

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 2 April 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

P140285/O - HYBRID APPLICATION - PART OUTLINE FOR 76 DWELLINGS (35% AFFORDABLE) AND A BUSINESS CENTRE FOR B1 USES, WITH ALL MATTERS EXCEPT ACCESS TO BE RESERVED. PART FULL, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SINGLE B1 BUSINESS UNIT AND THE MEANS OF ACCESS THERETO AT LAND AT PORTHOUSE FARM, TENBURY ROAD, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4NJ

For: Mr Harrison per Mr John Wilson, 66 Stratford Road, Shirley, Solihull, West Midlands B90 3LP

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Transportation Manager – No objection subject to the imposition of conditions

Economic Development Manager – Welcomes the introduction of an employment element within the revised scheme. The employment element will help to meet an identified need for employment land in Bromyard.

It is agreed that the demand for employment units is most likely to come from local start-ups or smaller local companies looking to expand and the proposal would meet this need. The applicant's demand led approach is prudent and would give some flexibility to meet specific requirements.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Bromyard and Winslow Town Council have indicated that they intend to complete a Neighbourhood Plan, but have yet to formally submit the area which this is to cover.

Condition 17 of the recommendation refers to the provision of the two proposed accesses onto Tenbury Road. As the application is made in outline with layout reserved for future consideration, more detailed conditions that relate to parking, turning and estate road layouts can reasonably be imposed on any reserved matters application should planning permission be forthcoming in this instance.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

In the third clause of the Draft Heads of Terms Agreement reference is made to open market and affordable dwellings. The reference to affordable dwellings should be omitted and the calculation will be based only on the open market dwellings proposed.

P132924/O - SITE FOR ERECTION OF 40 DWELLINGS 1, 2, 3 AND 4 BED UNITS AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AT GADBRIDGE ROAD, WEOBLEY, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 8SN

For: Mr Barnes per Mr Harris, Stoneycroft Planning & Development Consultants, 11 Paulbrook Road, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 5DN

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The Parish Council has made a further response to the application as follows:

The Parish Council would like to make the following comments in respect of the amended Transportation Statement. Receipt of the traffic census and speed survey data included in the report was delayed and we would note that this has limited the time available to us to assess and respond.

The Statement We note that the text of the report is the same as previously submitted apart from changes to paragraph 2.4 to take account of data received from the new survey. However, it also again includes reference to the traffic counts having been conducted on High Street (also erroneously referred to as being a 'continuation of Gadbridge Road') whereas it was in fact, and as requested, conducted on Gadbridge Road.

Appendix A – Photographs These are limited to the immediate area around the proposed site and give no indication of the congestion issues on Gadbridge Road travelling west along to the junction with High Street and Hereford Road, particularly that caused by parked cars, including those of patients visiting the doctors and dentists surgeries, or at the pinch point near 'The Old Post House'.

Appendix B – Plans The site layout (for 41 houses) is different from that submitted in the application (40 houses) and also does not show the proposed accesses from dwellings sited between the existing Bearcroft estate boundary and the access to the new development which might pose additional safety issues for vehicles and pedestrians entering and exiting the site off Gadbridge Road. The development's proximity to the existing access to the Village Hall has already been highlighted by the Parish Council.

Appendix C – Road Traffic Count and Speed Survey The survey was conducted on the western end of Gadbridge Road near to the junction with Hereford Road and High Street, below the vehicular entrance to 'The Old Post House' but before the access to the Unicorn Court development of 12 houses. The report states that the traffic flow on Gadbridge Road has an average peak generation between 11 am and 4 pm. Our own analysis of the report data re traffic count would indicate that this period is in fact between 8 am and 6 pm (there appears to be no separate analysis included with the survey census data listing the totals of the hourly traffic figures per day for the period which would illustrate this) and we consider that these times naturally reflect the flow of commuters travelling to and from work and schools, and patients attending the doctors and dentists surgeries. We therefore cannot see how the traffic flow peaks for the proposed housing, stated in the report as likely to be early morning and evening, will not have an impact on the local road network or why the demographic of residents living in the proposed development would be any different to those

in the adjoining existing estates, Bearcroft and Apple Meadow, and less likely to use Gadbridge Road at the same times. In addition to journeys relating to the existing houses feeding on to Gadbridge Road the census figures will include many regular journeys made by a variety of types of vehicles, as identified by the survey data, including farm machinery and delivery vehicles and of those travelling via Gadbridge Road from neighbouring areas, e.g. Weobley Marsh and Dilwyn, as well as those visiting the surgeries which serve a wide area.

Although the report relates to the survey conducted on Gadbridge Road, it has again repeated its statements included in the report for the 2004 survey conducted on High Street and concludes that there was 'a variety of results over the week of the survey with no defined pattern'. The only variety in the results would seem to be a not unexpected change for Saturday and Sunday. It also states that 'traffic numbers on this stretch of road are generally very low'. There would appear to be no support for this statement as there is no comparison or benchmark data provided, e.g. for similar unclassified roads.

The report data also shows the traffic speeds on this part of the road for the census period. We would suggest that this does not give a true reflection of the speeds attained by vehicles on Gadbridge Road as the census equipment was sited near to the junction with Hereford Road and High Street and vehicles would therefore be expected to be achieving slower speeds at this point.

Appendix E – TRICS data Although it is acknowledged in the report that there are limited sets of data available for similar sized mixed private housing, we consider the five sets that have been used are not comparative. They appear to be in suburban locations and do not compare with the rural nature of the proposed development at Gadbridge Road with the demographic and the vehicle movements likely to be different.

In conclusion, we consider that the report and data provided by the traffic census does not support claims that the proposed development will not have a major impact on the local road network.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The location of the survey equipment was changed at the request of the parish council and local people in order to take account of movements associated with the doctor's surgery, dental practice and Bearcroft. The consultant did raise some concerns that this would not give an accurate reflection of traffic speed as vehicles would either be reducing speed towards the Gadbridge Road / High Street junction, or increasing as they had just negotiated the same junction. However, it is your officers' view that speeds are typically low along Gadbridge Road and the majority of the site, including the access, falls within a 30mph zone.

The Transport Statement has been completed by an appropriately qualified consultant using an accepted methodology. The contents of the statement have been considered by the Council's Transportation Manager, including traffic flows along Gadbridge Road, and he has raised no objection to the proposal.

The limitations of the TRICS data are acknowledged in the Transport Statement and the comments made by the parish council that vehicle movements associated with the development are likely to be different due to the rural context of this site are accepted. With no other available data however, any alternative figure would simply be an estimate and not evidence based.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

It has been noted that the education part of the Draft Heads of Terms Agreement does not include reference to St Marys RC High School. This should be included but will not affect the amounts referred to.

**P133251/F - CONTINUED VARIATION OF CONDITION 21 OF
PLANNING PERMISSION DMS/112675/F DATED 22/11/2011 AT
THE HEREFORD ACADEMY, MARLBROOK ROAD,
HEREFORD, HR2 7NG**

**For: The Hereford Academy, Marlbrook Road, Hereford, HR2
7NG**

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Following receipt of additional comments from the local residents, Officers requested that the Environmental Health Officer visit and consider the issues further (please note that there has recently been a change in officer so this is essentially a second opinion on this proposal).

Comments were received as follows:

I have given this proposal further consideration and have visited the site. The flood lighting does not appear to be directed in a way that would be a cause of nuisance to neighbours.

Whilst noise from sporting activity from the pitches is audible outside neighbouring dwellings it was not excessive when I visited, and would be very much reduced inside the said dwellings. The application in effect only permits the increased use of these pitches for a relatively short period, and only during the winter months and as such I do not think any increase in noise can be considered so significant as to be considered a nuisance and therefore I concur with the earlier response of 'no objection'.

N.B. If lights are shining 'directly' onto neighbours and causing nuisance I am of the opinion that these could be readily redirected.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

132851/O - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 120 DWELLINGS), ACCESS, PARKING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE WITH PLAY FACILITIES AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND SOUTH OF HAMPTON DENE ROAD, HEREFORD

For: The Owner and/or Occupier per Ms Rachel Adams, 1 Broomhall Business Centre, Broomhall Lane, Worcester, WR5 2NT

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Appeal against non-determination

The applicant has lodged an appeal against non-determination with the Planning Inspectorate. The Inspectorate has confirmed that the appeal is valid and that jurisdiction for decision-taking is no longer with the local planning authority. It is the intention, however, that Members make a resolution today confirming how they would have determined the application were it within their jurisdiction. This will inform the forthcoming appeal.

Additional Traffic Manager Comments

The development is predicted to add 51 trips in the morning peak to Hampton Dene Road, 43 going north and 8 going south. The access junction itself has no capacity issues at all in respect of these flows, with plenty of reserve capacity.

In terms of existing flows, this equates to an 18% increase in northbound trips and 3% in southbound trips in the morning peak. Both the mini roundabout junction at Church Road and the priority junction with A438 can both cope with these flows and are well within capacity. The only junction that exhibits any capacity issues is the signalised junction at Folly Lane, as previously commented.

The evening peak is also not a problem, with no school traffic on Hampton Dene Road.

In terms of accident record, there are only two recorded personal injury accidents on Hampton Dene Road between Ledbury Road and Church Road in the last 5 years, those both being slight injury with one in 2010 and one in 2011 and each with a single person injury.

Therefore as previously stated, as I do not consider the likely residual detriment to the Tuspley signalised junction to be severe, I do not consider there to be any highways grounds for refusal.

Comments in relation to S106 agreement

The applicant has confirmed a preparedness to make contributions via S106 on the strict proviso that the Council can demonstrate that such contributions comply with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations i.e. that contributions are:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

To this extent the applicant is awaiting further justification from the Council in relation to the contributions towards educational infrastructure and the costs associated with the identified highway improvements. The resolution is for approval subject to completion of the S106, which will necessitate further discussion.

One further letter of representation has been received. It raises no new material planning issues.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

That Members provide a resolution confirming that subject to the conditions attached to the report and the completion of a Community Infrastructure Levy compliant S106 agreement, they would have been minded to delegate authority to officers to issue planning permission and that this position is adopted in appeal proceedings.