

JCM/KH/BRS.5147

11 March 2020

Ms Charlotte Atkins
Herefordshire Council Planning Services
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

Dear Charlotte

Application for Approval of Reserved Matters associated with Planning Permission No: P141487/O, Land to the East of the A49, Holmer, Hereford Planning Application Ref: 193296

Further to our recent exchanges, thank you for providing a comprehensive list of comments and suggested revisions.

Following our meeting with yourself and Katy Jones (Highways) on the 27th February, and after liaising with our client, each of the matters that you noted within your email dated on the 11th February has been carefully considered. A series of changes have been incorporated in response in a suite of amended plans as follows:

- Planning Layout (Drg. No. 13347/5000 Rev N);
- Facing Materials Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3170 Rev H);
- Roofing Materials Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3171 Rev G);
- Adoption Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3172 Rev D);
- Movement Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3173 Rev D);
- Affordable Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3174 Rev D);
- Storey Heights Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3175 Rev D);
- Refuse Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3176 Rev F);
- Chimney Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3177 Rev E);
- Boundaries Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3178 Rev F);
- Access and Driveway Visibility (Drg. No. 13347/3180 Rev A);
- Ext. Electric Socket Strategy Plan (Drg. No. 13347/3181);
- Dorking Elevations (Drg. No. 13347/6011.2 Rev D);
- Keswick Elevations (Drg. No. 13347/6013.2 Rev A);
- Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals (1 of 3) (Drg. No. BIR.4884_100 Rev B);
- Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals (2 of 3) (Drg. No. BIR.4884_100 Rev B);
- Photographs of porches at Bartestree site.

The purpose of this letter is to explain those changes (or where we otherwise challenge the requested changes). The discussion is arranged in the order of your email, with your comments are presented in bullet points in *italics* and our responses are provided in plain text below.

Pegasus Group

First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL
T 01454 625945 | F 01454 618074 | W www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | Dublin | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Newcastle | Peterborough

DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | PLANNING | ECONOMICS | HERITAGE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales Registered Office: Pegasus House, Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT

1) Access (approved at outline)

- Approved access (OPP and subsequent DoC drawings) overlaid on RM layout to confirm compliance

As confirmed in our meeting, the proposed access matches that secured under conditions application (Ref: 173403) and Approved RM (Ref: 162912), and with the s278 agreement with Highways England.

2) Open Market Housing Mix

- Revised mix does not accord with the GL Hearn Report (part of the CS evidence base)
Proposal:
 - 13 x 2 bed = 28.8% (GLH = 22.9%)
 - 20 x 3 bed = 44% (GLH = 54.5%)
 - 4 bed = 26% (GLH = 17.5%)
- Revised mix increases 4 beds from 8 to 12 and reduces 3 beds from 24 to 20, compared to the originally submitted mix (which was 17% and 53% respectively).

Following the meeting the housing mix has been amended in line with your comment to reduce the number of 4 beds, by replacing two of the 4 bed units with 3 bed units. The revised open market housing mix is set out in the table below which demonstrate that the revised scheme has far greater compliance with the preferred mix set out in the LHMA 2013 than the Approved RM mix:

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4+ Bed	Total
LHMA 2013	5.0%	22.9%	54.5%	17.5%	99.9%
Approved RM	0	5	14	15	34
	0.0%	14.7%	41.2%	44.1%	100.0%
Current RM (Dec 2019 submission)	0	13	20	12	45
	0.0%	28.9%	44.4%	26.7%	100.0%
Revised Current RM (Mar 2020 submission)	0	13	22	10	45
	0.0%	28.9%	48.9%	22.2%	100.0%
Difference between Approved RM & LHMA 2013	-5.0%	-8.2%	-13.3%	+26.6%	
Difference between Revised Current RM & LHMA 2013	-5.0%	+6.0%	-5.6%	+4.7%	

3) Layout

- *Insufficient parking (options to address this and clarification of parking standards at The Furlongs)*

The number of bed spaces has reduced which in turn lowers the parking requirement, and where possible additional parking spaces have been added to plots and visitor bays have been provided to the two private drives. You requested we look at reducing the number of garages and the revised layout now has 21 garages, a reduction from the 24 previously proposed. In addition, where some of the 4 bed dwellings were deficient in parking (for example the central section) we have swapped some housetypes around in order to ensure the larger dwellings are provided with more proportionate parking.

The aim has been to increase the parking provision without being detrimental to the overall design and landscaping of the scheme. A layout for 52 dwellings with 100% compliance is not feasible and would create a car-dominated scheme. The revised layout now has a total of 129 spaces for 150 bedspaces, which represents 86% provision against the standards, which is an improvement upon the previous layout (80%) and the Approved RM (76%). The layout ensures all 2 beds have 2 spaces, all 3 beds have at least 2 spaces, and all 4 beds have at least 3 spaces. This level of parking for a sustainable site is appropriate and would not set a precedent for the determination of future planning applications as all applications should be determined upon their merits.

We note the Parish Council's references to The Furlongs development having parking issues; however this is not a comparable site. The Furlongs is a historic site which was in the planning system between 2006-2011 when parking requirements were based upon PPG13 maximum standards and the UDP policy at the time was maximum parking at "an average of not more than 1.5 spaces per dwelling".

- *Plot 1 – no turning head and prominence of garage*

Notwithstanding Plot 1's double garage was proposed as per the Approved RM, our client has addressed your concern on its prominence by replacing with a single garage tucked to the side of the plot and providing a turning head.

- *Substation and pumping station prominence (rationale for siting – revised siting for substation)*

As explained at the meeting the pumping station is in this position as it must be located at the lowest point of the site. The sub station will have materials to match the adjacent Plot 33 and this has been added to the Facing and Roofing Materials Strategy Plans.

- *Plots 37 & 38 – re-orientate as per landscape comments/EHO considerations*

It was agreed at the meeting that these plots will remain as proposed.

- *Density of plots 7-12*

Whilst it has not been possible to revise this section of the site, additional landscaping has been added which will assist in breaking up the parking area.

- *Generally, more cramped than previous RM layout (despite plot 41 now providing 10 dwellings, essentially only 2 additional dwellings across the remainder of the site)*

Our client explored your suggestion of relocating a plot to the former Plot 41 section, but this did not work. However, several the 4 bed units have been relocated to the eastern side of the site in order that the larger dwellings sit within the larger plot depths.

- *Visibility for pedestrians (see Transportation comments)*

Please see the response below under 5) Landscaping.

- *Drainage (include on plan to demonstrate layout takes account of this) – clarification of why pumping station is now included (essentially loses a plot)*

A drainage strategy has been approved under conditions, but the approved strategy would require a closure of the A49, therefore alternative options are being considered which will require a pumping station on-site.

- *Parking to plots 41 & 42*

This has been addressed through the amended plans with the parking spaces broken up by a footpath.

- *Siting/orientation to maximise south/west gardens*

We have made amendments to maximise this, but the layout of the site is largely defined by route of the main road/constraints. As you suggested Plot 22 has been relocated so that it now benefits from a south facing garden.

4) Appearance

- *Materials – replacement of brown tiles with orange/red (sunset Blend/Red Mixed Russet)*

As per your suggestion we have replaced the brown tiles with an orange/red tile on the Roofing Materials Strategy Plan.

- *Substation – external materials/colour, fencing?*

The Facing and Roofing Materials Strategy Plans have been updated to demonstrate the substation will have materials to match the adjacent Plot 33.

- *Pumping station – sections (levels), fencing etc.*

Most of the pumping station will be below ground, with the above ground elements screened by a brick wall.

- *Design: three light windows above two light*

This is only on the Ashted housetype which is always plotted as a semi or terrace so the windows are symmetrical.

- *Bathroom windows to principal elevations (higher cills)*

As requested, the Dorking and Keswick housetype elevations have been revised to bring the bathroom window cills level with other first floor windows.

- *Gablets above first floor windows to discuss.*

The gablets are retained as they provide variety to the streetscene.

- *Porches – replace house types with canopy design to posts*

Photographs of the porches at Crest's Bartestree site are provided which demonstrate their timber construction and appearance.

5) Landscaping

- *Plot 36 – 2.5m fence (for noise) or 1.96m?*

As confirmed in your 28th February email, the fence to Plot 36 has been retained at a height of 2.5m in line with the EHO's preference to ensure maximum noise attenuation to the plot. In addition, Plot 36 has been substituted with a housetype with a smaller footprint, no garage, and the dwelling reorientated to allow for an improved rear garden.

- *Needs to address Transportation comments:*
 - *Most of the visibility splays for the private shared drives appear to be obstructed by planting. This should be amended. It would be useful if visibility splays could be demonstrated on the planning layout plan which shows the planting.*
 - *Forward visibility around the bend could be reduced to 33m (measured along the carriageway). This should be kept clear of planting above 0.6m and this will form one of the conditions attached to any planning consent. It would be useful to put a footway on the northern side of the carriageway around the bend (along the frontage of the play area). This would serve two purposes, firstly it would protect the forward visibility splay and secondly it would provide a footway connection for pedestrians on the private path through the play area and allow them to cross at a safe place. Currently the private footpath crosses pedestrians onto the private access road junction to the south of the play area which not only results in a road safety issue but also makes it difficult to provide tactile paving at the crossing point. Pedestrians should ideally cross to the west of the current arrangement.*
 - *Visibility splays should also be provided for all pedestrian crossing points.*
 - *Manual for Streets states that consideration should be given to whether pedestrian 2m x 2m splays are required in a given location.*

The LHA consider them to be necessary due to all of the pedestrian activity being located along the spine road. They should be demonstrated on a plan which, as with the visibility splays, shows the landscaping plans.

- *Car parking provision is not compliant with the Holmer and Shelwick NDP.*

As requested, a Access and Driveway Visibility drawing has been provided which demonstrates the visibility requirements requested by Highways, and visibility has also been included on the Planning Layout and Landscaping drawings. In addition, my client has specified on the Landscaping drawings that shrub planting within visibility splays are of low growing species and are to be maintained at a maximum height of 0.60m and are happy to accept a condition to this effect.

The forward visibility has been reduced to 33m and will be kept clear of vegetation above 0.6m. The footpath through the POS has been relocated to ensure the southern exit point and crossing point no longer clashes with the private access road junction.

6) Open Space

- *Confirmation of future maintenance*

As per the S106 Agreement, our client has previously notified the LPA (see email dated September 19th 2019), that the POS will be transferred to a Management Company, and this has been confirmed.

7) Sustainability Credentials

- *Electric charging points to provide for electric car charging for each dwelling, solar panels*

A Sustainability Credentials Statement has previously been submitted which demonstrates this is a sustainable site, they considered this request and have added the provision of external electric points to all plots (as shown on the Ext. Electric Socket Strategy Plan). This will provide occupiers with the ability to plug in electric/hybrid vehicles if they wish.

- *Future Homes Standard – compliance (& post 2025 depending on build out rate)*

As the development will be built out before 2025 this is not applicable.

8) Tree Removals

Further to your email regarding the neighbour's concerns that trees were to be removed the Landscaping drawings have been updated to show these trees to be retained.

I trust the amended plans will meet with your satisfaction, but if you have any concerns or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

My client agrees to an extension of time for 4 weeks from the date of this submission.

Yours sincerely



Jonathan Coombs
Principal Planner
e-mail: jonathan.coombs@pegasusgroup.co.uk

enc