

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 29 JANUARY 2014

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.

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

1	P132230/O - SITE FOR ERECTION OF NINE HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT AT LAND ADJACENT TO CROSS FARM, CREDENHILL, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 7DJ For: Mr Griffiths per Stansgate Planning LLP, 9 The Courtyard, Timothy's Bridge Road, Stratford upon Avon, Warwickshire, CV37 9NP
----------	---

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

One additional letter has been received from Mr and Mrs Stewart who reiterate their previous comments.

Following the site visit the applicant's agent has provided a plan identifying the proposed and existing positions of the wall that fronts the A480 and made the following suggestions / comments in respect of options for this boundary as follows:

1. The wall remains intact. The Transportation Manager accepts a 70m visibility splay (as existing).
2. Wall reduced in height to 600mm
3. Wall demolished and new 1.2m tall post and rail fence erected (with hedge behind). This is better for the root structure.
4. Wall demolished and new 1.2m tall wall erected 1m away.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

2	132701/F - PROPOSED ERECTION OF LOW COST MARKET BUNGALOW FOR REGISTERED DISABLED PERSON AT AMBERLEY HEIGHTS, SUTTON ST NICHOLAS, HEREFORD, HR1 3BS
----------	---

For: Mr Ashcroft per Mr John Phipps, Bank Lodge, Coldwells Road, Holmer, Hereford, Herefordshire HR1 1LH

OFFICER COMMENTS

An appeal (2207787) on the land immediately adjacent to the site for the temporary stationing of a mobile home in connection with an established rural business was dismissed last week. Whilst the focus of this was on the functional need for a dwelling, the issue of sustainability was also considered. The inspector concluded:

“Sustainable location for development

...19. Notwithstanding the proximity of the Amberley Arms, most local services are some distance from the appeal site. I accept that the main nearby villages of Sutton St Nicholas and Marden provide a fairly wide range of services for a rural area, including a number of shops, post office, schools, further public houses, churches and village halls. I note also that, from a bus stop adjacent to the site, there is an hourly service between Hereford and Leominster.

However, I agree with the Council’s view that the villages are on the cusp of acceptable walking distance from the site and that the routes are not ideal for pedestrians, being for the most part along unlit lanes with no footway.

20. Overall, therefore, I have concerns as to whether the proposal would represent a sustainable form of development, with particular regard to accessibility by a choice of modes of transport and relationship to local services and amenities.

The relatively isolated location and restricted access to services indicate conflict with the objectives of the Framework, particularly paragraph 55, and UDP Policies S1 and S2, which aim to promote sustainable forms of development...”

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION