

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING **HELD AT CREDENHILL COMMUNITY HALL ON 16th SEPTEMBER 2026**

PRESENT:

Councillor Mr Paul Beechey Chair (PA), Councillor Mr Paul Burrridge Vice Chair (PB), Councillor Mrs Sandra Cheasley (SC), Councillor Mrs Dot Pullen BEM (DP), Councillor Miss Consuelo Abel (CA), Councillor Mr Paul Warrington (PW), Councillor Mr Andrew Slater (AS), Councillor Mr Dan Fellows (DF), Councillor Mrs Kelly Edwards (KE) Councillor Mr Martin Leaton (ML).

Ward Councillor Mrs. Charlotte Taylor (CT)

Parish Council Clerk/RFO – Mr. Lee Harper-Smith (Clerk)

6 Members of the Press /Public present.

The Chair opened the meeting at 7.32 pm.

1. Apologies for Absence - To receive and accept apologies for absence.

Councillor Mr Chris Lewis (CL).

2. Declarations of Interest & Dispensations

2.1. No declarations of interest in agenda items from Councillors.

2.2. No written applications for dispensation

3. Public Question Time

Opportunity for members of the public to raise issues or ask the Parish Council questions.

PCSO Adam Westlake (AW) provided an update on all policing matters for the parish; no major concerns on the parish however there has been an increase in high-performance car thefts in the county. The team is now the following:

- Inspector Julie Watson
- Sgt Rebecca Colcombe
- Constable Kimberly Jones
- PCSO Adam Westlake

A member of the public reported that the woodland steps have been vandalised. AW confirmed that it had not been previously reported and highlighted the importance of reporting all crimes so that the police can prioritise based on ongoing trends. (Clerk to follow up with the Woodland Trust)

AW confirmed that he would be at The Life & Soul Kitchen on 12th November between 13:00 – 14:00 where members of the public can discuss local matters. (Clerk to put in CCN).

4. Outline Planning Application P262019/O

Consider planning application P262019/O - Land to the north of Granary Cottage - Outline application with all matters reserved, save access, for a development of up to 250 residential dwellings

The Chair (PA) read out his report on the application – Appendix B

The Ward Councillor (CT) read her report on the application – Appendix C

The chair opened up the debate to the council and the general public.

The parish council unanimously resolved to submit the comments detailed in appendix D.

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



5-minute recess to allow members of the public that want to leave to leave

5. Speakers

Opportunity for visiting speakers to address council and the public in attendance.

5.1. Update from Ward Councillor Charlotte Taylor.

Tedder Avenue Fencing

At the request of the Parish Council, I began investigating the longstanding issue of the damaged fencing at Tedder Avenue in January 2025.

One of the first challenges was establishing ownership and responsibility for the fence. Following extensive enquiries, it was eventually confirmed that Connexus was responsible for its maintenance.

Once responsibility had been identified, I engaged with several teams within Connexus to seek a resolution and secure repairs. Unfortunately, progress was slower than anticipated, with changes in personnel and staff departures causing delays and requiring ongoing follow-up. Although a repair date was initially agreed, this subsequently passed without the work being completed, necessitating further correspondence and intervention.

I am pleased to report that the damaged fence panels were finally replaced on 28 July 2026, bringing this matter to a successful conclusion after many months of persistence.

I would like to thank Connexus for ultimately delivering the repairs and resolving the issue. The completion of these works is particularly important as it should now enable the Parish Council to proceed with the flood mitigation works it has been planning for the area. This is an excellent example of how partnership working between residents, the Parish Council, housing providers and ward councillors can deliver positive outcomes for the community.

Bus Stops and Shelters at Oakfield View

At the end of January 2026, I was contacted by a resident who highlighted that Oakfield View had no dedicated bus stops and that the walking distance to the nearest existing stops presented difficulties for several residents, particularly those who rely on public transport.

Following this approach, I began making enquiries into whether bus stops could be provided for the area and what funding opportunities might be available. Since then, I have held numerous discussions with both the Council's Section 106 (S106) and Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) teams to explore potential solutions.

I am pleased to report that it has now been agreed in principle that S106 transport funding could be used to support the provision of bus stop infrastructure serving Oakfield View. In addition, funding may also contribute towards the relocation and improvement of the bus shelter adjacent to the VIVO entrance opposite Jellicoe Way, which also includes a crossing.

The transport team has recognised that there may be a viable way forward and has agreed to commence further investigations into the feasibility, design requirements and siting of new bus shelters and associated infrastructure. Whilst further work is required before any final decisions can be made, this represents a significant step forward in improving public transport accessibility for residents in this part of the ward.

I will continue to work with officers and stakeholders and will provide updates as the feasibility work progresses.

6. Minutes

DF proposed to approve and sign the minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting held on 17th June 2026, seconded by PW.

7. Matters arising since last meeting:

7.1. TRO Dovecote Lane – Double Yellow Lines – No progress

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



- 7.2. The submissions for Roman Park Tender - Early Years Play Area (0–5 Years) – Roman Park were reviewed, it was agreed that more time was needed to consult with residents with children, decision to be made at the October meeting.
- 7.3. The Roman Park tender for a Multi-Use Games Arena will be up for review on 9th October where the Parish Clerk will be sitting on the review panel.
- 7.4. Funding for the Hydrological survey of Credenhill Parish has been approved by Herefordshire Council. DF proposed to go ahead, seconded by AS all in favour except ML who abstained.
- 7.5. The correspondence received from Life & Soul Kitchen Charity requesting a variation in the lease was discussed. ML proposed that the matter to be passed on to the solicitor to confirm the cost of the variation, seconded by PW. Carried unanimously, Clerk to follow up.
- 7.6. The Community Centre Fencing amendments have been completed by the contractor however 2 snagging issues remain; the clerk is withholding 50% of the cost until the matters have been addressed.
- 8. Financial Reports – Appendix A**
 - 8.1. Confirmation of Bank Balances
 - 8.2. Receipts
 - 8.3. Invoices for Payment
 - 8.4. Comparison of YTD Actual Spend to Budget

SC proposed to approve the financial reports and to make the payments, seconded by DF.

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



9. Planning (PA, AS)

Reference	Details	CPC Status	HC Previous Status	HC New Status
P251908/F	Land at Town Well - Proposed conversion of stable outbuilding into a residential dwelling. Works include a two-storey extension, single storey extension, balcony and balustrade. Internal works including insulation. Proposed carport to include removal of wall.	Comments Submitted – Object RECONSULTATION - Object	Comments by 02/07/2026	Approved with Conditions
P251909/L	Land at Town Well – Listed building consent for application P251908/F	Comments Submitted – Object RECONSULTATION - Object	Comments by 02/07/2026	Approved with Conditions
P252968/X A2	Lower House – Discharge of conditions 10, 17 and Biodiversity Net Gain Plan attached to planning permission 242989	No Comments required	Determine by 09/12/2025	Ongoing Drainage
P260978/F	The Hollies, Crowmoor Lane - The reuse of a redundant rural building for two, 2-bed holiday lets (retrospective).	Comments Submitted – More Information Required	Determine by 26/05/2026	Ongoing Ecology
P261136/F	Land at Lower House - to amend the design of dwelling occupying plot 4.	Comments Submitted – Support	Determine by 24/07/2022	Approved with Conditions
P261671/L	Town Well Listed building consent - Creation of a WC within the utility room on the ground floor through the insertion of a partition wall and installation of a toilet and sink	Comments Submitted – Support	Determine by 11/09/2026	Approved with Conditions
P262023/F H	104 Ecroyd Park – Extension	NEW	NEW	Comments by 29/09/2026

ML formally thanked PB and CT for attending the planning committee meeting regarding applications P251908/F and P251909/L. PB and CT provided excellent representation for both the Parish Council and local residents

AS provided his report on P262023/FH – Appendix E– PB proposed to submit the recommended comments, seconded by SC. Clerk to submit comments.

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



10. To receive reports from working groups

- 10.1. Finance & Asset Management (AS, ML, PW, PA) – No update
- 10.2. Community Hall (SC, AS) – Appendix F
- 10.3. Footpaths (SC, DF) – Clerk to contact the Woodland Trust about the damaged steps.
- 10.4. Shops/Businesses (DP, KE) – Onestop is being refurbished as Tesco Express and will be closed for a number of weeks.
- 10.5. War Memorial (ML, CL) – ML currently planning for remembrance.
- 10.6. Schools (CA) – CA to have a meeting with CT and the school, will also discuss play equipment with the nursery.
- 10.7. Roman Park (DF, ML, SC) – No update
- 10.8. Social Club (TBC) – No update
- 10.9. Climate Change (SC, DF, EJ) – No update
- 10.10. Credenhill Community Club (PW) – New toilet purchased with grant money.
- 10.11. Resource Centre/Life & Soul Kitchen (PA/ML/SC/CT) - No update.

11. Public Question Time

Further opportunity for members of the public to raise issues or ask the Parish Council questions.

A member of public asked why the Parish Council has no NDP? Clerk confirmed the history of the NDP in the parish and that a lack of volunteers to lead the steering group lead to no NDP being produced and that the Parish Council has since agreed not to produce one.

A representative from Wye Ventures CIC advocated for assessing how local physical layouts shape the health and development of children, proposing that the council invest in preventative spatial mapping alongside existing infrastructure projects like the hydrological survey. PA acknowledged that we had previously received a talk from Wye Ventures CIC, but had not received any application for grant funding which had now been spent for 2026/27 and that the play equipment tender for £25,000 discussed on the agenda had gone out for public tender. PA requested a written proposal via email so that the Parish Council could look at what was being proposed.

12. Confirmation of the next Meetings, Time, Date & Place.

The next ordinary Parish Council meeting will be at 7.30 pm, 14th October 2026, at Credenhill Community Hall. A summons and notice will be provided nearer the time.

The Chair declared the meeting closed at 21:23.

Councillor Mr Paul Beechey Chair

Signed.....

Date.....

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



Appendix A - Financial Information

Income & Expenditure		Lloyds Current	Lloyds Reserve	Total
31/07/2026	Closing Balance	2,306.07	40,868.72	43,174.79
Receipts				
10/08/2026	Lloyds Bank – Interest		18.78	18.78
14/08/2026	The Life & Soul Kitchen – Rent	680.00		680.00
14/08/2026	Mini Athletics - Roman Park Hire	62.00		62.00
19/08/2026	Kathy Jagger - CCN Advertising	185.00		185.00
28/08/2026	Joe Liddiard - CCN Advertising	105.00		105.00
Total Received in Period		1,032.00	18.78	1,050.78
Payments				
18/08/2026	Lloyds Bank - Bank Fees	-4.67		-4.67
20/08/2026	Mrs E Jones – Wages Aug 2026	-397.43		-397.43
20/08/2026	Mr L Harper-Smith – Wages July 2026	-1,012.80		-1,012.80
20/08/2026	Mr L Harper-Smith – Expenses July 2026	-87.05		-87.05
20/08/2026	C Powell - Parish Maintenance July 2026	-104.78		-104.78
20/08/2026	Mark Wozencroft – Roman Park Tarmac Maintenance	-200.00		-200.00
20/08/2026	Countrywide Grounds Maintenance – Weed Control 1 of 2	-330.00		-330.00
20/08/2026	Hydro-GIS Ltd – Hydrological Survey 50%	-2,550.00		-2,550.00
20/08/2026	OTM Groundscare Ltd – Grass Cutting 1-4/7	-3,121.20		-3,121.20
20/08/2026	Mayglothling – Sewage Collection	-265.00		-265.00
20/08/2026	Creative Play – Backhouse Park Inspection/Service	-354.00		-354.00
20/08/2026	NEST - Pension Payment	-86.85		-86.85
26/08/2026	Valda Energy - Electricity Carpark/Changing Rooms	-68.03		-68.03
Total Spent in Period		-8,581.81	0.00	-8,581.81
Transfers		Total Transfers in Period		
		8,000.00	-8,000.00	0.00
31/07/2026	Closing Balance	2,756.26	32,887.50	35,643.76
Payments to Authorise				
16/09/2026	Mrs E Jones – Wages Sept 2026	-397.43		-397.43
16/09/2026	Mrs E Jones – Expenses Aug 2026	-8.04		-8.04
16/09/2026	Mr L Harper-Smith – Wages Aug 2026	-1,012.60		-1,012.60
16/09/2026	Mr L Harper-Smith – Expenses Aug 2026	-56.55		-56.55
16/09/2026	C Powell - Parish Maintenance July 2026	-41.52		-41.52
16/09/2026	Signworx – Newsletter Printing Sept 2026	-430.00		-430.00
16/09/2026	OTM Groundscare Ltd – Grass Cutting 5/7	-792.90		-792.90
Total Payments to Authorise		-2,739.04	0.00	-2,739.04
Transfers to Authorise				
	Transfer between accounts	2,000.00	-2,000.00	0.00
Total Transfers to Authorise		2,000.00	-2,000.00	0.00

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



ASSETS

Cash & Bank			Balance
Lloyds – Current Account (after payments)			2,017.22
Lloyds – Reserve Account (after transfers)			30,887.50
Petty Cash			0.00
Total Cash & Bank			32,904.72
Debtors	No Due	Overdue	Total
The Life & Soul Kitchen Ltd – Rent/Water Recharge	680.00		680.00
Fishwick Auto Services – CCN Advertising	185.00		185.00
Natalie Hogg– CCN Advertising	185.00		185.00
RO-Stars Hereford – Roman Park Hire	50.00	200.00	250.00
Total Debtors	1,100.00	200.00	1,300.00
Other Debtors			
Total Other Debtors	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ASSETS			34,204.72

LIABILITIES

Creditors	Not Due	Overdue	Total
Total Trade Creditors	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Liabilities			
HMRC - PAYE Owing (DD)	342.72		342.72
NEST Pension Payments Owing (DD)	86.85		86.85
Youth Club Funds	771.13		771.13
VAT at 20% to be reclaimed from HMRC	-2,177.37		-2,177.37
VAT at 5% to be reclaimed from HMRC	-18.75		-18.75
Total Other Liabilities	-995.42	0.00	-995.42
TOTAL LIABILITIES			-995.42
TOTAL			35,200.14

CREDENHILL PARISH COUNCIL



2026-2027 Budget/Actual Comparison YTD

2026-2027 Budget/Actual Comparison YTD											
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
	b/fwd. Reserve	March	Year Budget	Total Budget (inc Reserve)	YTD Comparable Budget Total	YTD Actual Spent/ Receipt	YTD Variance	Agreed Budget Movements	YTD Comparable Budget Change	Revised YTD Variance	Notes
Wages (inc Employers NI)			18,703	18,703	7,793	8,234	- 441	401	401	- 40	Street Cleaner paid 1 month in advance
Employer Pension Contribution			526	526	219	220	- 1	-	-	- 1	Street Cleaner paid 1 month in advance
Staffing Costs	-		19,229	19,229	8,012	8,454	- 442	401	401	- 41	
Software			102	102	43	43	- 0	-	-	- 0	
Travel & Subsistence			156	156	65	61	- 4	-	-	- 4	
Printing			50	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Telephone			60	60	25	25	-	-	-	-	
Postage			12	12	5	-	- 5	-	-	- 5	
Stationary			84	84	35	12	- 23	-	-	- 23	
Homeworking Allowance			240	240	75	75	-	-	-	-	
Meeting Room Hire/File Storage			584	584	276	208	- 68	-	-	- 68	
Office & Meeting Costs	-		1,288	1,288	524	424	- 100	-	-	- 100	
Website Hosting Fee			182	182	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Printing CCN			5,333	5,333	2,591	2,270	- 321	-	-	- 321	
Advertising & Promotion	-		5,515	5,515	2,591	2,270	- 321	-	-	- 321	
Insurance			1,911	1,911	1,911	1,777	- 134	-	-	- 134	
Bank Fees			60	60	25	22	- 3	-	-	- 3	
Internal Audit			200	200	200	200	-	-	-	-	
External Audit			331	331	331	-	- 331	-	-	- 331	
ICO Membership Fee			47	47	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Professional/Planning			-	-	-	2,125	- 2,125	-	-	- 2,125	50% Paid - To be rebilled to Herefordshire Council
Election Costs			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Legal Fees			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Playground Inspection			300	300	-	295	- 295	-	-	- 295	
Insurance, Legal & Professional Cost	-		2,849	2,849	2,467	4,418	- 1,952	-	-	- 1,952	
Changing Rooms - Electric			315	315	131	139	- 8	-	-	- 8	
Changing Rooms - Water Rates			113	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Community Centre - Waste Disposal			778	778	389	384	- 4	-	-	- 4	
Community Centre - Water			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Community Centre - Electric			504	504	210	164	- 46	-	-	- 46	
Utility & Waste Management Costs	-		1,709	1,709	730	687	- 43	-	-	- 43	
Outsourced Maintenance Costs											
Maintenance			2,097	2,097	706	845	- 139	-	-	- 139	
Materials			300	300	125	9	- 116	-	-	- 116	
Cleaning			448	448	186	56	- 130	-	-	- 130	
War Memorial Improvement Fund			150	150	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Blooming Credenhill Project	382		500	882	35	35	- 0	-	-	- 0	
Hedge Cutting			426	426	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Weed Control			1,474	1,474	737	275	- 462	-	-	- 462	
Grass Cutting			4,806	4,806	3,343	3,262	- 82	-	-	- 82	
Tree Maintenance			1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Outsourced Maintenance Costs	382		11,200	11,582	5,133	4,482	- 650	-	-	- 650	
Total Operating Costs	382		41,790	42,172	19,456	20,736	- 1,281	401	401	- 880	
Exceptional/Planned Costs											
Charitable Grant Provision			7,000	7,000	7,000	8,904	- 1,904	-	-	- 1,904	
Roman Park	21,086		4,000	25,086	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Community Hall Fence/Exit Ramp	2,500		-	2,500	658	658	- 0	-	-	- 0	50% Paid
Asset Repairs & Renewals	7,649		6,097	13,746	1,050	1,050	- 0	-	-	- 0	
Hall/Resource Centre Boundary Fence	3,000		-	3,000	1,687	1,687	- 0	-	-	- 0	50% Paid
Backhouse Park - Fencing/Wall	3,645		400	4,045	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Exceptional/Planned Costs	37,880		17,497	56,359	20,790	12,299	- 1,904	-	-	- 1,904	
Total Projected/Actual Costs	38,262		59,287	98,531	40,246	33,035	- 3,185	401	401	- 2,784	
Income											
Precept			-48,623	- 48,623	- 24,312	- 24,311	- 1	-	-	- 1	
Rent			- 8,160	- 8,160	- 4,080	- 4,097	- 17	-	-	- 17	
Bank Interest			- 120	- 120	- 120	- 94	- 26	-	-	- 26	
CCN Adverts			- 1,785	- 1,785	- 1,030	- 1,050	- 20	-	-	- 20	
Hire of Changing Rooms			- 600	- 600	- 300	- 422	- 122	-	-	- 122	
Donations/Other Income			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Grants Income			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Utilities Recharges			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Income	-		-59,288	- 59,288	- 29,842	- 29,973	- 132	-	-	- 132	
YTD Budget/Actual Variance							- 3,053			- 2,652	



Appendix B – Chair Report P262019 – Land North of Granary Cottage.

Good evening everyone and thank you for attending.

We know this meeting has attracted a lot of interest, and we understand why. A proposal of up to 250 new houses on the edge of Credenhill is a major development, and it is natural that people feel strongly about it. Before we begin, I want to make one thing absolutely clear:

The Parish Council is not here tonight to support the developer, nor to defend Herefordshire Council. Our role is to represent the people of Credenhill, fairly, calmly, and based on evidence.

Tonight is about listening to you, explaining what we know, and setting out how we will respond formally to the planning authority.

First, what this application actually is

This application is outline, not full planning permission. That means:

- It does not approve the final layout.
- It does not approve the final number or position of houses.
- It does not approve drainage details, landscaping, noise mitigation, or open space design.
- The only thing being considered now is the principle of development on this land, and the access point onto the A480.

If outline permission were ever to be granted, the developer would still have to submit a second application called Reserved Matters, where all the detailed design must be shown and approved.

So tonight is not about approving a finished housing estate. It is about understanding whether the principle of up to 250 houses here is acceptable under planning policy.

What we can and cannot do as a Parish Council

We cannot stop people feeling worried or frustrated. We cannot make promises about the outcome of the planning process. We cannot reject an application simply because it is unpopular.

But we can:

- Review all technical documents submitted.
- Consider all consultee responses.
- Listen to parishioners' concerns.
- Identify gaps, risks, and conflicts with planning policy.
- Submit a clear, evidence based response to Herefordshire Council.
- Ensure your voices are heard.

That is exactly what we are doing.

What the technical evidence tells us

Over the past weeks, we have reviewed a large number of documents, including:

- The Landscape Officer's report
- The Open Space Officer's memorandum
- The Environmental Health (military noise) assessment
- The Transport Assessment
- Active Travel England requirements
- The MOD safeguarding comments
- Objections from local residents, including Stretton Court Farm / Cider Barn
- Known issues with NHS capacity
- Known issues with school capacity at Stretton Sugwas Primary, St Mary's Catholic High and Weobley High

- The applicant's Planning Statement
- The revised National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)
- The Herefordshire Core Strategy



So from all of the information we have, we are able to summarise our findings:

The Council's Senior Landscape Officer has raised a substantial landscape objection. Their professional assessment states that:

- The site is visually exposed from public footpaths, bridleways, and Credenhill Park Wood.
- The proposal represents over development of a rural agricultural field.
- The development would cause a loss of rural character.
- Landscape buffers are too narrow to screen the housing.
- The SuDS water features are placed too close to the Commonwealth War Graves cemetery, risking tranquillity and groundwater protection.
- The scheme is not landscape led, despite the applicant's claims.

This is one of the strongest objections in the file.

The Transport Assessment suggests the roads can cope. However, several issues remain:

- The A480 junction already experiences congestion and long queues.
- The MOD has raised concerns about traffic affecting security and access to Stirling Lines.
- Active Travel England contradicts and states that methods used are not adequate and the results are not a fair assessment of the current movement around the area:
 - o Only one walking route was assessed.
 - o No cycling level of service audit was carried out.
 - o No off site improvements are proposed.
 - o Station Road's narrow footways and pinch points remain unaddressed.

Military noise and safeguarding, the environmental Health comments confirm that the noise assessment:

- Was only monitored for around 24 hours.
- And did not capture irregular or peak military noise.
- And did not assess helicopter movements, training exercises, generators, or night time activity.

So this application would apply to the rule "The agent of change principle applies": The new housing must protect its own amenity without restricting military operations. In other words.....the person or developer making the change (the "agent of change") must provide fix-it measures, such as soundproofing.

The MOD has also raised safeguarding concerns about:

- Security risks from increased civilian presence.
- Floodwater management near the base.
- Traffic affecting access to Stirling Lines.

The Open Space Officer confirms that:

- The development must provide 1.725 hectares of accessible greenspace.
- It must provide formal equipped play for children.
- Green connectivity through the site must be improved.
- SuDS basins must be safe and appropriately located.

The current indicative plan:

- Does not clearly show formal play provision.
- Has weak north-south connectivity.
- Places SuDS basins too close to the military cemetery.
- Uses landscape buffers that are too narrow to function properly.

We know from local experience that:

- St Mary's Catholic High School is at or near capacity.
- Weobley High School is at capacity with no clear expansion plan.
- Stretton Sugwas Primary is near or at capacity.
- NHS primary care is already overstretched, with residents struggling to get appointments.

The application does not provide clear evidence of:

- Education contributions,



- School expansion plans,
- Or NHS capacity improvements.

This raises serious questions about whether the village can absorb the growth.

So what would be the overall impact on Credenhill if the development were approved
If outline permission were granted, the village would experience:

- Permanent loss of rural agricultural land.
- A large new housing estate on the eastern edge of the village.
- More urban character in an area currently defined by countryside.
- More traffic on the A480, Station Road, and Roman Road.
- Increased demand on schools and healthcare.
- More pressure on village facilities such as One Stop, Roman Park, and community services.
- A significant increase in population.
- Changes to the identity and feel of the village.
- Potential tension between existing and new residents.
- Increased risk of noise complaints towards the MOD.
- Potential pressure on Stirling Lines operations.
- Greater need for safeguarding measures because of a higher risk to threat.

After this meeting:

- The Parish Council will compile all evidence, consultee responses, and parishioner concerns.
- We will submit a formal, detailed planning comment to Herefordshire Council.
- If you haven't already done so, we encourage parishioners to submit their own comments individually.

- The planning authority will consider all responses before making a decision.

We will continue to keep residents informed throughout the process.

Myself and my fellow councillors would like to thank everyone for attending tonight and for engaging respectfully. We knew this proposal would and has caused tension and anxiety through the village.

Thank you.



Appendix C – Ward Councillor Report P262019 – Land North of Granary Cottage.

I have formally requested that Planning Application 262019, which seeks outline permission for up to 250 dwellings north of Granary Cottage, Credenhill, be referred to the Planning and Regulatory Committee for determination.

The Local Planning Authority has acknowledged my request and confirmed that it will be considered through the Council's redirection process. Heather Carlisle, Principal Planning Officer, has advised that the request has been added to the agenda for the next redirection meeting.

The application has generated considerable public interest, with more than 120 objections submitted. Concerns raised by residents and consultees include landscape impact, flood risk and drainage, highway matters, heritage considerations, and the potential impact on sensitive neighbouring receptors, including Credenhill Hillfort, the Commonwealth War Graves Commission Cemetery and nearby Ministry of Defence facilities. These concerns are reflected in formal objections received from the Council's Landscape and Land Drainage consultees.

I have also met with residents at The Priors to discuss longstanding flooding concerns and the potential implications of the proposed development. The issues raised by residents are consistent with concerns expressed in planning objections and with the Land Drainage Officer's objection to the application.

Following these discussions, I requested that the Council's flood risk specialists investigate the matters raised so that any existing drainage and flooding constraints are fully understood before any decision is reached.

In addition, the Ministry of Defence has identified matters requiring consideration in relation to security, safeguarding, highways, landscaping, noise, drainage and flood risk. Whilst these comments do not amount to

a formal objection, they demonstrate the complexity of the proposal and the range of issues that require careful consideration.

The Landscape Officer has raised concerns regarding overdevelopment, loss of rural character, inadequate landscape mitigation and potential harm to important views and landscape settings. The Council's Land Drainage Team has also objected, advising that the current proposals present a risk of flooding to neighbouring properties and cannot be supported at outline stage. These concerns identify potential conflicts with Core Strategy policies and national planning policy relating to landscape protection, environmental quality, drainage and heritage.

Given the scale of the development, the significant consultee objections, the environmental sensitivities of the site and the high level of public concern, I believe it is essential that the application receives transparent and robust scrutiny through the committee process.

This remains one of the most significant planning proposals currently affecting the ward. I will continue to represent residents' concerns, ensure that all material planning considerations are fully examined, and keep residents and the Parish Council informed as the application progresses.



Appendix D – Agreed Parish Council Response P262019 – Land North of Granary Cottage.

We submit the following comments in response to the above outline application. Having reviewed all technical documents, consultee responses, national policy (NPPF August 2026), and the Herefordshire Core Strategy, we consider that the proposal does not currently demonstrate compliance with several key policy requirements and raises significant unresolved impacts on transport, landscape, community infrastructure, and sensitive neighbouring uses.

While the outline nature of the application means some matters could be addressed at Reserved Matters stage, the principle of development must still be assessed against national and local policy. On balance, the evidence indicates that the proposal does not yet meet the requirements of the revised NPPF (2026) or the Core Strategy and therefore cannot be supported in its present form.

Compliance with the NPPF (August 2026)

Policy S3, S4, S5 – Sustainable Development & Development Outside Settlements

Although the applicant relies heavily on Policy S5(1)(j) (unmet housing need), the NPPF requires that development outside settlements must be:

- physically well related to the settlement,
- of a scale that can be accommodated by existing infrastructure,
- and must not generate adverse effects that substantially outweigh benefits.

The evidence shows significant infrastructure constraints in Credenhill:

- Stretton Sugwas primary school at or near capacity.
- Secondary schools (Weobley High & St Mary's High) at capacity with no clear expansion plan.
- NHS primary care already struggling to meet demand; S106 healthcare contributions are uncertain and historically difficult to secure.
- MOD operational noise and safeguarding constraints remain unresolved.
- Transport impacts on the A480 corridor and Station Road remain materially unmitigated.

These constraints indicate that the scale of development cannot currently be accommodated, contrary to NPPF S5.

Policy HO7 – Meeting Housing Need

Policy HO7 requires substantial weight to be given to housing delivery. However, this weight is not automatic and must be balanced against environmental and infrastructure harm. The consultee evidence demonstrates that harm is significant and unresolved.

Policy DP3 – Well Designed Places

The Landscape Officer identifies multiple failures against DP3, including:

- excessive density for a rural edge location,
- inadequate landscape buffers,
- inappropriate SuDS placement adjacent to the Commonwealth War Graves cemetery,
- lack of street trees and climate resilient design,
- failure to respect local landscape character and views of Credenhill Park Wood.

These issues indicate non-compliance with DP3.

Compliance with the Herefordshire Core Strategy

2.1 Policy RA2 – Housing in Main Villages

Credenhill is a RA2 village, but RA2 does not allocate housing numbers nor imply unlimited growth.

Development must be:

- proportionate,
- reflective of local character,
- and supported by infrastructure.



A single proposal of 250 dwellings represents a scale far beyond typical RA2 growth and is not proportionate to the size, character, or infrastructure capacity of Credenhill.

Policy LD1 – Landscape & Townscape

The Landscape Officer's report comment "Substantial Landscape Objection due to over development of the site" and continues to make reference to:

- loss of rural character,
- inadequate screening,
- harm to views from PROWs and Credenhill Park Wood,
- inappropriate proximity to the military cemetery,
- overdevelopment of a rural agricultural parcel.

This constitutes clear conflict with LD1.

Policy MT1 – Transport & Highways

The Transport Assessment concludes no severe impact, but ATE's statutory role requires compliance with active travel standards. The WRAT score is high, but ATE compliance is not achieved because:

- the route assessment does not consider increased pedestrian volumes,
- no improvements are proposed despite the scale of development,
- Station Road's constrained footways and traffic calming pinch points remain unaddressed.

Additionally, local residents and MOD Credenhill already report significant congestion at the A480 / Roman Road roundabout and Station Road junction. The cumulative impact of 250 dwellings is not fully mitigated, contrary to MT1.

Policy OS1 / OS2 – Open Space

The Open Space Officer confirms:

- 1.869 ha of GI is required,
- formal equipped play must be provided,
- green connectivity must be improved,
- SuDS must be safe and appropriately located.

The indicative masterplan does not meet these requirements, particularly regarding:

- formal play provision,
- north-south connectivity,
- SuDS placement near the cemetery.

Policy SD1 / SS6 – Amenity & Military Noise

Environmental Health confirms the noise assessment is inadequate and does not capture irregular or peak military noise. The MOD has raised safeguarding concerns. This represents non-compliance with SD1 and SS6.

Impact on Credenhill if Approved

If approved, the development would have the following impacts:

Infrastructure Pressure

- Schools: Stretton Sugwas primary, St Mary's High and Weobley High are already at capacity. Additional pupils would require expansion funding or result in longer travel distances.
- Healthcare: Existing NHS provision is already non-existent in Credenhill and with the application of a pharmacy earlier in 2026 refused the NHS for Herefordshire is arguably already overstretched and suffering a severe lack of GP appointments in some practices serving the residents of Credenhill. S106 healthcare contributions are uncertain and historically difficult to secure.
- Highways: Increased congestion on the A480 corridor, Station Road, and Roman Road roundabout.
- Parking & village centre pressure: Increased demand on the local amenities and community facilities.

Landscape & Character

- Permanent loss of rural agricultural land.



- Urbanisation of the village's eastern edge.
- Harm to views from PROWs and Credenhill Park Wood.
- Potential disturbance to the Commonwealth War Graves cemetery.

Military Compatibility

- Increased risk of complaints from new residents regarding helicopter movements, training noise, and nighttime operations.
- Potential future pressure on MOD operations (Agent of Change principle).

Social Impact

- Significant change to village identity and scale.
- Increased demand on parish resources and community facilities.
- Potential tension between existing residents and new development.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence available, the proposal does not currently comply with the revised NPPF (August 2026) or the Herefordshire Core Strategy. Significant unresolved issues remain in relation to:

- landscape harm,
- transport and active travel,
- military safeguarding and noise,
- open space and SuDS design,
- school and healthcare capacity,
- and the overall scale and proportionality of development under RA2.

For these reasons, we cannot support the application in its present form.

Appendix E – P262023/FH – Planning Report

Councillor's Assessment

I have considered the above planning application from the perspective of the Parish Council, including the relationship of the proposed development with adjoining residential properties.

There is no objection in principle to the extension of an existing dwelling within this established residential area. However, any extension should remain proportionate to the original property and should not result in an unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The Parish Council is aware that the occupiers of **No. 103 Ecroyd Park have raised concerns specifically regarding the proposed height of the extension and the resulting impact upon their property.** Other neighbouring occupiers are understood not to have raised objections.

The absence of objections from other neighbours is noted. However, the particular relationship between No. 104 and No. 103 means that the impact upon No. 103 should be considered on its own merits.

The existing relationship between the properties appears relatively close, and therefore the proposed **height, scale, massing and proximity to the shared boundary** require careful assessment.

In particular, the Planning Authority should consider whether the extension would:

- appear unduly dominant or overbearing when viewed from No. 103;
- materially reduce daylight or sunlight reaching the neighbouring property or garden;
- result in unacceptable overshadowing;
- adversely affect the outlook currently enjoyed by the neighbouring occupiers;
- create any additional overlooking or loss of privacy;
- result in a form of development that is disproportionate to the existing dwelling; and
- adversely affect the established character and appearance of this part of Ecroyd Park.



Parish Council View

The Parish Council recognises the concerns raised by the occupiers of No. 103 regarding the proposed height of the extension.

Given the relatively close relationship between the two properties, the Parish Council considers that the **impact of the proposed height and massing upon No. 103 is the principal planning consideration in this application.**

The Parish Council therefore requests that the Planning Officer carefully assesses the proposed extension from the neighbouring property and considers whether its height, scale and proximity would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity through an overbearing effect, loss of outlook, overshadowing or loss of daylight.

Recommended Parish Council Response

No objection in principle, but concern is raised regarding the proposed height and its potential impact upon the residential amenity of No. 103 Ecroyd Park.

The Parish Council requests that the Planning Authority satisfies itself that the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing effect upon No. 103.

If the Planning Officer considers that the proposed height would result in material harm to neighbouring amenity, the Parish Council would support the submission of amended plans reducing the height or massing of the extension.



Appendix F: Community Hall Report (SC)

1. Events - Over the summer Terri and Betty have liaised to talk about co-ordinating a couple of events together so all on site are involved. This is the Indoor Car Boot on 11th Oct and Xmas Fair 21st Nov. Most of the discussion today was about the Xmas Fair and what each site has to offer to benefit from the event. Hall income from the tables, Social Club income from the bar, L&S income from the catering. Mandy, Terri and Betty will meet again nearer the time to discuss further details about the organisation for the day and the decorations around the site especially Santa's Grotto!
2. Booking - A few party bookings are in but unfortunately Baby Sensory have cancelled their weekly sessions and Troy from Martial Arts has cancelled his Saturday booking. Troy also owes £800 in booking fees dating back to the Spring and is still using hall for his weekly sessions. David has emailed chasing the money, but Betty will ring and speak to him directly again, apparently his circumstances have changed. Beth from Pilates is always a bit late in paying but think she is a bit unorganised with her Admin. We had a discussion about the Terms and Conditions of the initial contract and perhaps the Hall need to take a stronger line over late payment and terminating the booking without giving due notice and in that case keeping the deposit initially paid. Also charging when Hall is booked and there is a no show for a week rather than charging when just the groups are in.
3. Finance - Please see accounts attached. David is very concerned over the lack of income now coming in especially with the winter months ahead. There is a loss with Baby Sensory, Martial Arts and Magna. Also still the problems with the electric bills and the issue of no credit from the solar panels. Over the hot weather, the energy company Corona have continued to charge about £250 monthly when hardly any electric should have been used probably just lighting and a bit of kitchen usage. David still has concerns on the Meter Installation and wonders if it is the correct one. He also wonders if the batteries at night are taking energy from the grid to charge up. Lee, he has e-mailed you with his concerns.
4. Grant money works - Betty asked if you have organised the quotes for the guttering works. The Hall has had a bit of water ingress again in the kitchen.