

**MINUTES of the meeting of Central Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 19th October, 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, P.J. Edwards, J.G.S. Guthrie, R.I. Matthews, J.W. Newman, Ms. G.A. Powell, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, W.J.S. Thomas, Ms. A.M. Toon, W.J. Walling and R.M. Wilson

**In attendance:** Councillors T.W. Hunt and J.B. Williams

**73. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors A.C.R. Chappell, Mrs. S.P.A. Daniels, Mrs. M.D. Lloyd-Hayes, J.C. Mayson, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Miss F. Short, D.B. Wilcox and A.L. Williams.

**74. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interests were made:

Councillors	Item	Interest
Mrs. S.J. Robertson	Agenda Item 10, Minute 82 DCCE2005/2132/O <b>40 Newtown Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9LL</b>	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.
Mrs. W.U. Attfield	Agenda Item 12, Minute 84 DCCE2005/2619/F <b>2 Holme Lacy Road, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR2 6BY</b>	Declared a personal interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.
Mrs. S.J. Robertson	Agenda Item 16, Minute 88 DCCW2005/2985/F <b>Bank Lodge, Coldwells Road, Holmer, Hereford, HR1 1LH</b>	Declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting for the duration of this item.

**75. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st September, 2005 be approved as a correct record.**

**76. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS**

The Sub-Committee noted the Council's current position in respect of Planning Appeals for the Central Area.

77. **DCCE2005/2426/F - NEW RENTS, LUGWARDINE, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR1 4AE [AGENDA ITEM 5]**

*Proposed new dwelling with garage.*

Councillor R.M. Wilson, the Local Ward Member, commented on the rural setting of the area and noted that the site was within the Conservation Area of Lugwardine. He noted the proximity of a public right of way and expressed concern about the impact upon privacy. He also felt that the development was over intensive and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the village.

Some Members spoke in support of the Local Ward Member's views, particularly in relation to the density of the development.

The Chairman commented that the application site was within the settlement boundary and noted other development in the locality.

In response to a question, the Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed density of development was below that required in the guidance but was considered acceptable given the Conservation Area status and the general character of the area; therefore, it would be difficult to defend a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of over intensive development. He also reported that a previous application for a dwelling had been withdrawn [DCCE2005/1437/F refers], given Officers' concerns about scale and design, and this new scheme had been informed by the advice of Officers. In response to concerns about the public right of way, he advised that the issue of privacy related to the impact that this proposal might have on the residents of existing dwellings and not to the possibility of passers-by looking into the proposed dwelling. The Central Team Leader added that it would be up to the occupiers of the dwelling to determine the most appropriate means of protecting their own privacy.

A number of Members felt that the proposal was sensitive to the character and appearance of the locality and supported the application.

**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. C04 (Details of window sections, eaves, verges and barge boards).**

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

**4. C05 (Details of external joinery finishes).**

**Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of**

[special] architectural or historical interest.

5. E17 (No windows in side elevation of extension).

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

6. E19 (Obscure glazing to windows).

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

7. G01 (Details of boundary treatments).

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

8. G04 (Landscaping scheme (general)).

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

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

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

10. G17 (Protection of trees in a Conservation Area).

Reason: To ensure the proper care and maintenance of the trees.

11. H03 (Visibility splays).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12. H05 (Access gates).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

13. H08 (Access closure).

Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic using the adjoining County highway.

14. H09 (Driveway gradient).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

15. 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.

16. W01 (Foul/surface water drainage).

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

17. 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.

**18. 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. N03 - Adjoining property rights.**
- 2. HN01 - Mud on highway.**
- 3. HN02 - Public rights of way affected.**
- 4. HN05 - Works within the highway.**
- 5. HN10 - No drainage to discharge to highway.**
- 6. The site lies adjacent to a public footpath (LU9) which runs along the eastern boundary. This right of way should remain at its historic width and suffer no encroachment or obstruction during or the time of completion. The right of way should remain open at all times throughout the development. If development works are perceived to be likely to endanger members of the public then a temporary closure order should be applied for, 6 weeks in advance of work starting.**
- 7. N16 - Welsh Water Informative.**
- 8. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC.**

**78. DCCW2005/1602/F - 99 DORCHESTER WAY, BELMONT, HEREFORD, HR2 7ZW [AGENDA ITEM 6]**

*New boundary fence.*

Councillor P.J. Edwards, a Local Ward Member, felt it regrettable that the re-alignment of the fence could not be achieved and maintained his view that the openness of the area should be retained. He noted the specific traffic flows in the locality and felt that the proposed 1.80 metre high fence would have a detrimental impact on highway safety. Councillor Edwards emphasised the need to protect open areas and proposed that the application be refused as it was contrary to policies GD1 (General Development Criteria) and C30 (Open Land in Settlements) of the South Herefordshire District Local Plan and policies DR1 (Design) and HBA9 (Protection of Open Areas and Green Spaces) of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft). He also felt that the application should be refused on the grounds of both vehicular and pedestrian safety.

A number of Members spoke in support of the Local Ward Member's views.

The Development Control Manager noted that it was a matter of interpretation in respect of the appearance and character of the locality but, on the issue of highway safety, reminded Members that the Traffic Manager had raised no objections subject to a condition in respect of the visibility splay.

The Central Team Leader advised the Sub-Committee that the land had been transferred into the applicant's ownership and that permitted development rights

would allow the enclosure of the boundary with a fence not exceeding 1 metre.

Councillor Edwards noted that a 1 metre fence would not have the same impact on highway safety as a 1.8 metre fence.

In response to a comment, the Legal Practice Manager confirmed that the tidiness of open spaces was not a planning consideration but it might form part of a restrictive covenant on the property.

**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. Protection of open areas and green spaces; and**
- 2. Highways safety.**

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

[Note: Following the vote on this application, the Development Control Manager advised that he would not refer the decision to the Head of Planning Services given the Sub-Committee's interpretation of the relevant policies.]

**79. DCCW2005/2861/T - STREETWORKS AT VERGE OPPOSITE GRANDSTAND PUB, GRANDSTAND ROAD, WIDEMARSH, HEREFORD, HR4 9NH [AGENDA ITEM 7]**

*Installation of telecommunications equipment comprising 15m streetworks monopole, containing 3G antenna and associated mini-equipment cabinet.*

Councillors Mrs. P.A. Andrews and Ms. A.M. Toon, the Local Ward Members, advised that they had not received any objections to the proposal directly.

**RESOLVED:**

**That prior approval is not required.**

**80. DCCE2005/2392/F - HEREFORD CHARCOAL GRILL, 41 COMMERCIAL ROAD, HEREFORD, HR1 2BG [AGENDA ITEM 8]**

*Application to vary Condition 1 of CE2000/0427/F to extend opening hours to:- Mon - Tues: 12.00 to 02.00; Wed - Sat: 12.00 to 03.00; Sun: 12.00 to 02.00; Bank Holiday (except Christmas day): 12.00 to 03.00.*

The Senior Planning Officer advised that paragraph 1.2 of the report should also refer to Thursdays in the condition [planning application CE2000/0427/F refers].

The Chairman, speaking in his capacity as Local Ward Member, expressed his concern about late night openings but noted the recommendation to limit the opening hours in line with the hours confirmed by the Licence.

**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. **The use hereby permitted shall only be open to customers during the following hours:**

**Monday to Wednesday 1200 hours to 2330; Thursday 1200 hours to Friday 0030; Friday 1200 hours to Saturday 0130 hours; and Sunday 1200 hours to 2300 hours.**

**Reason: In the interests of residential amenities.**

**Informatives:**

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

**81. DCCE2005/2024/F - PLAY NIGHTCLUB, 51-55 BLUE SCHOOL STREET, HEREFORD, HR1 2AR [AGENDA ITEM 9]**

*Application to vary Condition 1 of Planning Inspector's Appeal Decision CE2000/0448/F to allow opening beyond 1.30 a.m.*

The Principal Planning Officer reported the receipt of a letter from Alistair McHarg and summarised its contents. It was noted that the Regulatory Sub-Committee had granted an extension to hours recently and it was proposed to limit the opening hours accordingly. It was also noted that the applicants had indicated a willingness to provide a contribution towards the operation of CCTV in the locality.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Sinclair-Simon and Mr. Reynolds (applicants) spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman, speaking in his capacity as Local Ward Member, noted the concerns of local residents about the new Licensing regime and, whilst welcoming a contribution towards CCTV, noted the consequential impact on Police resources. Other Members expressed similar concerns.

Some Members noted the need to prevent under age drinking and for more street cleaning to be undertaken in the area. In response, the Legal Practice Manger advised that the Licensing Act 2003 should provide effective controls and that efforts were being made to harmonise street cleaning provision. Councillor R.I. Matthews commended the applicants for their co-operation in respect of Licensing matters.

The Legal Practice Manager explained the controls available through the Licensing Act and where these linked with the planning system.

**RESOLVED:**

**That Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to negotiate the possibility of a financial contribution towards the operation of**

CCTV in the locality of the application site and if agreement is reached;

The County Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to complete a planning obligation/unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and

Upon completion of the planning obligation the Officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following condition and any further condition(s) considered necessary by officers.

The use hereby permitted shall only be open to customers during the following hours:

Monday 1000 hours to Tuesday 0330 hours;  
Tuesday 1000 hours to Wednesday 0200 hours;  
Wednesday 1000 hours to Thursday 0200 hours;  
Thursday 1000 hours to Friday 0330 hours;  
Friday 1000 hours to Saturday 0330 hours;  
Saturday 1000 hours to Sunday 0330 hours;  
Sunday 1200 hours to Monday 0230 hours (except Bank Holiday Sunday until Monday 0300 hours);  
These hours will apply with the exception of Christmas Day 0200 hours, New Years Eve 1100 hours to New Years Day 2300 hours.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties and to define the terms of the permission.

**82. DCCE2005/2132/O - 40 NEWTOWN ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 9LL [AGENDA ITEM 10]**

*Erection of 3 dwellings.*

The Senior Planning Officer advised that paragraph 6.4 of the report should read '...an obligation for each property to contribute £200 per annum (inflated annually to the retail price index) in perpetuity for ~~restoration~~ and maintenance *and management*'. He also advised that the Environment Agency had raised an objection on flooding grounds but it was anticipated that the issue could be resolved and, therefore, the recommendation remained the same as detailed in the report.

Councillor Mrs. P.A. Andrews said that she had considerable anxieties about the proposal, particularly relating to backland development and access issues. Given the potential impact on the locality, Councillor Mrs. Andrews proposed that a site inspection be undertaken on the ground that the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

**RESOLVED:**

**That consideration of planning application DCCE2005/2132/O be deferred for a site inspection.**

**83. DCCE2005/2799/F - LAND ADJACENT TO 51 LINGEN AVENUE, HEREFORD, HR1 1BY [AGENDA ITEM 11]**

*Two storey dwelling and widening of access.*

The Principal Planning Officer reported the receipt of suitably amended plans and

advised that the recommendation detailed in the report could be amended accordingly.

The Chairman, speaking in his capacity as Local Ward Member, welcomed the amended plans and anticipated that the changes should overcome local concerns.

Councillor Mrs. P.A. Andrews felt that the access was very tight and questioned whether any additional comments had been received from the Traffic Manager. The Development Control Manager advised that the Traffic Manager had no objections, subject to conditions, and that sufficient parking to serve both the existing and the proposed dwellings would be provided.

**RESOLUTION:**

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

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

5. **E16 (Removal of permitted development rights).**

**Reason: To enable the local planning authority to control any future enlargement of the dwellings or development within their curtilage in the interests of residential amenity.**

6. **E18 (No new windows in specified elevation).**

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

7. **H06 ( Vehicular access construction).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

8. **H09 (Driveway gradient).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

9. **H10 (Parking – single house).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of**



traffic using the adjoining highway.

**10. 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.**

**Informatives:**

- 1. HN01 - Mud on highway.**
- 2. HN04 – Private apparatus within highway.**
- 3. HN05 – Works within the highway.**
- 4. HN10 – No drainage to discharge to highway.**
- 5. N15 – Reason(s) for the Grant of PP.**

**84. DCCE2005/2619/F - 2 HOLME LACY ROAD, HEREFORD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 6BY [AGENDA ITEM 12]**

*Change of use of ground floor from class A1 (retail) to class A5 (takeaway).*

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the item and explained the proposed rationalisation of parking.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Bunn (4 Holme Lacy Road) spoke against the application and Mr. Rackham (applicant's agent) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor R. Preece, a Local Ward Member, commented that the residential amenities of the area had improved since the closure of the convenience store. Referring to the Highways Agency comment that '...takeaway restaurants by their very nature generate more trips in the evening and some of these trips may fall within peak times', Councillor Preece noted that peak times lasted until at least 6.30 p.m. in this area. He noted that a 'Keep Clear' marking was proposed at the point of access onto Holme Lacy Road but he felt that drivers would take little notice of it. He also noted the parking problems in the area generally.

Councillor P.J. Edwards suggested that, in order to address some of the concerns of residents, an additional condition requiring the placement of litter bins on all the nearby road junctions should be added to any planning permission granted.

In response to questions, the Principal Planning Officer advised that Environmental Health had looked at the application in detail and did not object to the application subject to conditions; he added that the positioning and type of extraction system would ensure that noise and odours were limited. He advised that recommended condition 7 (scheme of refuse storage) would ensure the provision of bins and the management and collection of litter. He also advised that he was unaware of any serious accidents as a direct consequence of the previous use of the site for retail purposes and noted that neither the Highways Agency nor the Traffic Manager had raised formal objections to the application. He emphasised that the lawful planning use of the site for retail purposes could be re-implemented at any time.

A number of Members expressed concerns about highway safety and sympathised with local residents about the potential impact on residential amenities.

The Development Control Manager commented that the Authority could not require the placement of bins outside the application site but, noting that the applicant's agent had indicated a willingness to resolve such issues, Members' concerns could be addressed through recommended condition 7. The Development Control Manager responded to a question by advising that a delivery service could be operated from the site as long as it was ancillary to the lawful planning use.

The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to recommended condition 8 which sought to safeguard the amenity of adjacent residential properties through the construction of a fence or wall to a minimum height of 2 metres along the eastern boundary of the site.

In response to a proposed condition, the Principal Planning Officer suggested that Officers be delegated to investigate requirements in respect of the use of bio-degradable food containers and, if other legislation did not cover this issue, add an appropriate condition if planning permission was granted.

Councillor Preece felt that the application should be refused on the grounds of highway safety and impact on residential amenities.

A motion to refuse the application received an equal number of votes and the Chairman used his casting vote to refuse the application; the Chairman felt that the case had not been made to warrant approval of the application.

**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:**

- 3. Highways safety; and**
- 4. Detrimental impact on residential amenities.**

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

[Note: Following the vote on this application, the Development Control Manager advised that he would refer the decision to the Head of Planning Services as the Sub-Committee's view might not be defensible if challenged given the comments received from the Highways Agency and the Transportation Manager.]

**85. DCCW2005/2579/F - ASHGROVE CROFT, MARDEN, HEREFORD, HR1 3HA  
[AGENDA ITEM 13]**

*Change of use from agricultural to a one family gypsy caravan site, permission for 2 caravans and stable block.*

Councillor J.G.S. Guthrie, the Local Ward Member, noted that the application site was in open countryside and outside of any identified settlement boundary. It was also noted that the site was close to the boundary of Marden Parish Council and Bodenham Parish Council. Councillor Guthrie proposed that a site inspection be

undertaken on the grounds that a judgement was required on visual impact and the setting and surroundings were fundamental to the determination or to the conditions being considered.

The Central Team Leader noted that there was an issue regarding the positioning of the development and that the re-siting of the mobile home, as recommended in the conditions, would reduce visual impact.

**RESOLVED:**

**That consideration of planning application DCCW2005/2579/F be deferred for a site inspection.**

**86. DCCW2005/2681/O - SITE ADJACENT TO ORCHARD LEA, CREDENHILL, HEREFORD, HR4 7EH [AGENDA ITEM 14]**

*Site for new bungalow.*

The Central Team Leader noted that this was an outline application and that the details, other than the means of access, would be subject to a reserved matters application. He noted the concerns of local residents but it was felt that, with appropriate conditions, the amenities of the locality would be satisfactorily protected.

Councillor R.I. Matthews, the Local Ward Member, noted that Credenhill Parish Council had no objections and that the recommended conditions should address the concerns of adjoining neighbours.

Councillor Ms. A.M. Toon felt that the application site was cramped and expressed concerns about density and congestion.

The Central Team Leader reminded Members that they needed to consider the application before them and that the application was considered acceptable by Officers.

Councillor Matthews noted that the Officers had examined the location of the proposal and, to address concerns about potential overdevelopment, changes had been made as a result.

In response to a question, the Development Control Manager explained that the map attached to the report was an Ordnance Survey map to illustrate the general location of the application site and the map displayed at the meeting was indicative of the proposed layout of the actual proposal.

**RESOLVED:**

**That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. A02 (Time limit for submission of reserved matters (outline permission)).**

**Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

- 2. A03 (Time limit for commencement (outline permission)).**

**Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

3. A04 (Approval of reserved matters).

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to exercise proper control over these aspects of the development.

4. A05 (Plans and particulars of reserved matters).

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. The development shall be single storey only and no dormer windows, roof lights or other similar structures shall be constructed within the roof space.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residents.

6. F16 (Restriction of hours during construction).

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

7. F17 (Scheme of foul drainage disposal).

Reason: In order to ensure that satisfactory drainage arrangements are provided.

8. The boundary treatment of the driveway and properties on Mill Close shall be submitted for approval in writing of the local planning authority prior to works commencing on site and shall form a fixed treatment of wall/fence together with soft landscaping. The boundary treatment shall be constructed prior to occupation and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residents.

9. The surface treatment of the driveway shall be a sealed surface, tarmacadam or similar to the approval in writing of the local planning authority and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residents.

10. H13 (Access, turning area and parking).

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

**Informative:**

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

87. DCCW2005/2550/F - LITTLE HOLME, KENCHESTER, HEREFORD [AGENDA ITEM 15]

*Proposed replacement dwelling.*

The Senior Planning Officer reported the receipt of an additional letter of objection from Mr. Pritchard of The Mill, Kenchester and noted its contents.

Councillor R.I. Matthews, the Local Ward Member, drew attention to the comments of the local Parish Council and noted that Officers considered that the proposal complied with the relevant policies.

Some Members noted the poor state of repair of the existing dwelling and felt that the proposed replacement dwelling would be an improvement.

**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. A07 (Development in accordance with approved plans).**

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

- 3. C02 (Approval of details) (External elevations and fenestration treatment).**

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

- 4. B01 (Samples of external materials).**

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

- 5. Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme of flood proof construction shall be agreed with the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.**

**Reason: To protect the development from flood risk.**

- 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no enlargement or other alteration to the dwelling shall take place, including conversion of the roof void to provide habitable accommodation.**

**Reason: In order to comply with the criteria within Policy SH21 of the South Herefordshire District Local Plan.**

- 7. E09 (No conversion of garage to habitable accommodation).**

**Reason: In order to comply with the criteria within Policy SH21 of the South Herefordshire District Local Plan.**

- 8. H05 (Access gates) (5 metres).**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

- 9. H09 (Driveway gradient).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

10. F18 (Scheme of foul drainage disposal).

Reason: In order to ensure that satisfactory drainage arrangements are provided.

11. F20 (Scheme of surface water drainage).

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

12. G09 (Retention of trees/hedgerows).

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the area.

Informative:

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

88. DCCW2005/2985/F - BANK LODGE, COLDWELLS ROAD, HOLMER, HEREFORD, HR1 1LH [AGENDA ITEM 16]

*Retrospective application for general purpose agricultural shed.*

The Central Team Leader advised Members that paragraph 6.5 of the report should read 'The site has been viewed from the grounds of Coldwells Cottage, the nearest residential property and, at the request of the ~~applicant~~ *objector*, from within the ground floor living room'.

A number of Members supported the Officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

**Subject to no further objections raising additional material planning considerations 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 condition and any further conditions considered necessary by Officers:**

1. The development hereby approved shall not be used for the housing or rearing of pigs.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity.

Informative:

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

89. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting was due to be held on Wednesday 16th November, 2005. In addition to site inspections in respect of planning applications DCCE2005/2132/O and DCCW2005/2579/F, the Sub-Committee agreed to inspect forthcoming planning application DCCW2005/3151/F, 7-8 Walkers Green, Marden.

**CHAIRMAN**