

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 September 2012

## 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.

**N121318/F - CONVERSION OF RURAL BUILDING TO ONE DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AT THE BARRACKS, CHURCH LANE, MUCH COWARNE, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4JG**

**For: Mr Day per Mr Linden Alcock, Palace Chambers, 3 King Street, Hereford, HR1 9BW.**

### ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

#### Representations

The following email has been received from Martin Hewitt who is Church Warden and Chairman of the Much Cowarne History Group;

*I feel that the Paunceford Court Hop-Pickers Barracks near the church might not be an Elizabethan half timbered building, and may be poorly built but it is the only building that tells of the huge hop-yard empire that the Pudge Family had at Cowarne Court and Bishops Frome. In its own way it is an historic building. The building has been an eyesore for many years and from what I have seen of the plans, Francis Day is aiming to sympathetically convert the building to a higher degree than I think is necessary, but still keep the look of its original function.*

*I am afraid I can't be at the Planning Committee meeting on the 19th September because I am on holiday that week. I have farmed at Panks Bridge Farm, Much Cowarne for 43 years. I am a Church Warden and also Chairman of the Much Cowarne History Group. I am writing in support of the planning application by Francis Day who I have known since we moved here in 1969. I feel that Francis Day as a partner in a local firm that is very active in the community should be given every opportunity to stay in the parish.*

### NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

**S121611/F - CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL TO B2 GENERAL INDUSTRIAL - RE-USE OF EXISTING BUILDING WITH EXTENSION TO FORM WORKSHOP FOR KIT CAR ASSEMBLY AT MILL FARM BUILDING, MILL LANE, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EJ**

**For: Mr Bulmer per Mr Alex Coppock, Studio 1, Grange, Shelwick, Hereford, HR1 3AW.**

## **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

### Representations

Note that there was one letter of support submitted in response to the application that had been omitted from the report. This was from T C Lewis – 81 Ecroyd Park and these comments are summarised as follows:

No objection as in today's economic state any firm offering employment no matter how small or large, should be encouraged for the sake of the local community. This project would bring extra trade to shop etc. Noise would not be an issue, as well within permitted hours and would be minimal anyway. Provided speed not an issue down Mill lane then wish project well.

A petition with 56 signatories has been received that states:

*'Please sign and support this petition against the use of planning application 121611/F for Mill Farm Building, Mill Lane, Credenhill, Hereford or signatures that signed original petition that does not live in the area and who it does not concern.'*

### Internal Consultees

Further to the details being submitted (as per paragraph 6.10 / 6.11 of the report) the Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on these details and is now content that these address the issues.

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

Following the details submitted by the applicants revised conditions are recommended to ensure that the appropriate works are undertaken in accordance with these details. Whilst the EHO is satisfied that these methods are appropriate, we would require details of the ventilation systems, noise levels (Before and after) before we could discharge these conditions. Likewise. Whilst the methodology is sound, we would require manufactures details of the systems to ensure that they are sufficient.

## **CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

No change to recommendation

**N121446/CD - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AT LEOMINSTER INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, HEREFORD ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE**

**For: Herefordshire Council per Amey Property Services, Explorer 2, Fleming Way, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 9GT**

## **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

### Conservations Manager – Landscape

The application does not demonstrate how landscape character has influenced the site selection or design. The existing school site, to the southern hedgerow boundary, is within the Urban landscape character of Leominster. The proposal is to extend the school site further south into the character type principal settled farmlands. This land for the proposed extension is classified as being of high landscape sensitivity within the council's Urban Fringe Sensitivity Analysis (Jan 2010).

The open spaces around the site will create a multifunctional framework, including sport, play, relaxing, parking, movement, growing food, drainage, learning, wildlife habitats and creating a sense of place.

The application could be improved through presentation of a strong landscape design framework and supporting management plan. This should balance the site opportunities and constraints and ensure that the natural environment is fully integrating into the way the school is planned, design and managed for the long term.

Further clarification is required on the detailed treatment of the boundaries. In particular:

- Levels along the new southern boundary, gradient of the slopes between the sports pitch, building and existing vegetation to be retained.
- Footpath along east boundary. I do not support the proposal for the new fence to be located approx.. 30mm away from the existing fence. This will create a narrow, hard, unattractive corridor for users of the footpath and will require significant vegetation removal for the installation. Consideration should be given to the security fence being at the top of the new bank / back of the car park bays. It could be set approx.. 1m back from the top of the bank to allow new planting on the school side to soften the appearance for the pupils.
- The details of the new fencing and the existing / proposed hedgerows and trees needs further consideration all around the site. The boundary treatments have the largest impact on the surrounding sensitive landscape, particularly where it adjoins open countryside.

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

The location of the development and its visual impact are dealt with in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10. It is acknowledged that the proposal will have a visual impact and that a balance has to be struck between this impact, the operational and financial costs of re-developing the existing sites and the benefits derived through the significant improvement of education provision in the town. It is considered that the visual impacts can be mitigated through the imposition of conditions. This is also referred to later in the Landscape Officer's comments.

## **CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 8 – Additional sentence to be added to read as follows:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the new school is first brought into use.

Condition 9 – Additional sentence to be added to read as follows:

The approved Management Plan shall be implemented upon the commencement of the development of the site and shall remain in force until all works covered by this permission are complete.

**N121131/FH - ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING AT THE COTTAGE, WOODEND, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE HR8 2RS**

**For: Mr Ingleton per Mr Stephen Turner, 5 Barbourne Road, Worcester, Worcestershire, WR1 1RS**

## **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

One of the objecting local residents (the occupier of 'Spring Grove Farm') is unable to attend today's meeting due to a long-standing medical appointment. She has therefore asked that her views are relayed to the Planning Committee in full. Her request is that the letter is read out in full today, however, it is considered by Officers that it is best set out in full within this written update report. She states:-

“Thank you for the opportunity to restate my views on this application.

I would emphasize that the months which have elapsed since I submitted a response to the application have not changed my views in any way.

I reiterate that this proposed extension is unsuitable in the environment of the adjoining properties i.e. the hamlet of Woodend.

The proposed extension is totally out of keeping with the original dwelling and those surrounding it, all of which have had improvements and extensions but within the framework of size and style limitations in force. This includes my own property the style and size of which was dominated by the cottage it replaced.

I listened carefully to the arguments put forward by Mr Close on the phone and during his visits. Whilst I respect his professional opinion, I feel that his support for the proposed extension is misguided. It is an extension which is unsuitable to the context of the Black and white cottage and has the potential to affect the neighbouring properties.

Since it is the neighbouring properties which have to live with the outcome of this application I would ask that the views of the residents are taken fully into account. The open Parish Council meeting has communicated its views to you and using this opportunity endorsed them.

I draw your attention to the development of access to the rear of The Cottage. The lane, giving access to all four properties, has no known owner.

The three houses, with access on the lane, have parking for at least two vehicles within their boundaries. Out of respect for our neighbours' rights and safety, we do not park in the lane.

The Cottage has had two pedestrian accesses to the lane but now the hedge has been removed making the lane continuous with the rear garden of the dwelling.

Currently, the end of the lane is being used as a parking area by the Cottage. This lane/garden boundary needs reinstating even if a double gate allows vehicular access.

The Cottage needs more than two parking spaces since there are already two vehicles based there. . The presence of a third vehicle tends to obstruct:-

- a) the turning area thus forcing any subsequent vehicle to reverse blindly round the bend into the B... road.
- b) the gateway to my property which has a Wayleave requirement of 24 hour access to the electricity supply for the immediate area.

With each of these comments in mind and, considering the earlier submission, I ask you to refuse the current application.”

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

None

## **CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

None