

TO: CONSERVATION MANAGER
FROM: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

H26



<sup>PA1
06j</sup>
**Herefordshire
Council**

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION NO: DMN/121031FH
DESCRIPTION: Demolition of existing garage and boiler room and replacement with larger garage, two storey extension to rear to provide utility room and bedroom, eastern side extension to provide ground floor library.
SITE: Pippins, Horse Road, Wellington Heath, Ledbury, HR8 1LS
APPLICATION TYPE: Full Householder
PARISH: Wellington Heath
GRID REF: OS 371121, 240036
CASE OFFICER: Mr R Close

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 within 5-7 working days using the following link: <http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk>

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

<input checked="" 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 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"/>	Amended Plans
<input type="checkbox"/>	AAI	<input type="checkbox"/>	Additional Info

Please can you respond by.

Comments

This site lies within the Malvern Hills AONB and is on the southern edge of the hamlet of Wellington Heath. The house is built on a corner plot with a large garden to the front (south) with mature shrubs. There is a very small rear garden that would be mostly covered by the proposed extensions to the dwelling. This application follows a refusal of a previous scheme.

The original dwelling serves its purpose but is not of particularly high design quality and this is continued in the proposed extensions. The shape of the site has been used to its maximum on the west side with a garage extension, but this has resulted in a very ungainly chamfer to the roof, roof pitches that are much lower (22°) than the recommended minimum pitch for concrete plain tiles (35°) and odd angles to the walls. The elevations and roof plan for the garage do not quite match up – a very small hip is indicated on the front elevation that does not appear on the roof plan.

The rear extension has not fared much better by having a mansard roof as its crowning glory, presumably as a way of getting a larger room with better headroom.

After looking more closely at the site and the proposals, it appears that the rear extension would be more prominent than original envisaged. It would be easily seen from both the upper and lower roads and given its roof design it would be an unfortunate anomaly in the area.

The east extension has again been given a roof pitch that is incompatible with the concrete plain tiles proposed. This footprint is incorrectly sized on the block plan where it is shown as being considerably smaller than on the ground floor plan – this gives a distorted impression when considering the total footprint in relation to the site and its boundaries.

The extensions proposed do provide considerable extra space to the property however given the size of the plot, the scale of the finished building would be increased possibly beyond the character of the locality. This is particularly the case if, at a later date, further first floor extensions were again considered. The proposed ground floor accommodation would not be particularly balanced by the first floor provision, however more first floor bedroom or bathroom space would definitely over develop the site.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE in current form

Signed: Sarah L Lowe, Senior Building Conservation Officer

Date: 16 May 2012