



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W1850/W/22/3291647

Land Adjoining Lucknow Cottage, Putley Green, Putley HR8 2QN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs F Fortnam against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref 202910, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area and the setting of nearby listed buildings, namely Lucknow Cottage and Homestead.

Reasons

3. The eastern side of the road is characterised by a group of historic buildings including three cottages Lucknow Cottage, Homestead and the Old Post Office. The cottages are timber framed with later additions and are sited perpendicular to the road sitting on its edge. The special and historic interest and significance of these properties, in part, lies in their attractive architectural form reflecting the development of the village over time.
4. The surrounding agrarian landscape and green spaces that extend through the village and surround the built form positively contribute to the verdant and spacious character of the area. The notable separation between Lucknow Cottage and Homestead provides a spacious and open setting to the cottages and allows an appreciation of them from the area.
5. Despite the presence of the existing garage, the position of the proposed dwelling set back into the site and the modest increase in footprint of the built form the scale of the development at full two storey height would be very apparent from neighbouring buildings and, albeit localised, from the roadside. It would erode the sense of openness that currently prevails which contributes to the setting and significance of the neighbouring listed buildings.
6. I acknowledge that the extent of the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and may change and be experienced differently as the asset and its surroundings evolve. However, the proposed development would be very intrusive and would

diminish the site's contribution to the collective setting and significance of Lucknow Cottage and Homestead.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be of a contemporary design reflecting local materials. Indeed, there are occasions where old and new can sit comfortably side-by-side. However, I find that the proposed form and position of the dwelling would be unduly cramped and incongruous failing to integrate into the street scene.
8. The condition of the garage on site and the presence of other outbuildings in the surrounding area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
9. Whilst the Council's Conservation Officers did not raise heritage concerns to the application this does not alter my findings in respect of the main issue.
10. In accordance with Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), it is for the decision maker, having identified harm to designated assets, to consider the scale of that harm. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where, appropriate, securing its optimum viable use, which I now turn to.
11. The proposal would contribute to local housing supply, employment with the creation of an additional dwelling and future occupiers would contribute to the surrounding rural community, but these benefits are modest commensurate with the provision of only a single dwelling. I therefore afford these benefits limited weight. I acknowledge that no objections were raised by the Council's highway and drainage officers. But these are neutral factors in the planning balance.
12. Taking into consideration the points above I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve the setting of Lucknow Cottage and Homestead causing less than substantial harm to the significance of each. The harm would clearly outweigh the public benefits of the proposal.
13. As such, the proposal would unduly affect the character and appearance of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of designated heritage assets contrary to Policies SD1, LD1 and LD4 of the Herefordshire Local Plan (2015) and Policies PUT7 and PUT8 of the Putley Neighbourhood Development Plan (2018) which, amongst other things, require new developments to maintain local distinctiveness, respect the character of adjoining development and townscape and protect, conserve and where possible enhance heritage assets and their setting in an appropriate manner. It would also be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Framework in respect of the historic environment.

Other Matters

14. I note that representations were made by local occupiers to the proposed development raising additional concerns. However, given my findings, it is not necessary to consider these matters in detail.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR