

From: Web <web@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 April 2019 10:13
To: Planning Enquiries <planning_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application comment was submitted

The following is a comment on application '**P191013/RM**' by '**Jenny Jones**'

Nature of feedback: Objecting to the application

Comment:

19 April 2019

Response to Planning application reference number P191013/RM –land to the North of Ashperton Village Hall, HR8,

Firstly I am surprised that this application for reserved matters (ARM) has been accepted by HCC in its current format and surprised it has been put out for consultation given the number of inconsistencies and errors in accompanying documentation.

It contains items for which the outline planning permission has not been given namely
1) car ports for plot 6 and 7 are shown on the reserved matters application as solid buildings with a garage at ground floor level and living accommodation with its own external entrance on the first floor.

These car ports with accommodation have the potential for being rented out as a stand alone workspace or accommodation - in effect creating the possibility of at least two extra dwellings which is not part of the original outline permission. Is there any restrictions also to prevent car ports 4 and 5 also being further developed into further housing?

2) the attenuation pond on the reserved matters application did not feature in that position on the outline permission and also the landscaping and proposed planting of trees to hide the development seems to have been now much reduced. The attenuation pond is an engineered structure and will be an ugly imposition visible on entering the site. Permission was given for landscaping and trees so why has this been changed in the ARM?

3) I am puzzled by the apparent presence of a ditch alongside the A417 and can categorically state that in reality no such ditch is present – this is a basic error. Even if such a ditch was created it will in no way deal with the flood risk to properties South of the A417. There is nowhere suitable for water in the attenuation pond and ditch to go – it will flood both the main road and nearby homes.

4) With respect to the ARM, it seems to me that some of the earthworks and the attenuation pond and non-existent ditch do in fact lie outside the area that the outline permission relates to.

Surely applying for something for which permission has NOT been granted in the original outline planning permission is inherently wrong?

Why has Herefordshire Council accepted the ARM with the various omissions and fundamental errors?

The ARM doesn't show the full extent of neighbouring properties. Why not?

Why isn't Drew's Orchard on the opposite side of the A417 to the proposed development, shown in the drawings? Two of these houses are finished and occupied ; the third is approximately half built – by omitting these houses and more importantly the exit from these houses onto the main A417 the true context of the proposed development is not available to the planning committee.

By failing to include the entrance/exit for Drews Orchard onto the A417 and illustrating its close proximity to the proposed development , the applicant is glossing over the very real safety concerns of having what will essentially be a staggered crossroads and increased traffic, in the middle of a stretch of road where excessive speed and irresponsible overtaking is already a major problem.

Also I note the public right of way running North-South between the Village Hall and the proposed development has been omitted – another example of inattention to detail and thus failing to provide information with which to make an informed decision.

Again there is no information forthcoming from the Council regarding the height of these properties.

I recall the Council saying that this would be addressed since it was omitted from conditions applicable to the outline consent. The development is on a prominent piece of land so height of the buildings is an important and necessary consideration. Why has the application for reserved matters been allowed to progress without any mention of heights of the houses?

The design is thoroughly disappointing isn't it?

It is urban, wholly inappropriate in a rural setting and unimaginative.

The majority of houses within the village are either traditional oak/wattle and daub i.e. black and white; or red brick. The designs do not reflect this.

Wooden slats do not seem to weather particularly well and in my experience soon look shabby if not maintained. The use of such large amounts of wood presents an increased risk of structural damage in the event of a fire.

The use of aluminium window frames too is hardly ecologically sustainable let alone

aesthetically pleasing – again not in keeping with properties within the village.

The windows of the properties are disproportionately small in relation to the wall areas – daylight is essential for well being. Whilst neighbouring properties do have small windows, the windows are in proportion to the wall surface area as they are cottages.

The designs do not blend with existing housing let alone any of the listed buildings nearby. The site of the development means that the first thing visitors to the village will see when approaching from the West is an odd and insular collection of ultra modern houses which are totally out of keeping with current properties. How can this proposal possibly make a positive contribution to an historic rural village – the design is contrary to the Herefordshire Core Strategy.

The proposal does nothing to protect the heritage and assets of the village does it?

The design and eventual price of these properties ignores totally the need for affordable housing in rural communities.

Whilst I appreciate this is an application for reserved matters the question of appropriate infrastructure continues to be ignored by the applicant.

The measures to deal with rain water and run off by means of an attenuation pond are poorly thought through. There is no mains drainage in Ashperton to accommodate present rainfall and the main road is prone to sudden large puddles/surface water during heavy rain.

In this field the soil soon becomes saturated. Despite the fact that no outline permission exists for the attenuation pond shown on the ARM , to place it there would inevitably lead to further flooding on both on the main A417 and the properties adjacent to The Farm.

I suggest the reality of the situation is that the attenuation pond and planned ditch will not be able to cope with run off water – there is just no suitable drainage network in place to remove the water.

How can significantly increasing the flood risk for the main road and adjacent houses ever be considered acceptable in any shape or form ?

Likewise disposal of foul water has not been properly considered- how can an application for reserved matters even be progressed when the supporting infrastructure is undecided?

To date there is still no viable solution for dealing with the foul water/sewage produced. The land is unsuitable for septic tanks as confirmed by survey in the original application. Letting foul water, albeit treated, trickle down into stagnant part of the Herefordshire – Gloucestershire canal is far from satisfactory and again contrary to HCC saying it wishes to support regeneration of the Canal as a leisure amenity.

I urge Herefordshire Council Planning Committee to reject this application for reserved matters and ask that haste to comply with Government building targets does not cloud their judgement to the lasting detriment of Ashperton village and its community.

J A Jones

Attachment:

Their contact details are as follows:

First name: Jenny

Last name: Jones

Telephone: [Response - Telephone]

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: HR8 2RY

Address: Parish Cottage

48 Ashperton Road

Ashperton

Link Id:

https://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/info/200142/planning_services/planning_application_search/details?id=191013