

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 8 April 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

242783 - A HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION COMPRISING: AN APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A DAY NURSERY (USE CLASS E (F)) AND FOODSTORE (USE CLASS E (A)) INCLUDING ACCESS, CAR PARKING LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORK; & AN APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A MEDICAL CENTRE (USE CLASS E(E)), WITH AT LAND SOUTH OF LEADON WAY (A417) AND EAST OF DYMOCK ROAD (B4216), LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE,

For: Lidl GB Ltd per Mr Rob Mitchell, Brunel House, 2 Fitzalan Road, Cardiff, CF24 0EB

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Two further representations have been received (1 x objection and 1 x support) have been received and officers consider that these matters are addressed within the Committee Report.

A further representation has been received from the Ledbury Health Partnership. It raises matters relating to the provision of the medical centre land and officers consider that these matters are addressed within the Committee Report.

Four letters of additional representation / correspondence have been received from Mr Martin Robeson (on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd) dated 24, 26 & 27 March 2026, and 6 April 2026. These have been published to the planning register (website):

[Planning Application Details - Herefordshire Council](#)

Comments are principally made in relation to the grounds previously identified in the legal challenge.

Officers consider that the matters identified are comprehensively addressed within the Committee Report. However, the following commentary is provided for completeness.

In terms of Ground 1, Members are advised that the interpretation and application of Core Strategy Policy E2, and the assessment of compliance with the development plan taken as a whole under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is ultimately a matter for the Local Planning Authority when determining the application, not for the applicant. This issue is addressed fully within the Committee Report, which supersedes all previous reports, and sets out the Local Planning Authority officers' assessment of Policy E2 and its relevance to the determination of this application.

No further applicant commentary is therefore necessary in this regard.

The correspondence raises further comment in respect of Ground 2 of the Consent Order, relating to the previous misdirection in the application of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It suggests that clarification from the applicant might reasonably have been expected in relation to this matter. As stated above, the determination of the application for planning permission is for the Local Planning Authority. However, and for completeness, following the quashing by consent of the previous grant of planning

permission, officers have considered afresh whether para.127 of the NPPF is engaged and is a material consideration. Officers consider that it is not. The proposal includes two of the land uses which are encouraged for the site through the Ledbury NDP (policy EE1.2). The proposal does not include employment floorspace within use class E(g) nor a hotel, which are also encouraged by that policy. As set out in the main report, the NDP policy does not require all uses encouraged within the policy to come forward on the site. Therefore, officers consider that the proposal is for uses for which the site is allocated. Para.127 of the NPPF, which addresses the approach where there is no reasonable prospect of an application for planning permission coming forward for uses for which the site is allocated in a development plan, is not engaged. For completeness, there is no evidence about the prospect of employment or hotel uses coming forward on the site. Given that officers consider that para.127 is not engaged, there is no requirement for such evidence. As such, NPPF para.127 is not considered to be engaged and is not a material consideration in the determination of the application. It did not form part of the assessment in the main report for this reason.

There has been no undisclosed material prepared in relation to this issue or at all. All material considerations that have been relied upon by officers are set out within the Committee Report before Members, and the documents are published and accessible on the Herefordshire Council website.

Noting the points made in terms of Ground 3, Members are advised that a revised draft Section 106 agreement was published on the planning register on 12 March 2026, and that the scope and effect of the proposed obligations are explained within the Committee Report.

In respect of Ground 4, comments are made with respect to the timing and publication of the request for and outcome of, the Environmental Impact Assessment screening. It is noted that the Screening Opinion has since been published, and reference is made to the fact that the original request for screening was not previously visible on the planning application webpage.

Members are advised that a formal request for an EIA Screening Opinion was made by the applicant, and the Local Planning Authority issued its EIA Screening Opinion on 18 March 2026 under a separate reference, namely [260181](#). The Screening Opinion and associated Screening Matrix were made publicly available on the Council's planning register on that date and as is normal practice, these documents can be accessed on the Council's website under reference 260181.

The Local Planning Authority has issued a note including a correction to and clarification of the EIA Screening Opinion, dated 1 April 2026, which addresses the responses to Question 13.2 of the Screening Matrix. That Note, together with the original Screening Opinion and Matrix, has also been published on the planning register and has also been added to the decision tab of the associated planning application (ref: 242783). The documents are therefore available under both reference 260181 and [242783](#) on the Council's website.

As a final point, officers would draw members attention to supplementary information as part of correspondence and titled '[Email from agent re updated sales density 18.2.26](#)'. This is addressed within the Committee Report.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

251666 & 251667	PROVISION OF SECURITY CAMERAS FIXED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING AND PROVISION OF BOUNDARY FENCING FOR SAFEGUARDING PURPOSES AT CHURCHILL HOUSE, 3 VENNS LANE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1DE. For: Mr Rogers per Mr Andrew Baker, Walnut House, Wellington, Hereford, Herefordshire HR4 8AZ	
--------------------------------	--	--

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

One additional representation has been received that states:

Last week, I took three photographs of the front elevation of Churchill Gardens. It would be helpful to me and I'm sure to members of the committee also if these (or similar) were included in the visuals which the Planning Officer traditionally includes in their introduction.

1. Side elevation of Churchill Gardens house showing the vehicle entrance gate.



2. Front elevation (close up) illustrating the view of the house from the public footpath linking the public car park off Venns Lane and Aylestone Hill.



3. Side elevation from the public park which leads to an area locally known as the Sensory Gardens which lies to the west of the house.

