# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Date: 9 December 2015

Morning

**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

151145 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 21 DWELLINGS ALONG WITH NEW ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT FIELD ADJOINING A4112 AND CHESTNUT AVENUE, KIMBOLTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE

For: Mrs Susan Churchward, Moreton Farmhouse, Moreton Eye, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 0DP

#### ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

The applicant has provided an updated drainage strategy plan, in the light of the typo identified in the originally submitted plan identified by the Land Drainage Consultant

#### **OFFICER COMMENTS**

This revised plan corrects a direction flow arrow.

#### NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

151641 - PROPOSED ERECTION OF NINE DWELLINGS AT LAND TO REAR OF BRAMLEY HOUSE AND ORCHARD HOUSE, OFF KINGSACRE ROAD, SWAINSHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 0SG

For: Messrs Griffiths per Mr Robert Jolly, P O Box 310, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR14 9FF

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Members of the Parish Council have raised concerns about the assessment of the site as part of the Hereford Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) that was published in mid-November.

The assessed site (CRE10) is 1.3 hectare site and the assessment is as follows:

No known environmental constraints to development. Suitable for residential use, B1 employment and/or mixed use. The suitability of the site for development would be dependent on the extent/delivery of the proposed western (Three Elms) urban extension due to its current poor relationship with the existing urban boundary of Hereford. The site has a medium landscape sensitivity therefore a sensitive design approach would be necessary. Site lies within the relief road corridor, and may be suitable for development. Once a detailed route is established such sites will be reassessed. Site rejected due to inadequate access on advice of HC.

The Parish Council have also raised concern about lack of reference to policy SS4 of the Core Strategy.

#### OFFICER COMMENTS

Officers have been able to confirm that the information provided in the HELAA in respect of this site is incorrect. The Route Corridor identified in the Core Strategy does not extend this far west and therefore does not impact upon this site. Historically, the site was within the 'Outer Route' Corridor and this seems to have been carried over into this document.

The HELAA itself does not set policy but provides background evidence on the potential availability of land for housing and economic development. The identification of sites in the HELAA should not be taken as an intention to allocate these sites for housing/economic development or that planning permission will be granted, likewise, just because a site is rejected in this document does not mean that upon further scrutiny and examination, sites would not obtain planning permission.

The application submission relates to <u>less than half</u> of the site identified in this document. The Council's Highways officer has raised no objection subject to conditions and officers are satisfied that this development would not adversely impact on highway safety and this proposal is compliant with the policies of the Core Strategy.

Officers also acknowledge that whilst Policy SS4 is referenced in the Section 2, there is no specific reference to this strategic policy in the appraisal and would take the opportunity to expand on this point.

Policy SS4 states that; New developments should be designed and located to minimise the impact on the transport network, ensuring that journey times and the efficient and safe operation of the network are not detrimentally impacted. Furthermore, where practicable, development proposals should be accessible by and facilitate a genuine choice of modes of travel including walking cycling and public transport.

This site has direct access onto the A438 and its bus services, by existing footway, and does offer a genuine opportunity to access means of travel for some journeys other than the private motor vehicle. This is not to say that there will be a reliance of the car – but this is so of any development in the Breinton Neighbourhood Area and it could be that accessing buses and footways will be much more accessible and realistic from this location than some of the more rural areas within the Parish. In the context of Policies RA2 and SS4 this must be a consideration.

### NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

150052 - PROPOSED 10 NO DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AT LAND OFF GINHALL LANE, LEOMINSTER,

For: Mr Owens & Parry per Mr John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The Applicant's agent confirms that the visibility requirements are as recommended by the Council's Transportation Manager, following a speed survey. The agent also confirmed that the Town Council have been informed that grounds of prematurity are not substantive grounds for refusal and that the emergence of the Neighbourhood Development Plan cannot hold up determination of sustainable development. S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny Sec.

Schedule of Committee Updates

S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny

### **Transportation**

2 bed - £1966

3 bed - £2949

3 bed - 3932

### **Open Space**

2 bed - £965

3 bed - £1640

4 bed - £2219

### Recycling

£80 per dwelling including affordable

#### **Affordable**

25% of the dwellings being Affordable units covering the whole site

#### NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

150053 - PROPOSED 25 DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES AND CAR SPACES AT LAND AT, AND WEST OF WEST WINDS, CHOLSTREY ROAD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Mr And Mrs Preece per Mr John Needham, 22 Broad Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1NG

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The Applicant's agent confirms that the visibility requirements are as recommended by the Council's Transportation Manager, following a speed survey. The agent also confirmed that the Town Council have been informed that grounds of prematurity are not substantive grounds for refusal and that the emergence of the Neighbourhood Development Plan cannot hold up determination of sustainable development.

S106 headline figures subject to legal scrutiny

### **Transportation**

2 bed - £1966

3 bed - £2949

3 bed - 3932

#### **Open Space**

2 bed - £965

3 bed - £1640

Schedule of Committee Updates

4 bed - £2219

# Recycling

£80 per dwelling including affordable

# **Affordable**

25% of the dwellings being Affordable units covering the whole site

# NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION