

MINUTES of the meeting of Southern Area Planning Sub-Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 5th July, 2006 at 2.00 p.m.

Present: Councillor P.G. Turpin (Chairman)
Councillor H. Bramer (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: M.R. Cunningham, N.J.J. Davies, Mrs. C.J. Davis,
G.W. Davis, J.W. Edwards, Mrs. A.E. Gray, Mrs. J.A. Hyde, J.G. Jarvis,
G. Lucas, D.C. Taylor and J.B. Williams

In attendance: Councillors T.W. Hunt (ex-officio)

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

20. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7th June, 2006 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

21. ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS

The Sub-Committee noted the Council's current position in respect of planning appeals for the southern area of Herefordshire.

22. DCSE2006/1583/F - BRAMLEY COTTAGE, HOWLE HILL, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 5SH (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Retention of small dog kennel and run

Councillor J.G. Jarvis, the Local Ward Member, was concerned that granting the application could set a precedent. He noted that condition 3 of planning permission SE2004/2539/F removed permitted development rights to erect a building of this nature, and felt that the condition should not be overridden retrospectively.

The Development Control Manager noted the concerns of the Local Ward Member but felt that granting the application would not set a precedent. He also advised the Sub-Committee that the application had to be determined on planning merits only and that it had no effect on the AONB.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted.

Informative:**1 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission.****23. DCSE2006/1408/F - 11 THE GLEBE, HILDERSLEY, ROSS-ON-WYE, HR9 5BL (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Two-storey extension.

Councillor Mrs. A.E Gray, one of the Local Ward Members, noted that Ross Rural Parish Council had initially objected to the application but that they were now satisfied with the dimensions proposed by the applicant. She therefore 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. B02 (Matching external materials (extension))

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

3. 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(s):**1. N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission****24. DCSE2006/1677/F - LAND ADJACENT TO 'MARSH COTTAGE', PONTSHILL, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 5SZ. (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

Erection of one dwelling

The Principal Planning Officer reported the receipt of revised plans from the applicant.

Councillor H. Bramer, the Local Ward Member, felt that he could not support the application. He felt that a three storey development would be overpowering on the site. He noted that Pontshill did not meet the criteria for a small settlement and that it had therefore been removed as a small settlement in the UDP. He noted that the site had planning permission for a cottage style building but felt that the proposed dwelling was not suitable.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Sub-Committee that the existing planning permission on the site was a material planning consideration. He noted that all of the drainage and flooding issues had been dealt with on the previous application.

Members discussed the application thoroughly and felt that it should be refused

contrary to the officer's recommendation as it was in breach of UDP Policy H7, the proposed dwelling was too large for the site and also that granting the application would have a negative effect on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

RESOLVED:

That: (i) The Southern Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application subject to the reason 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:

- a) In Breach of Policy H7**
- b) Proposed dwelling is too large for the site and inappropriate for the area**
- c) Detrimental effect on amenities of local residents**

(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 this application, the Development Control Manager advised that he would not refer the decision to the Head of Planning Services.]

25. DCSW2006/1298/F - LAND ADJACENT TO PETERSTOW COMPRESSOR STATION, TREADDOW, OFF THE A4137, HENTLAND, HEREFORDSHIRE (AGENDA ITEM 8)

New natural gas pressure reduction installation and associated works. (Tie-in to existing Peterstow Compressor Station and No. 2 feeder outside the Compressor Station and extension to existing site access road)

The Development Control Manager reported the receipt of a letter of objection from Peterstow Parish Council as well as further correspondence from the residents of Little Peterstow Barn. He also reported the receipt of comments from the Council's Rights of Way Officer who noted that the application would not have a detrimental effect on footpath HN17.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Wood, representing Peterstow Parish Council, and Mr. Gething-Lewis, a local resident, both spoke in objection to the application and Mr Mercer, the applicant, spoke in support.

Councillor Mrs. J.A. Hyde, one of the Local Ward Members, thanked the Development Control Manager for a detailed report, she also felt that the site visit had been beneficial to members. She noted the concerns of the Parish Council and agreed that site D would be a more suitable location for the development.

Councillor G.W. Davis, the other Local Ward Member, also felt that site D would be a more suitable option for the development. He confirmed that he did not object to the application in principal but did feel that the siting of the development was not in a suitable location.

Members discussed the application thoroughly and felt that the proposed application would be visually intrusive on the proposed site, they felt that this matter could be resolved by using site D. They felt that granting the application would breach countryside policies C1, C2, C3, C9, C11, and C47 and that it could result in light

and noise pollution to the residents of Little Peterstow Barns.

RESOLVED:

That: (i) The Southern Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to refuse the application subject to the reason 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:

- d) Too visually intrusive**
- e) In open countryside**
- f) Light and noise pollution to local residents**
- g) Environmental damage**

(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 this application, the Development Control Manager advised that he would refer the decision to the Head of Planning Services.]

26. DCSE2006/1450/F - THE SHRUBBERY, CAMP ROAD, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 5NA (AGENDA ITEM 9)

Erection of new dwelling in garden.

Councillor Mrs. C.J. Davis, the Local Ward Member, noted the concerns of local residents and felt that Members would benefit from a site inspection.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of planning application DCSE2006/1450/F be deferred for a site inspection for the following reasons:

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

27. DCSE2006/1431/A - OVERROSS GARAGE LTD, OVERROSS STREET, ROSS-ON-WYE, HR9 7AS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

Illuminated fascia letters, fascia sign, 2 entrance features, pole sign, pylon sign and directional sign. Non-illuminated activity panel, customer parking, welcome, dealer, sales, parts sign and flags.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the revised plans had not yet been received from the applicant.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Bernard, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

In response to a question raised by the Local Ward Member, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a condition could be added to the recommendation in order to

ensure that no lights were left on outside of normal business hours.

RESOLVED:

That

1) In relation to the proposed advertisements nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 & 16 on drawing Ren 0682 planning and subject to the receipt of amended drawings the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions considered necessary by officers:

1 The existing advertisements at Overross Garage shall be removed prior to the display of the advertisements hereby approved or in accordance with a time-table to be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the display of the advertisements.

Reason: In the interests of public amenity.

2 The level of luminance of the signs hereby granted consent shall not exceed 1 lux vertical on windows of any adjacent property or 5 lux horizontal on the adjoining highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

3 H23 (Canopies/signs/projections over the highway)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety/

2) In relation to the proposed advertisement no.17 that consent be refused for the following reason:

1 The proposed advertisement, because of its size and prominent position, would detract from the street scene and the character and appearance of this part of Ross on Wye Conservation Area. This advertisement would therefore harm public amenity and thereby be contrary to Policy C50 of South Herefordshire District Local Plan and HBA11 of Herefordshire Unitary Development (Revised Deposit Draft).

28. DCSE2006/1358/O - MUDDY BOOTS SOFTWARE LTD, PHOCLE GREEN, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 7XU (AGENDA ITEM 11)

ICT development, customer support and sales offices.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the receipt of an email from Councillor J.C. Mayson, the Cabinet Member for Rural Regeneration and Strategy, who supported the application. He also advised the Sub-Committee that comments had been received from the Traffic Manager who felt that granting the application would result in a 25% increase in traffic to the site and therefore suggested conditions. The Senior Planning Officer finally reported the receipt of comments from Herefordshire Council's Regeneration Team, who supported the application and Ross Town Council, who objected to it.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr. Evans, the applicant, spoke in

support of his application.

Councillor J.W. Edwards, the Local Ward Member, noted the concerns of the Parish Council but felt that the site was in a good location and that the visual impact would be minimal.

Councillor H. Bramer, the Vice Chairman, advised the Sub-Committee that the application had received support from the Cabinet Member for Rural Regeneration, the Ross Area Partnership, and the Chamber of Commerce. He felt that granting the application would offer employees an excellent working environment and would help to attract quality Information Technology Personnel to the area.

RESOLVED:

That: (i) The Southern Area Planning Sub-Committee is minded to approve the application subject to the conditions set out below (and 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:

(a) No conditions recommended

(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 approve the application subject to such conditions 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.]

The meeting ended at 3.50 p.m.

CHAIRMAN