

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

APPLICATION NUMBER

193983

Woodmanton, Hope-Under-Dinmore, Leominster, HR6 0PT

CASE OFFICER: Mrs Fay Griffiths

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 19/12/2020

**Relevant Development
Plan Policies:**

Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy

Policies:

SS1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

SD1 – Sustainable design and energy efficiency

LD1 – Landscape and townscape

Hope-under-Dinmore Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), made of 21 September 2019 – No specific policies in relation to alterations to dwelling houses, but in relation to landscape:

HUD6: Landscape Character

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

Relevant Site History:

DCH780378/A30 - ERECTION OF A STORE AND CAR PORT FOR PRIVATE DOMESTIC USE AT WOODMANTON, HOPE UNDER DINMORE, LEOMINSTER. - Approved with Conditions

P174096/FH - Proposed extensions. – Approved

P182381/FH - Proposed pitched roof, dormer windows and balco at side elevation - Approved with Conditions

CONSULTATIONS

	Consulted	No Response	No objection	Qualified Comment	Object
Parish Council	X	X			
Environmental Health (contamination)	X		X		
Site Notice	X				X
Local Member	X		X		

PLANNING OFFICER'S APPRAISAL:

Site description and proposal:

The proposal site comprises a detached and well-altered two-storey property on the northern side of the U94001, commonly known as Winsley Road.

The proposed scheme is for a proposed erection of balcony and increase ridge height of roof plus additional fenestration. Part retrospective. For ease of reference, please refer to the plans below:



Existing elevations



Proposed elevations

Representations:

Local Member – Cllr Crockett has been updated and has confirmed that she does not intend to request that the application is re-directed

Parish Council – No response

Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) – *Received 09/01/2020*

“I refer to the above application and would make the following comments in relation to contaminated land and human health issues. Given what's proposed, I've no comments to make.”

Objection from Mr Wright – *Received 01/03/2020*

“To whom it may concern,

Objection

Planning No: P193983/FH

- Excessive size to extensions which detract from the original stone cottage and drawf the original.
- Two storey extensions which double the floor area of the original
- Excessive dormer windows to northern extension bringing the appearance of a top heavy design
- Ridge height to northern extension excessive and imposing as previously lower than west extension.

In conclusion

- Overbearing
- Excessive
- Badly design
- Shows no respect for a previously beautiful stone cottage.

Pre-application discussion:

None

Constraints:

Road No. U94001

Contaminated land

SSSI Impact Zone

SWS – Nearby

Ancient woodland – Nearby (144m)

Appraisal:

Policy context and Principle of Development

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states as follows:

“If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”

In this instance the adopted development plan is the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy (HCS). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a significant material consideration. It is also noted that the site falls within the Hope-under-Dinmore Neighbourhood Area, which published a made Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) on 21 September 2018.

The proposal is for the addition of the erection of a balcony and increase ridge height of roof plus additional fenestration. The increase ridge height of the roof is retrospective. The key theme of the NPPF is to promote and achieve sustainable development, identified in paragraph 11 of the current NPPF. Chapter 12 states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

When assessing planning applications for extensions, planning policy SD1 of the HCS is applicable. This states that proposals should be designed to maintain local distinctiveness through detailing and materials, respecting the scale, height, proportion and massing of surrounding development. The proposal should also safeguard the amenity of existing and proposed residents in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.

Policy LD1 of the HCS is also of note and states that development proposals should be influenced by the existing townscape and landscape in regards to design, scale and nature.

HUD6 of the NDP is also relevant which reinforces LD1 of the HCS. HUD6 strives to ensure the landscape character provides a positive influence in the design of proposals.

When considering the proposed changes and alterations to Woodmanton, in relation to the amount of built development as a result of the proposals, it is not considered to be at a scale that would either be unacceptable or constitute overdevelopment. The site is within a relatively spacious plot and in the absence of a specific NDP policy in relation to residential amenity and built development, it is my view that the proposal constitutes an appropriate form of sustainable development.

Further to this, the visual changes from a public perspective, namely the U94001, would be the small acknowledgement to the balcony. However, this does not detract from either the character of the original dwelling house, nor does it raise concerns with respect to residential amenity. Accordingly, the proposal meets the applicable criterion of SD1 of the HCS.

It should be noted that amended plans were received during consultation and the proposal is assessed against such amendments. SD1 of the HCS explains that proposals should be

designed to maintain local distinctiveness through detailing and materials, respecting the scale, height, and proportion and massing of surrounding development. The proposal introduces the addition of a second balcony on the rear elevation. Whilst a loss of character to the property may have raised such concerns, the plans submitted, namely the existing elevations, accord with what I noted on my site visit of the building at the time.

Whilst there is no specific policy in relation to the alterations to dwelling houses within the NDP, a policy does consider the provision of Landscape Character, HUD6, which reinforces LD1 of the HCS, which deals with ensuring that proposals have considered the landscape character and has resulted in a positive influence in the design, scale, nature and site selection, leading to the protection and enhancement of the setting. The proposed materials and scale will compliment the host dwelling and I am of the view that it will provide cohesion, which will help to enhance its landscape setting and character particularly with respect to topography and settlement pattern.

In light to the comment received from the objection, the application has been resubmitted and reassessed to include amending plans with the slight differing ridge height. The site does not lie in either an AONB or a Conservation Area and furthermore, the lack of objection from environmental health and no other objections reaffirms my view that this is not a ground for refusing the application. Due to the lack of surrounding neighbouring dwellings and positioning of the dwelling the additional balcony is like likely to have a detrimental impact on local residents.

When I visited the site to erect the site notice for the plans received, whilst it was evident that some works have progressed on site, this in itself does not provide grounds for resisting development, as the application is determined on its merits with regards to the development plan, in this instance the HCS and NDP. The site has planning history and whilst some may hold the view that footings had been poured prior to submission of this application, this is with regards to the previously approved extension on site.

The local member has been updated as outlined above. The proposal is acceptable and complies with national and local planning policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: **PERMIT** ☒ **REFUSE** ☐

CONDITION(S) & REASON(S) / REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:
(please note any variations to standard conditions)

C01
C06 (Drawing Number P103, dated January 2020)

Informatives

IP2 – Application approved following revisions

Signed: F.G Dated: 11/03/2020

TEAM LEADER'S COMMENTS:

DECISION:

PERMIT

☒

REFUSE

☐

Signed: AB

Dated: 26/3/2020