

MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 9th February, 2005 at 2.00 p.m.

Present: Councillor D.J. Fleet (Chairman)
Councillor R. Preece (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: Mrs. P.A. Andrews, Mrs. W.U. Attfield, Mrs. E.M. Bew, A.C.R. Chappell, P.J. Edwards, J.G.S. Guthrie, Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, R.I. Matthews, J.C. Mayson, J.W. Newman, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Ms. G.A. Powell, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, Miss F. Short, W.J.S. Thomas, Ms. A.M. Toon, W.J. Walling and D.B. Wilcox

In attendance: Councillors T.W. Hunt (ex-officio) and J.B. Williams (ex-officio)

100. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. S.P.A. Daniels, G.V. Hyde and A.L. Williams.

101. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillors	Item	Interest
Mrs. P.A. Andrews	Item 6 - DCCW2004/2410/F – Proposed enclosure of existing unloading dock and installation of new electrical sliding gate to service yard at: TESCO STORES LTD, ABBOTSMEAD ROAD, BELMONT, HEREFORD, HR2 7XS	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.
R. Preece	Item 10 - DCCE2004/2401/F – Proposed replacement of two dwellings at: 5 AND 6 GRAFTON COURT CLOSE, GRAFTON, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 8BL	Declared a personal interest.
R.M. Wilson	Item 12 - DCCE2004/4340/F – 4 No. 3-bedroom semi-detached houses with integral garages at: BUILDING PLOT BETWEEN 30 AND 32 BARNEBY AVENUE, BARTESTREE, HEREFORD, HR1 4DH	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

Ms. G.A. Powell	Item 14 - DCCW2004/3789/F – Demolition of redundant premises and erection of 10 no. residential dwelling apartments at: 17 WHITECROSS ROAD, HEREFORD, HR4 0DE	Declared a personal interest.
R.I. Matthews	Item 18 - DCCW2004/3917/F – Change of use to small school for pupils 11-16 years at: TRINITY HOUSE, 31 BARRICOMBE DRIVE, HEREFORD, HR4 0NU	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

Mr. K. Bishop, Principal Planning Officer, declared a prejudicial interest in respect of item 5 and a personal interest in respect of item 12 and left the meeting for the duration of these items.

102. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12th January, 2005 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

103. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS

The Sub-Committee received an information report in respect of planning appeals for the central area.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

104. DCCW2004/3085/F - LAND AT ATTWOOD LANE, HOLMER PARK, HEREFORD [AGENDA ITEM 5]

32 dwellings and associated works.

The Central Team Leader updated the Sub-Committee as follows:

- an additional letter had been received from W. & J. Scaffolding Ltd. which reiterated previous objections and provided further details about the number of people employed on the site or in association with the businesses operating from the site;
- Welsh Water had not raised objections in principle and it was noted that recommended condition 4 would ensure that 'No development shall commence until mains drainage is available on site';
- the Conservation Manager had advised that the existing conifer forming part of the frontage of the site was not considered to be of sufficient amenity value to warrant retention;
- the Transportation Manager had advised that there was no technical requirement to provide street lighting as part of this application.

CENTRAL AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE WEDNESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 2005

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Owen spoke on behalf of Holmer Parish Council, Mr. O'Neill had registered to speak on behalf of Holmer and District Residents' Association but was not in attendance at the meeting, and Mr. Brockbank spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor Mrs. S.J. Robertson, the Local Member, expressed a number of views, including:

- the comments of Holmer Parish Council were noted, particularly in relation to the number of people employed on or in association with the site;
- the Head of Community and Economic Development had commented that from an economic development perspective the site should be retained and safeguarded for employment use;
- the Forward Planning Manager had commented that the application ran contrary to current adopted Local Plan policy;
- the site was not redundant and that it would be difficult for businesses to relocate and would have an adverse impact on the local economy;
- the importance of tourism was noted and there was concern that this development would harm the rural feel of this area;
- concerns about the lack of infrastructure and facilities in the locality;
- concerns about the drainage arrangements;
- the value of employment land such as this was noted, especially for small businesses; and
- it was felt that the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the material planning considerations in this instance.

In response, the Central Team Leader highlighted the principal local and national planning policy considerations. In particular, it was reported that the removal of the employment use of the site would bring a benefit to the surrounding residential development by removing what were considered to be non-conforming uses.

Councillor D.B. Wilcox supported the views of the Local Member, particularly given the lack of suitable employment land on the north side of the river and the potential impact upon local businesses and the families that they supported. He also felt that the proposed contributions did not outweigh the significant concerns that had been raised.

Councillor R.I. Matthews expressed his dismay that key information had not been available until this meeting. He felt that the development should be resisted and that references to brownfield redevelopment were misleading given that the site was on the edge of high quality countryside. He proposed that planning permission be refused on the grounds of highway concerns, loss of employment land and the impact on the local community.

A number of Members felt that there was no justification for the loss of this employment land.

A few Members felt that the application should be supported and commented that the lack of alternative employment sites and facilities should not be overestimated given the proximity of the site to Roman Road.

In response to questions, the Central Team Leader advised that it was difficult to

establish the exact number of people employed given the information available.

Councillor P.J. Edwards spoke against the loss of employment land and felt that the density of the proposal was too high given that the site was on the periphery of the settlement boundary and the importance of maintaining a transition between residential development and open countryside.

In response to comments made regarding perceived contradictions and anomalies in the report, the Head of Planning Services advised that a balance had to be achieved both in the weight given to the policies of the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Unitary Development Plan and in the weight given to the loss of employment land and the benefits to the locality of the proposal. He added that the report attempted to provide as clear and as balanced a view as possible given the information available. It was noted that the loss of existing employment land in terms of adopted policy was a potential reason for refusal.

It was suggested that the application also be refused because the scale and density of the proposal would destroy the character of the area. However, it was noted that this might not be defensible given the targets detailed in PPG3 and it was therefore proposed that the impact on the appearance of the countryside be given as a reason for refusal.

RESOLVED:

That (i) The Central Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application, subject to the reasons for refusal set out below and any further reasons for refusal felt to be necessary by the Head of Planning Services provided that the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:

- 1. Loss of employment land;**
- 2. Impact on the appearance of the countryside.**

(ii) If the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee, Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be instructed to refuse the application, subject to such reasons for refusal referred to above.

[Note: Following the vote on the above resolution, the Development Control Manager noted that the Sub-Committee had thoroughly debated the issues and the reasons for refusal could be defended. Therefore, the application would not be referred to the Head of Planning Services.]

105. DCCW2004/2410/F - TESCO STORES LTD, ABBOTSMEAD ROAD, BELMONT, HEREFORD, HR2 7XS [AGENDA ITEM 6]

Proposed enclosure of existing unloading dock and installation of new electrical sliding gate to service yard.

Councillor P.J. Edwards, a Local Member, noted the view that the electronic sliding gates reduced noise level emissions when compared to the previous hinged gates.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans).

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

Informative:

1. N15 - Reasons for the Grant of PP/LB/CAC.

106. DCCE2004/4316/F - 42B HOLME LACY ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 6BZ [AGENDA ITEM 7]

Change of use of premises for A2 purposes as a licensed betting office.

The Central Team Leader advised that recommended condition 2 should refer to 6.00pm on Sundays and not 5.00pm as given in the report.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Norris spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor Mrs. W.U. Attfield, a Local Member, expressed concerns regarding the lack of parking provision in the vicinity and related highway safety issues. She added that the situation would be exacerbated by this proposed use as customers of the betting shop were more likely to park for longer periods whilst they watched sporting events. She also questioned the assertion in the report that 'a significant number of customers will be likely to be pedestrian or those linking car trips with the use of other shops and services in the parade'.

Councillor A.C.R. Chappell, a Local Member, endorsed the views of Councillor Mrs. Attfield and commented on the existing traffic problems on Holme Lacy Road. He said that the parking provision was inadequate for the businesses already operating in the area and felt it unlikely that the nearby public house would allow its own spaces to be used by customers of the betting office. He also felt that the highway issues in the area should be given greater attention by the Council. Councillor Chappell proposed that the planning permission be refused on the grounds of inadequate parking and related highways safety issues. Councillor R. Preece, also a Local Member, supported the comments made above.

The Senior Engineer noted local concerns but reminded the Sub-Committee that these premises could carry on being used for retail purposes and, therefore, Officers could not identify any material planning reasons to justify the refusal of planning permission in this instance. The Development Control Manager added that it was possible that the unit would remain empty if planning permission was refused and that it might be difficult to defend on appeal having regard to the advice provided by Officers.

A motion to refuse planning permission failed and the resolution detailed below was then agreed.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to no valid planning objections being received by the end of the

consultation period, the Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to approve the application subject to the following conditions:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the hours of 9:00am and 10:00pm Mondays to Saturdays, and 11:00am and 6:00pm on Sundays (Non Standard Condition)

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality.

Informative:

1 N15 -

**107. DCCW2004/4341/F - 5 PRIORY VIEW, BELMONT, HEREFORD, HR2 7XH
[AGENDA ITEM 8]**

Two storey extension to side of property.

Councillor P.J. Edwards, a Local Member, noted the concerns of Belmont Rural Parish Council and local residents but noted that there were no material planning reasons to warrant refusal of the application, particularly given the distances between this site and adjacent properties. Councillor Edwards noted the difficulties associated with parking in the area and suggested that permitted development rights should be removed to ensure that the front hard-standing area was retained for parking. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that this issue could be addressed through a condition. It was agreed that this matter would be examined in consultation with the Chairman and the Local Members.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans).

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

3. B02 (Matching external materials (extension)).

Reason: To ensure the external materials harmonise with the existing building.

4. E16 (Removal of permitted development rights)

Reason: To ensure that the front hard-standing area is retained for parking.

5. E18 (No new windows in specified elevation).

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

Informatives:

1. N03 – Adjoining property rights.
2. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

108. DCCE2004/3938/F - CROSS KEYS INN, CROSS KEYS, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 3NN [AGENDA ITEM 9]

Proposed dormer windows in lean-to roof of holiday lets.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Hall spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor R.I. Matthews, the Local Member, noted that Officers recommended refusal of planning permission but he did not agree that the proposed dormer windows would have a detrimental impact upon the property. He felt that the proposal would in fact enhance the character and appearance of the building.

The Senior Planning Officer responded by advising that the national and local planning policies sought to retain the intrinsic value of rural buildings and the positioning, design and external appearance of the proposed dormer windows would be out of keeping with the existing building, hence the recommendation of refusal.

Whilst recognising the importance of the planning policies, a number of Members agreed with the Local Member that the proposal would enhance the building and, as it was to be used for tourist accommodation, the conversion would contribute to the sustainability of the area. It was noted that the Conservation Manager had not commented on the application, that Withington Parish Council had no objections and that no letters of objection had been received from local residents. Therefore, it was proposed that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RESOLVED:

That (i) The Central Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions listed below, (and to any further conditions felt to be necessary by the Head of Planning Services), provided that the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee:

1. Matching external materials;
2. Details of external joinery finishes.

(ii) If the Head of Planning Services does not refer the application to the Planning Committee the Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be instructed to approve the application, subject to such conditions referred to above.

[Note: Following the vote on the above resolution, the Development Control Manager commented that the Sub-Committee had carefully considered the policies and, therefore, there were no critical policy issues at stake and the application would not

be referred to the Head of Planning Services.]

109. DCCE2004/2401/F - 5 AND 6 GRAFTON COURT CLOSE, GRAFTON, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 8BL [AGENDA ITEM 10]

Proposed replacement of two dwellings.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

3 G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

4 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

5 E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

6 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the levels approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

7 During the demolition and construction phase, no machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside of the following times, without prior consent from the local authority:

Monday - Friday 7.30am - 6.00pm, Saturday 8.00am - 1.00pm nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

8 No materials or substances shall be incinerated within the application site during the demolition and construction phase.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and prevent pollution.

9 All machinery and plant shall be operated and maintained in accordance with BS 5228: 1984 Noise Control of Construction and open sites.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and prevent pollution.

10 H12 (Parking and turning - single house)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.

11 E16 (Removal of permitted development rights)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

Informatives:

1 HN01 - Mud on highway

2 HN04 - Private apparatus within highway

3 HN05 - Works within the highway

4 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

**110. DCCW2004/4010/F - SUNBEAM CORNER, EIGN STREET, HEREFORD, HR4 0AJ
[AGENDA ITEM 11]**

Proposed redevelopment of shop into 6 apartments.

The Principal Planning Officer reported the receipt of additional correspondence from Hereford City Council and from Hereford Civic Society.

Councillor Mrs. E.M. Bew and Miss F. Short, the Local Members, felt that this proposal would enhance the area.

A number of Members felt that there should be car parking provided as part of this scheme. Comments were made about the lack of parking in the area, inadequate public transport and the need for people to use cars given the rural nature of the County.

Councillor P.J. Edwards noted the concerns of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee and Hereford Civic Society about the need for the development to make a visual statement given its prominent position. Other Members, however, felt that the design was acceptable and would complement adjoining residential uses.

In response to concerns about parking, the Principal Planning Officer commented that the location of the site justified it as a car-free development and noted that a secure cycle storage area to be provided. The Senior Engineer advised that PPG3 required local planning authorities to try to reduce car parking standards and car parking provision of between 0 and 1.5 spaces per dwelling was now encouraged. The Development Control Manager added that it was the developer's choice and risk whether parking was provided and it would be clear to potential occupiers that no parking was available and they could make their own decisions on that basis; he also commented that a poorer quality scheme might result if parking was to be provided.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. A09 (Amended plans) (23rd December 2004).

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

3. B01 (Samples of external materials).

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4. The secure cycle storage area identified on the submitted plans shall be available for use by all of the dwellings hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure all of the dwellings have suitable cycle storage.

5. G04 (Landscaping scheme (general)).

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

6. G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general)).

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

7. D01 (Site investigation – archaeology).

Reason: To ensure the archaeological interest of the site is recorded.

8. C05 (Details of external joinery finishes).

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of architectural or historical interest.

Informative:

1. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

111. DCCE2004/4340/F - BUILDING PLOT BETWEEN 30 AND 32 BARNEBY AVENUE, BARTESTREE, HEREFORD, HR1 4DH [AGENDA ITEM 12]

4 No. 3-bedroom semi-detached houses with integral garages.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Wargent spoke against the proposal.

In response to questions, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the site represented a link development between two contrasting residential developments

Councillor P.J. Edwards felt that the proposal could be considered over-intensive given that the site was on the periphery of the settlement boundary. In response, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the proposal would result in a density in the region of 50 dwellings per hectare and this was considered acceptable in the context of the emerging Unitary Development Plan and the advice given in PPG3. He also outlined the measures to mitigate parking concerns.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))
Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2 A09 (Amended plans)
Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.
- 3 B01 (Samples of external materials)
Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.
- 4 E08 (Domestic use only of garage)
Reason: To ensure that the garage is used only for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling.
- 5 E09 (No conversion of garage to habitable accommodation)
Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking arrangements remain available at all times.
- 6 E16 (Removal of permitted development rights)
Reason: Due to the restrictive nature of the application site.
- 7 E18 (No new windows in specified elevation)
Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.
- 8 E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)
Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.
- 9 F16 (Restriction of hours during construction)
Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.
- 10 G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))
Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.
- 11 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))
Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.
- 12 G09 (Retention of trees/hedgerows)
Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.
- 13 G33 (Details of walls/fences (outline permission))

Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity.

14 H04 (Visibility over frontage)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

15 H14 (Turning and parking: change of use - domestic)

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

16 H27 (Parking for site operatives)

Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

17 The foul discharge from the proposed development must be connected directly or indirectly to the 150mm public foul located at the cul-de-sac of Barneby Avenue

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

18 W01 (Foul/surface water drainage)

Reason: To protect the integrity of the public sewerage system.

19 W02 (No surface water to connect to public system)

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

20 W03 (No drainage run-off to public system)

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overload of the public sewerage system and pollution of the environment.

Informatives:

1 HN01 - Mud on highway

2 HN05 - Works within the highway

3 HN10 - No drainage to discharge to highway

4 N03 - Adjoining property rights

5 N11A - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) - Birds

6 N11B - Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Conservation (Nat. Habitats & C.) Regs 1994 - Bats

7 N16 - Welsh Water Informative

8 No building should be placed within a 4.25 metre stand-off of our overhead line apparatus. This would include the two stay wires that are

within the area in question.

- 9 A 3.0 metre stand-off between any building and the 415v underground cable must be maintained. Also, the cable should it eventually be contained in anything other than garden or the ground levels are changed then it must be lowered or diverted. Any costs incurred would be passed to the applicant.
- 10 It is essential that we maintain a vehicular access (to include a lorry) to this apparatus for future works including emergency out of hours work.
- 11 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

112. [A] DCCW2004/3707/F AND [B] DCCW2004/3708/C - 12-13 BRIDGE STREET, HEREFORD, HR4 9DF AND GWYNNE STREET, HEREFORD [AGENDA ITEM 13]

Retention of Art Deco frontage to Bridge Street and part of chapel, demolition of remaining buildings and proposed development for residential and retail purposes and associated ancillary works.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Sub-Committee that the whole of Gwynne Street would be paved and street lighting would be provided on the new building.

Councillor Mrs. P.A. Andrews proposed that a site visit be undertaken on the grounds that:

- the character or appearance of the development itself is a fundamental planning consideration;
- a judgement is required on visual impact; and
- the setting and surroundings are fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning applications DCCW2004/3707/F and DCCW2004/3708/C be deferred for a site visit.

113. DCCW2004/3789/F - 17 WHITECROSS ROAD, HEREFORD, HR4 0DE [AGENDA ITEM 14]

Demolition of redundant premises and erection of 10 no. residential dwelling apartments.

The Principal Planning Officer noted the concerns of some local residents but advised that the siting, design and layout was considered acceptable and that the location of the site justified the reduced parking proposed, comprising 10 car parking spaces and secure cycle storage, in line with PPG3.

Councillor Mrs. E.M. Bew and Miss F. Short, the Local Members, spoke in support of the proposal.

Some Members commented on the parking problems in the area and questions were asked about PPG3.

A number of Members commented that the scheme would significantly enhance the character and appearance of the area.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans).**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

3. **B01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4. **F16 (Restriction of hours during construction).**

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

5. **The secure cycle storage area identified on the submitted plans shall be available for use by all of the dwellings hereby approved.**

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of this permission and to ensure adequate cycle storage for residents.

6. **Details of the cycle and bin store shall be submitted for approval in writing of the local planning authority prior to work commencing on site and constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of any of the dwellings.**

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of this permission and to ensure adequate cycle storage for residents.

7. **F48 (Details of slab levels).**

Reason: In order to define the permission and ensure that the development is of a scale and height appropriate to the site.

8. **G01 (Details of boundary treatments).**

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

9. **G04 (Landscaping scheme (general)).**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

10. **G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general)).**

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

11. **H05 (Access gates).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12. H14 (Turning and parking: change of use - domestic) (10 parking spaces).

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

13. H21 (Wheel washing).

Reason: To ensure that the wheels of vehicles are cleaned before leaving the site in the interests of highway safety.

14. H27 (Parking for site operatives).

Reason: To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

15. H29 (Secure cycle parking provision).

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for secure cycle accommodation within the application site, encouraging alternative modes of transport in accordance with both local and national planning policy.

Informatives:

1. HN05 - Works within the highway.
2. HN10 - No drainage to discharge to highway.
3. HN19 - Disabled needs.
4. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

114. DCCW2004/3485/F - HOLMER PARK, HOLMER, HEREFORD, HR1 1LL
[AGENDA ITEM 15]

Groundsmans store.

Councillor Mrs. S.J. Robertson, the Local Member, thanked Officers for their efforts in negotiating a suitable scheme but asked for further clarification regarding issues in relation to the running track, previous Planning Inspector comments, whether other buildings could be used for storage, and whether anything could be done to ensure the preservation of a nearby Listed Building.

In response, the Principal Planning Officer advised that: the running track did not require planning permission if it only comprised a bark surface laid direct onto the existing soil; the Planning Inspector comments related to a previously refused and dismissed scheme for a residential home and this proposal would only have a limited impact on the built environment and would be well screened; that other buildings were not suitable for the storage of modern machinery; and the Conservation Manager would be alerted to the concerns regarding the deterioration of the Listed Building.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission)).**

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans).**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

3. **B01 (Samples of external materials).**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

Informative:

1. **N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**

115. DCCW2004/4212/F - LAND ADJACENT TO BRICK HOUSE, BUSH BANK, HEREFORD, HR4 8PH [AGENDA ITEM 16]

Erection of 2.590 ha. of Spanish polytunnels for use in soft fruit growing (table top method).

The Principal Planning Officer reported that the applicant was prepared to remove the existing polytunnels on the failed site and a condition would be required to this effect. However, it was also reported that the applicant did not feel able to remove two rows of tunnels from the original development nearest Pyon House as this would result in irrigation problems.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Vaughan spoke on behalf of Canon Pyon Parish Council and Miss Foggo spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor J.C. Mayson, the Local Member, expressed concern about the proximity of polytunnels to Pyon House and the resulting impact on visual and residential amenity. He felt that the two rows of tunnels nearest Pyon House should be removed given their intrusive nature and, whilst acknowledging that there might be technical difficulties to be resolved, he suggested that there should be further discussions with the applicant regarding this. A number of Members supported this suggestion.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCCW2004/4212/F be deferred for further discussions.

116. DCCE2004/3284/F - THE SWAN INN, 171 AYLESTONE HILL, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 1JJ [AGENDA ITEM 17]

Extension of car parking facilities.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Quine spoke against the application.

Councillor D.B. Wilcox, a Local Member, noted the speaker's concern about additional noise and light pollution and asked whether the suggestion that parking

could be provided in place of the existing leylandi trees, in order to move it further away from the neighbour's dwelling, had been fully explored with the applicant. He added that recent changes to the licensing laws could exacerbate the problem. In response, the Central Team Leader advised that he did not have information available regarding this but it could be considered as part of the landscaping scheme. Therefore, it was proposed that Officers be authorised to grant planning permission, in consultation with the Chairman and Local Members, to address this issue.

RESOLVED:

That Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, in consultation with the Chairman and the Local Members, be authorised grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and any other appropriate conditions considered necessary by the officers:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 G01 (Details of boundary treatments)

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

3 G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

4 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

5 H15 (Turning and parking: change of use - commercial)

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

Informative:

1 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.

117. DCCW2004/3917/F - TRINITY HOUSE, 31 BARRICOMBE DRIVE, HEREFORD, HR4 0NU [AGENDA ITEM 18]

Change of use to small school for pupils 11-16 years.

The Principal Planning Officer reported the receipt of correspondence from Herefordshire Housing and from Paul Keetch MP raising objections.

Councillor Mrs. P.A. Andrews, a Local Member, noted the significant level of local concern regarding this proposal and suggested that consideration of the application be deferred for further discussions to enable a meeting to take place between the applicant and local residents.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCCW2004/3917/F be deferred for further discussions.

118. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next scheduled meeting was 9th March, 2005.

The meeting ended at 4.52 p.m.

CHAIRMAN