

Supplement to the agenda for

Planning and Regulatory Committee

Wednesday 25 February 2026

10.00 am

**Conference Room 1 - Herefordshire Council, Plough Lane
Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE**

Schedule of Updates

Public Speakers

Pages

3 - 16

17 - 18

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 25 FEBRUARY 2026

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

252698 – CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDING TO STORAGE (USE CLASS B8) (RETROSPECTIVE) AT PONDEROSA, TWYFORD COMMON ROAD, RIDGEHILL, HEREFORD, HR2 8AE


For: Mr & Mrs Shaw per Mr Tom McEwen, The Rough Farm, Garway Hill, Herefordshire, HR2 8HD

OFFICER COMMENTS

In response to a number of queries which were raised during the site inspection:

- Condition 8 of the recommendation states: *“No goods, plant, materials or machinery associated with the approved use of the building shall be deposited or stored outside the building or land within the application red line boundary at any time.”*
- Hardstanding can be installed under permitted development provided it uses porous/permeable materials (e.g., gravel, permeable concrete block, or porous asphalt) that allow water to drain naturally.
- As part of the site clearance that was undertaken during early 2025 which includes part of the site boundaries for this application, a Planning Enforcement officer visited the site to inspect what had been undertaken as part of wider alleged breaches which relate more to the wider site. They sought a second opinion from the Council’s Tree Officer who did not identify that the trees removed would benefit from a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The Council’s Ecologist, whom has been consulted on this particular planning application, has not raised concerns in terms of the Hedgerow Regulations. To assist, photographs taken by the Enforcement officer in April 2025 are provided below along with how the site was prior to works commencing in Streetview images from April 2024:





In terms of mitigation in lieu of the removal of vegetation undertaken, this can be secured by planting and, if needs be, a condition. Officers would emphasise and exercise some caution that this site is small scale and that the application is essentially a change of use only and thus conditions for additional landscaping should be carefully considered in terms of the tests of use of planning conditions.

Members may wish to be aware that there was previously a permitted development right that, subject to Prior Approval under Class P of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended), did allow for change of use from use class B8 (storage and distribution) to use class C3 (residential). However, any application under that prior approval Class P needed to have been granted on or before 10th June 2019 such that development would not be permitted under Class P if an application was made after this date. A link to the relevant legislation can be accessed here:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/596/schedule/2/part/3/crossheading/class-p-storage-or-distribution-centre-to-dwellinghouses>

As stated in the officer report, the lawful baseline use of Ponderosa in planning terms is a stable block but there has been no update to Class P through statutory instruments since as far as officers are aware. Given the current status of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended), officers would view that Class P is essentially defunct though members should remember they are only to consider the application that is before them.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

**251696 - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CHURCH.
ERECTION OF 52 BED CARE FACILITY ON THREE FLOORS
WITH ANCILLARY AREAS AND PARKING AT ST BARNABAS
CHURCH, ST BARNABAS CLOSE, HEREFORD,
HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1DT**

**For: Mr Patient per Mr Michael Driver, The Old Grain Store, Sir
Johns, Hengrave, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP28 6NB**

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

There are two additional representations received:

- 1. See presentation from Simon Patient at Appendix 1**
- 2. Correspondence from Tim Phelps – in full below.**

In my short speaking time slot tomorrow, I will raise an issue alluded to, but not spelled out, by your case officers summary, and on this basis, I reckon the planning committee would almost certainly be in breach of their statutory duties under Core Strategy Policy SC1, if approval were to be given at present.

That SC1 Directive- referred to on pages 71 and 76, sections 6:51-53 and also referring to further para. 5.1.33 of Core Strategy document , obliges you to protect and retain existing social and community facilities except in very specific circumstances, and the proposals before you have completely failed to truthfully demonstrate that these conditions have been met.

Please additionally note: it is NOT acceptable within the terms of the Directive to substitute a nursing home extension in place of demolition and loss of sound community facilities, from which many more people benefit, and for which this Directive affords protection.

I will not be able to outline the many ways in which this proposal fails to align with the Directive's requirements in my short speaking time, and therefore I set them out below, so you have the information available with which to inform your decision making process.

The Policy wording of SC1- Social and Community Facilities, your notes page 76, states Existing facilities WILL be retained unless:

- 1) It can be demonstrated that appropriate alternative facilities are available, or can be provided;*

This has NOT been demonstrated; The largest group previously regularly using this building and site for meetings , several times a week , for groups of up to 100+, despite searching continuously over the last nearly 2 years, since having to leave, have found nowhere close to suitable or equivalent within the whole City of Hereford, of scale, condition and access. That search goes on; the demand is still there.

Hereford is short both of funds and available premises to provide alternative large size community buildings in sound condition.

2) It can be shown that the facility is no longer required, viable or fit for purpose

This has NOT been demonstrated; Yes , the Church of England no longer needs it, but its Church Commissioners and Local Agents have brazenly and deliberately withheld use from other eligible groups and obstructed other Christian groups from continuing to fulfill- possibly as fully as ever in its entire history-the founder and donor's vision that the building should be a centre in this part of town for christian worship and community use.

It is also worth noting in passing, that one of the 120+ robust objections sent to the Church Commissioners when they put forward proposals for closure and demolition, was by the well regarded local vicar of St.Pauls Tupsley, (now retired) who strongly supported the continuation of Oasis Church and other christian groups use of the premises as desirable and appropriate. Sadly the Church Commissioners were not listening, and were only intent on their predetermined course, whatever anyone else said.

The church / community building can be , with updating and maintenance,, and can continue to be ,a community asset fit for purpose, without cost to the council or ratepayers of the district; my understanding of the directive is that in such circumstances, the facility must be retained for community use- and nothing else overrides this statutory requirement.

3) Has been vacant- yes-, but for less than two years, and only because antagonistic policies of owners were intent on maximising profit at sale by demolishing the established building , and forcing out existing other church group users, so it could be marketed as a development site rather than honouring the statutory planning SC1 Directive, where the requirement is that such community assets must not be removed.

4) Has been marketed for community use without success; I understand a significant offer was made by the existing church group using the building, but this was rejected, because owners were intent on profit maximisation, on basis of higher open market price of a development site- although no such permission had been granted- and may not legally be able to be made- for demolition.

5)Finally- your officers report section 6:55; Tensions (of policy directives) are noted.

BUT I contest, the following statement then made:

'But the likelihood of the site being used for its original intended purpose (ie as a centre for christian worship and community use) is negligible'

- for all the reasons outlined above.

As said, I reckon it to be your statutory duty to retain these premises for continued church and community use, as required in the SC1 directive, unless suitable equivalent building, in size and decent condition and access can be provided within the City for continuing and future church and community use.

Possibly the only other way this directive could be complied with, allowing, with regret , this decent local landmark and building and vision to be erased, would be for the developer to be obliged, before demolition can be approved, to provide the council with the full sum, probably of between £500k-£700k, of the open market value of the community asset to be lost,- based on valuation with existing community use permissions- as a ring marked sum

strictly only to build/ upgrade or refurbish an alternative large building within the city available for larger church and community groups for the future.

Please stand up for the whole local community and fulfill your statutory obligations by insisting on the correct full implementation of the spirit and letter of the SC1 Directive, and ensure that deep pocketed developers cannot simply roll you over and rob the community of a valued church and community asset; either insist it is protected and retained , or if not, ensure the community is fully reimbursed, ahead of development, so the council can provide suitable replacement equivalent public premises, funded by the developer.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

251998 - PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF SEVEN HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AT LAND AT REAR OF MORTIMER COURT, BRIMFIELD, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4NQ

For: Mr Yarnold, Bannals Lane, Stoke Bliss, Tenbury Wells, WR15 8RZ

During the Committee Site Visit, a query was raised re the bedroom numbers of the proposed dwellings.

For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify the contradiction between paragraphs 2.1 (incorrect) and 7.26 (correct), it is confirmed that proposal includes 5no. 2-bedroom dwellings and 2no. 3-bedroom dwellings.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

252059 - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF PUBLIC HOUSE TO A SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE WITH NEW PORCH, PARTIAL DEMOLITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS AT TEMESIDE INN, LITTLE HEREFORD, LUDLOW, SY8 4AT

For: Mr Leonard per Mr DF Baume, 8 Peak View, Bollington, Cheshire, SK10 5GJ

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF AGENDA / REPORT.

Members of the Planning and Regulatory Committee received email correspondence dated 23 February 2026 making further comments in respect of the application, and the contents of the Committee Report.

It is copied below in full.

Dear Councillor,

I am writing to you on behalf of CAMRA (the Campaign for Real Ale) on the matter of a planning application appertaining to the Temeside Inn at Little Hereford, that is due to be determined by the Planning & Regulatory Committee on Wednesday 25th February. It is quite unprecedented for CAMRA to deem it necessary to write to the members of a council

Schedule of Committee Updates

planning committee, but there are grave concerns that the recommendation by the planning case officer to approve the application to convert the Temeside Inn into a dwelling would result in the unnecessary loss of the pub. I would be very grateful if you would indulge me and read the following. Please note that this letter is also copied to the planning officer, Mr Ollie Jones, as a matter of courtesy.

The officer's report (that supports the recommendation) concedes that alternative provision (i.e. other pubs) are not within walking distance of Little Hereford. Furthermore, he also acknowledges that there has not been any recent effort made to market the premises for sale as a pub business. CAMRA asserts that there would be interest in acquiring the pub if it were to be offered for sale at a realistic price. There are strong reasons to support this position:

- Attached to this e-mail is a statement made by a previous operator of the Temeside Inn. The fact that she ran a successful business there for ~2 years needs to be noted. (this document is cut and pasted from the planning file)*
- Due to a history of flooding, the applicant states that he has not been able to obtain insurance to cover the pub premises. However, there are numerous other pubs across the county that have recently been inundated by flood water, including the Dog Inn and Temple Bar in Ewyas Harold and the Bridge Inn at Michealchurch Escley. Whilst it will have been traumatic for the pub-owners at the time, the fact that all these venues promptly re-opened and are successfully trading again demonstrates that it is possible to own and/or operate a viable business in a flood-prone pub.*
- Besides the loss of the last commercial social amenity, what also needs to also be considered is the economic impact that would be felt should the Temeside Inn be converted into a house. It offers employment in a rural area; provides demand for goods and services in the supply chain, and as a destination pub it adds to the tourist, day-tripper and the dining offer for Herefordshire.*
- A number of Herefordshire pubs that had been closed for periods all longer than the Temeside Inn have recently re-opened. These include the Lamb Inn at Stoke Prior; the Kings Head at Docklow, and the Riverside Inn at Ross. Earlier this month the Cliffe Arms at Mathon was purchased and is now slated for refurbishment ahead of re-opening later this year. Between them these four pubs were closed for a total of over 48 years. It was only the action of Herefordshire Council declining change of use planning applications at various times for all of these pubs that ultimately brought them back onto the pub property market. Without those positive planning interventions all these pubs would have been lost forever. Under new ownership, they are now thriving and serving their local communities once more. Surely, the Temeside Inn now deserves its chance?*

For these reasons, it is CAMRA's strongly held view that there is great merit in seeking to see the Temeside Inn marketed for sale as a pub. Whilst there exists a likelihood that long term social and economic harm to the community of Little Hereford can be avoided, this should be considered. However, this outcome can only be achieved if this application is resisted.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Best regards,

Mark Haslam

On behalf of HEREFORDSHIRE CAMRA

A further letter from **Abbigael Court, 48 Honddu Court, Hereford** has also been received and is copied in full below:

I have been informed that a planning application has been put in to convert the Temeside Inn into a house. Having run this pub from February 2015 to March 2017 I would like to share my experiences of running the business there. Firstly, it needs to be made clear that I ran a successful and profitable business at the pub for the whole time I was there as the leaseholder. It was always very well supported, not just by locals but by visitors too. It helps a lot that it is on a main road, and it's riverside setting made sure it was very busy on fine days in the summer. Also, the hosting of events including private parties by the likes of the local Young Farmers, Weddings, Shoot Dinners, Christmas meals for local business' made for a strong trade across the whole year. We also had 2 pool teams, the Tenbury men's and woman's tug of war team, the local choir, WI, would all use us as a base bringing in lots of trade on quieter days and winter. The locals were so supportive of the pub even after being closed for some time before I reopened. It also got regular trade from the nearby caravan site at Westbrook, the site doesn't have its own clubhouse, so the pub is a major attraction for their visitors. I can't see how the Temeside could suddenly become unprofitable. I think if it were to re-open that there is no reason why it shouldn't do a good trade once more. The things that made it successful have not gone away. Should you require evidence of my successful business at the Temeside Inn, then I would be happy to provide copies of my books for the time I was there.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The correspondence from CAMRA reiterates matters previously raised during the consultation and their representation at that stage, including arguments relating to the continued viability of the public house, the absence of recent marketing, flood risk and insurance considerations, and the social and economic value of the facility. These matters have been fully summarised and addressed in the published Committee Report, particularly within the assessment against Core Strategy Policy SC1 and Policy BLH6 of the Brimfield and Little Hereford NDP.

The officer recommendation does not rely on a conclusion that the public house is no longer viable or required, but instead is based on the alternative-provision limb of the relevant development plan policies. The correspondence does not raise any new material planning considerations and does not alter the officer's assessment or recommendation.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION



Heritage Manor – St Barnabas site 25 February 2026

Presentation of plans

Who are Heritage Manor?

- Small group of five nursing homes operating in Herefordshire and Worcestershire for over 30 years;
- Employ over 300 staff, and proud to say runner-up at 2025 Care Employer of the Year for Great British Care Awards;
- Owner of Newstead House in Hereford since 2016, adjacent to the proposed development;
- Newstead won Top 20 home in Midlands three times in last five years, along with Gold Standard Framework for palliative care
- Our homes have a very good reputation with Herefordshire council quality teams, and I believe CQC;
- We are looking to build and then operate ourselves the St Barnabas site for many years to come.



MISSION STATEMENT


To provide warm and friendly care within a homely environment, delivered by well-trained and motivated staff, to enable residents to live their best lives.



Is Newstead House meeting that mission?



- We are fully staffed, unlike the majority of Herefordshire homes;
- Our challenge now is that not all rooms are en-suite, the home is not purpose-built and access outside can be problematic for certain residents;
- To continue to “enable residents to live their best lives”, we need larger and modern rooms, easy-to-use communal space, better access outside and living space designed for couples;
- Without the ability to adapt, older homes will have to close;
- 2025 H&W ICB figures predict a 50% increase in the over 85 demography to 2030, the key segment that we look after, and HCC figures confirm this. There is a pressing need.



Source:
Herefordshire
MPS Apr21

Review: My Father was part of the Newstead family, from June 2024, until he passed away in November 2025. We were always welcomed when we visited and, as we live in Yorkshire, we were always kept updated on Dad's health. Dad, wasn't one to always join in with the activities, but was always given the option to take part if he wished to. Many of the staff and management, at Newstead, have become friends and their care and compassion for Dad throughout his time there, always made us feel he was safe and secure, when we couldn't be there at all times.

The way they cared for Dad, especially, in the last few days of his life was exceptional, as is the support that we have received, since he passed. Thank you all so much.

Overall Experience ★★★★★	Facilities ★★★★★	Care / Support ★★★★★	Cleanliness ★★★★★
Treated with Dignity ★★★★★	Food & Drink ★★★★★	Staff ★★★★★	Activities ★★★★★
Management ★★★★★	Safety / Security ★★★★★	Rooms ★★★★★	Value for Money ★★★★★

Review: Our Mum lived at Newstead for 4 years and over that time her health condition meant she gradually became more frail until, sadly, she passed away in September 2025. During that time Mum's changing needs were well catered for-even when her involvement in group activities lessened the Activities team would spend time with Mum on a 1:1 basis. The carers were very good and supported Mum with her daily needs and established and maintained a good rapport with Mum and the family. The care Mum received in her final days was exceptional and much appreciated by my sisters and myself. Thank you to all the staff at Newstead.

Overall Experience ★★★★★	Facilities ★★★★★	Care / Support ★★★★★	Cleanliness ★★★★★
Treated with Dignity ★★★★★	Food & Drink ★★★★★	Staff ★★★★★	Activities ★★★★★
Management ★★★★★	Safety / Security ★★★★★	Rooms ★★★★★	Value for Money ★★★★★


Review: Mum lived at Newstead for over three years before she passed away in July 2025. She was very well cared for throughout the whole time she was there but the care she received at the end of her life was exceptional and she was treated with great dignity and respect. Our family were always welcomed at the home and my father in particular became part of the Newstead family. He visited every day and was encouraged to join in with the activities with Mum and then as an individual when Mum was no longer able to join in (but would sit and watch). In fact he still goes to the home several times a week to join in his favourite activities and is always welcomed as an old friend. It is incredibly, incredibly rare for any bank staff to be on shift and I am sure that this contributes to staff creating a family atmosphere. All staff are friendly and kind - the manager, nursing staff, health care assistants, cleaners and kitchen staff equally and they greet you when you arrive. A really lovely home.

Overall Experience ★★★★★	Facilities ★★★★★	Care / Support ★★★★★	Cleanliness ★★★★★
Treated with Dignity ★★★★★	Food & Drink ★★★★★	Staff ★★★★★	Activities ★★★★★
Management ★★★★★	Safety / Security ★★★★★	Rooms ★★★★★	Value for Money ★★★★★

Journey to today



- Without significant capital investment, the longer term viability of the existing home will become progressively more difficult. An approval will allow us to re-configure the existing home;
- We have spent two years working with Heather Carlisle and her team, going through three pre-apps to produce a design appropriate to the site;
 - Pulled building back from road and neighbours, along with significant reductions in height and mass;
 - Incorporated feedback historic buildings officer and council architect on design;
 - Worked with Councillor Ben Proctor and consulted with Admiral's Close neighbours;
 - Fundamental to the design is access to the outside and fresh air.
- Final design commercially not ideal at 52 beds compared to modern care home builds, but it works complementary to the existing home.
- There will not be a physical link between the two buildings, and we will be offering nursing provision;



PLANNING and REGULATORY COMMITTEE

25 February 2026

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Ref No.	Applicant	Proposal and Site	Application No.	Page No.
6	Mr & Mrs Shaw per Mr Tom McEwan	Change of use of building to storage (Use Class B8) (retrospective) at PONDEROSA, TWYFORD COMMON ROAD, RIDGEHILL, HEREFORD, HR2 8AE	252698	25
OBJECTOR MR WHURR (Local Resident)				
7	Mr Patient per Mr Michael Driver	Proposed demolition of existing Church. Erection of 52 Bed care facility on three floors with ancillary areas and parking at ST BARNABAS CHURCH, ST BARNABAS CLOSE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1DT	251696	43
OBJECTOR MR PHELPS & MR WOOD (Local Residents) SUPPORTER MR PATIENT (Applicant)				
8	Mr Yarnold per Mr Mark Yarnold	Proposed construction of seven houses and associated landscaping at LAND AT REAR OF MORTIMER COURT, BRIMFIELD, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4NQ	251998	103
PARISH COUNCIL MR HARRIS (Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council) OBJECTOR MR NORRIS (Local resident) SUPPORTER MR YARNOLD (Applicant)				
9	Mr Leonard per Mr DF Baume	Proposed change of use of public house to a single dwellinghouse with new porch, partial demolitions and associated external works at TEMESIDE INN, LITTLE HEREFORD, LUDLOW, HEREFORDSHIRE, SY8 4AT	252059	129
PARISH COUNCIL MR HARRIS (Brimfield and Little Hereford Group Parish Council) OBJECTOR MR COMLEY (Local resident) SUPPORTER MR LEONARD (Applicant)				

