O - OUTLINE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SIX DETACHED HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED VEHICULAR ACCESS AT LAND ADJOINING LLANGROVE COTTAGE, LLANGROVE, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 6EZ

For: M.F. Freeman Ltd. per Mr. J. Spreckley, Brinsop House, Brinsop, Hereford, HR4 7AS

Date Received: 15th June, 2004Ward: LlangarronGrid Ref: 52376, 19310Expiry Date: 10th August, 2004Local Member:Councillor Mrs. J.A. Hyde

Consideration of this application was deferred by the Sub-Committee on 4th August, 2004 in order that a site visit could be carried out. This took place on 16th August, 2004.

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site is immediately to the rear of the Royal Arms Inn in Llangrove. It comprises pasture land about 0.3 ha in area, belonging to Llangrove Cottage farm plus a small part of the Inn's car park. To the west of the site is a dwellinghouse (Garden Cottage) and two stone barns (part of the farm) for which planning application has been submitted for conversion into two dwellinghouses. To the south-west is farmland and to the south-east a further dwelling. To the east is a further part of the field but which is a further part of the field which is attached to Hazelnut Cottage.
- 1.2 The proposal is for residential development of 6 detached houses. The application is in outline form with only the access not reserved for later decision. The access would be through the car park of the Royal Arms. An indicative site layout shows a new car park to the rear of the Inn and the houses arranged around a curving access road.
- 1.3 This proposal is a revised scheme. An earlier application for the erection of 6 houses included access off the by-way about 70 m to the south of the application. This appolication has been withdrawn. An outline application (SE2004/1949/O) for residential development of the adjoining land south of Hazelnut Cottage has been submitted. This is the subject of a separate report in the Agenda.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Guidance

PPG3 Housing

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

Policy H16A Housing in Rural Areas

Policy H18	Residential Development in Rural Settlements
Policy CTC9	Development Requirements

2.3 South Herefordshire District Local Plan

Policy C2	Settlement Boundaries
Policy C29	Setting of a Listed Building
Policy SH6	Housing Development in Larger villages
Policy SH8	New Housing Development Criteria in Larger Villages
Policy SH9	Balance of Housing Types
Policy SH14	Siting and Design of Buildings
Policy SH15	Criteria for New Housing Schemes
Policy GD1	General Development Criteria
Policy T1A	Environmental Sustainability and Transport
Policy 11A	Environmental Sustainability and Transport
Policy T3`	Highway Safety Requirements
	nighway balety Kequilements

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan – Revised Deposit Draft

Policy H6 Housing in smaller settlements

3. Planning History

3.1 SE2003/1765/O Site for residential development of six - Withdrawn detached houses & associated 18.5.04 vehicular access

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 Environment Agency recommends a condition regarding drainage be imposed.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Head of Enginnering and Transportation recommends that conditions be imposed if permission is granted.
- 4.3 Head of Conservation does not wish to object in principle.

5. Representations

5.1 Parish Council observations are as follows:

Whilst the Parish Council have on a majority basis, no objections to the residential part of this application, serious concern is raised regarding the layout of the access and the possibility of a precedent being set for additional development on adjoining land. We feel that the provision for car parking at the Pub is insufficient. The Parish Council cannot emphasise too strongly the need, if this goes ahead, for an improvement in the road structure serving the village.

The Parish Council would also like to raise the following issues:

- (1) Why is the development utilising septic tanks and not mains sewerage?
- (2) If the reason for septic tank usage is because of the saturation of the existing mains sewerage, is sufficient care being taken with the percolation tests over a wide enough area to avoid problems to neighbours?

In conclusion we would add that the concerns that we have raised were along the lines of those raised by a large attendance at our Parish Council meeting.

- 5.2 7 letters have been received objecting to the proposals. The main reasons for objecting are, in summary, as follows:
 - (1) only part of field is included but to grant permission would open door for development on rest of field (SE2004/1949/O) and at Hill View (development rejected previously on access grounds) and field to south (permission refused 12 years ago).
 - (2) In total this could result in 10% or more increase in size of village 20 or more extra houses; this would be a housing estate more appropriate to a town.
 - (3) Such a large development would be wholly out of keeping with character of the village with potential to destroy peaceful way of life whole village should therefore be consulted.
 - (4) Local road network has narrow lanes, not always wide enough for two vehicles to pass - this enhances rural character but brings road safety problems. Always congestion at school starting/leaving time; school has increased numbers mostly from outside village.
 - (5) The proposal would lead to very significant increase in traffic (probably 20% extra) with dramatically increased safety risks unless traffic calming measures are undertaken.
 - (6) Reduction in number of parking spaces at pub which will result in parking on main village street or on access road.
 - (7) Ownership of access road will have bearing on how remaining part of field can or will be developed.
 - (8) Concern expressed regarding 6 septic tanks as experience indicates that there is a continuous layer of rock which may cause the effluent to flow towards existing properties. Independent consultant's study is needed. Soakaways, drainage etc. would have adverse environmental impact and electricity supply already stretched.
 - (9) Local infrastructure not adequate to support a medium sized housing development.
 - (10) Proposal does not meet European, UK and development plan requirements on sustainable development.
 - (11) Access road is outside village envelope and is long compared to size of development appears to be no suitable access to the main village road.
- 5.3 In addition a petition with 121 signatures expressing local opposition to the scheme has been received. It is pointed out that the signatures have been gathered in a very short time, from throughout the village and from all sectors. Also some signatures from users of facilities in the village.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Southern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 Llangrove is one of the larger settlements in the current development plan (Policy SH5 of South Herefordshire District Local Plan). The application site is within the defined boundaries of the settlement. Policy SH5 states that "new housing development will be directed to those settlements best able to support it and where need and demand is known. Within the limit to development....residential development will be allowed provided if conforms with Policies SH8, GD1 and other appropriate plan policies." The latter policies list criteria which new housing schemes should meet, of which the following are considered to be most relevant to this proposal:
 - scale of the development must complement the size, scale and character and not be visually intrusive;
 - will not adversely affect the settlement's setting, lead to cramming, unacceptable backland development or the loss of valuable amenity or open space;
 - additional traffic can be accommodated on the road system without undue environmental, operational and safety consequences.
- 6.2 The proposed number of houses (6) would result in a higher density in comparison with the property on adjoining plots. Higher densities are encouraged by PPG3 however and plot sizes would not be as high as elsewhere in the village e.g. Chapelfields. This is considered appropriate in view of the location toward the periphery of the village. The housing would not be visually intrusive, being partly screened by existing properties along the main village road and set away from the road and by-ways to west and south respectively. The indicative layout shows detached houses, informally arranged, which reflects the character of this part of the village. The number of new houses proposed would not be disproportionate to the size of the village. Although permanent pasture the land is not considered to be of special amenity value and development would not harm the setting of the village. For these reasons it is considered that the proposed development would be appropriate in this location and not harm the character of the village. The concern that permission would set a precedent for adjoining sites is appreciated but each case needs to be treated on its own merits and determined in the light of prevailing policies.
- 6.3 The roads leading to the village are typical narrow rural lanes. Within the village there is a network of by-ways. The proposed development however would be accessed off the main village road. There would be adequate visibility at the access, which is considered to be acceptable by the Head of Engineering and Transportation. There would be additional cars but not on such a scale as to add significantly to hazards and congestion within the village and its environs. The replacement car park for the Royal Arms is considered to be of adequate size.
- 6.4 It is understood that it would be practicable to connect the houses to the existing mains drainage system. This is preferable to septic tank drainage on environmental grounds and would overcome the concerns of neighbours.

RECOMMENDATION

That subject to the receipt of acceptable drainage proposals, the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions considered necessary by officers:

1 A02 (Time limit for submission of reserved matters (outline permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 A03 (Time limit for commencement (outline permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 A04 (Approval of reserved matters)

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to exercise proper control over these aspects of the development.

4 A05 (Plans and particulars of reserved matters)

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5 H03 (Visibility splays)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

6 No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of foul drainage works has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

Informative:

- 1 The Environment Agency advises that surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management.
- 2 N15 Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.