

TO: CONSERVATION MANAGER  
FROM: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

H26



*PA1.061*  
**Herefordshire  
Council**

**APPLICATION DETAILS**

APPLICATION NO: N121573/F  
DESCRIPTION: Proposed erection of two holiday let units  
SITE: Land adj to and South of Fairview, Putley, Herefordshire, HR8 2RE  
APPLICATION TYPE: Planning Permission  
PARISH: Putley  
GRID REF: OS 364123, 238057  
CASE OFFICER: Mr P Mullineux

I have received the above application on which I would be grateful for your advice. The application form and plans for the above development can be viewed on the Internet, normally within 24 hours, using the following link:  
<http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/searchplanningapplications>

I would be grateful for your advice in respect of the following specific matters: -

<input type="checkbox"/>	Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Landscape interest
<input type="checkbox"/>	Design comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	TPO/Trees
<input type="checkbox"/>	Setting of Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ancient Woodland
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic Park/Garden
<input type="checkbox"/>	Archaeology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biodiversity Interest
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scheduled Ancient Monument	<input type="checkbox"/>	Designated Habitat
<input type="checkbox"/>	Setting of Scheduled A M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Amended Plans</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	AAI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Additional Info</b>

Please can you respond by 13/08/2012 to [planning\\_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planning_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk)

**COMMENTS:**

This small triangle of land is situated between Putley Common and Putley. Historically the land has been in the same ownership as the commercial orchard to the south. The proposed scheme follows on from a refused scheme for three holiday let units.

In terms of principle the provision of new buildings for holiday accommodation is contrary to Policy RST12 as this site is outside any identified settlement in the UDP.

In terms of the merits of this particular scheme, the block plan shows that the new building would be located very close to the south boundary onto the orchard. This does not follow the general character of plots in the area or the wider countryside and would appear constricted unnecessarily.

Despite the ground levels indicated on the existing and proposed block plans the elevations make no reference to the significant slope on the site. The elevations have been drawn as if the site is flat and therefore gives a false impression of all the elevations except for the front/north-west. If the correct information was drawn then the two sets of French doors on the south-east elevation would be set above ground

level by about 1.1m and there is not sufficient room between the building and the boundary to insert a set of set of steps to reach the garden level.

The house plans are less than satisfactory and the deep plan results in a relatively large roof on both parts of the building. The east lean-to does not really relate to any change in room so that the very slight set back of the brick wall has no reasoning behind it which does not follow the traditions to which the building is trying to allude.

The staircase in the larger unit is awkwardly placed and results in difficult rooms shapes for the bathroom and bedroom in order to enable half of a window to let light onto the staircase. This is a fundamental flaw that should have been designed out early in the process.

The staircase in the smaller unit seems to have two windows however in practice the lower window would not be at the level shown on the elevation and would conflict with the upper window. The two windows should probably be one, located at proper cill height from the stair landing.

On a more detailed level the use of blue bricks for detailing purposes is not generally seen in this area. Occasionally buff bricks are sparingly used, such as on the extension to the property just to the north of the site, but not with full Victorian flamboyance to advertise the presence of the building.

It seems unusual that this small piece of land is not owned by an adjoining owner. The site does not therefore appear to be the expansion of an existing business in the area or a diversification.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

Signed: Sarah Lowe, Senior Building Conservation Officer

Date: 17 August 2012