

Agenda item

181494 - LAND ADJACENT TO SPRING COTTAGE, HEADBROOK, KINGTON, HR5 3DY

Proposed land for residential development and associated work together with public open space and local green space.

Decision:

The application was approved contrary to the Case Officer's recommendation.

Minutes:

(Proposed land for residential development and associated work together with public open space and local green space.)

(Councillor James fulfilled the role of local ward member and accordingly had no vote on this application.)

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr M Fitton, of Kington Town Council spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr B Brown, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mr M Turner, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor TM James, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- The question was whether the environmental harm outweighed the community benefit.
- One benefit would be that land by the riverside would be opened up for community use. There was a recreation area at the other end of the town but a lack of outdoor community space in the part of the town where the application site was.
- Discussions were taking place as to whether some land could be made available for allotments. There was a shortfall in provision in Kington.
- In relation to the representations by Heritage England he observed that the conservation area was a considerable distance from the application site. It could only be viewed from one small part of the conservation area.

- There was considerable opposition to the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and questions as to whether it was deliverable.
- Part of the site had been included in the 2012 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- The houses on Headbrook had no gardens. The proposal might offer the opportunity to provide them with some garden space.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The proposal was sustainable development close to an area of open space from which residents would benefit. It was within walking distance of Kington. It would provide housing that Kington needed, noting the concerns about the deliverability of the NDP.
- The access was achievable.
- There would be benefit if garden space could be provided for the houses currently backing onto the site.
- The outdoor sports investment plan would provide welcome benefits for young people.
- It was questioned whether there was an adverse effect on the conservation area.
- The draft NDP stated that the whole site should be designated as Local Green Space. The proposed development offered a way of providing affordable green space accessible to the public in a part of the town where there was currently no such provision.
- The development would link the newer Eardisley Road development to the historic core of the Town.
- The riverside was an important element of the town contributing to its character. The site was unimproved meadow land, which was in short supply.
- There were few letters in support of the application and a considerable number opposing it. The Town Council, the draft NDP, the CPRE, Historic England, the Conservation Officer (Landscapes) and the Conservation Manager (Historic Buildings) objected to the proposal.
- The draft NDP identified other housing sites and they should be explored before considering the application site.

The Development Manager commented that the indicative layout suggested land would be given to existing properties on Headbrook but no assurance had been given and this could not be required by condition. Similarly allotments

may be provided as part of a reserved matters application but could not be required to be provided.

The Lead Development Manager confirmed that if approved a S106 agreement would be required.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He commented that it was a difficult issue. The benefit of preserving a lovely meadow had to be set against the benefit of public access and provision of housing including affordable housing.

Councillor Greenow proposed and Councillor Edwards seconded a motion that the application be approved on the grounds that it was consistent with policies SS1, SS2 OS2 and MT1, with a S106 agreement also to be provided. The motion was carried with 11 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted on the grounds that the application was supported by policies SS1, SS2 OS2 and MT1, with approval to be subject to a S106 agreement to be prepared by officers after consultation with the Chairman and local ward member, and officers named in the scheme of delegation to officers be authorised to detail the conditions and reasons put forward for approval.