

# DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

## APPLICATION NUMBER

### 161042

Yew Tree Farm, Garway, Hereford, HR2 8RF

---

**CASE OFFICER: Mr Matt Tompkins**  
**DATE OF SITE VISIT: 21/04/16**

**Relevant Development**      **Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy**  
**Plan Policies:**                Policies SS4, SS5, SS6, SS7, SD1, LD1, LD2

**National Planning Policy Framework**

**Relevant Site History:**      A number of applications relating to the provision of agricultural buildings and the barn conversion scheme to the fore of the site, though none directly relevant to this application.

#### CONSULTATIONS

	Consulted	No Response	No objection	Qualified Comment	Object
Parish Council	X	X			
Neighbour letter/ Site Notice	X	X			
Local Member	X		X		
Environmental Health	X		X		

#### PLANNING OFFICER'S APPRAISAL:

##### Site description and proposal:

Yew Tree Farm is a diary farming enterprise which comprises a large range of agricultural buildings, a large stone farmhouse and a barn conversion. The site is located c. 200 metres to the west of Garway and is accessed by the C1221 or U74105 sitting in the apex of those two roads.

The application proposes the erection of three buildings. An extension to the north of the eastern most building of the farm (Building 1), an extension to the western most building of the farm (Building 2), and a free standing building immediately to the east of the existing farm.

Building 1 would have the same ridge height (6.1m), eaves height (4.3m) and span (13.3m) as the building to which it is attached. It would also protrude further to the east by virtue of a lean-to with an eaves height of 3.2 metres and a depth of 6 metres. The building would be 12.2m long. It would be constructed of Merlin Grey Box Profile Sheeting on precast concrete panels under a fibre cement roof to match existing.

Building 2 would have the same ridge height (6.1m), eaves height (4.3m) and span (13.3m) as the building to which it is attached. It would also protrude further to the east by virtue of a lean-to. The slab of the lean-to would be lower than the existing building and the main part of the extension by virtue of an existing immediate drop in ground levels. Thus height of the lean-to compared with its slab level is greater with its eaves at 5.0 metres and a depth of 6 metres. The building would be 20.0m long. It would be constructed of Merlin Grey Box Profile Sheeting on precast concrete panels under a fibre cement roof to match existing.

Building 3 would be on a comparative ground level with the lean-to of building 2. It would be 4.9 metres to eaves, 6.7 metres to ridge with a span of 13.5 metres and a width of 14.0 metres. It would be constructed of Merlin Grey Box Profile Sheeting on precast concrete panels under a roof of the same cladding.

#### Representations:

The Council's **Environmental Health Officer** for noise and nuisance does not object to the application.

The **Parish Council** has not provided response.

The **local member** was contacted by 'phone on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and does not object to the application being approved by delegated powers.

#### Pre-application discussion:

None

#### Appraisal:

Policy E1 allows for an appropriate extension to rural business to strengthen existing business operation whilst Policy SS5 supports the development of traditional employment sectors, specifically farming. This proposal seeks to extend an existing agricultural building and provide a new building to the fore, expanding the covered part of the enterprise. Thus, in extending an existing farming business, this application accords with the overarching policy objective.

#### **Landscape**

The main issue is considered to be landscape impact given the size of the building and their prominent location within the rural landscape. Policy SD1 advises that the distinctness of the locality is maintained and Policy LD1 that the character of the landscape is upheld.

Two proposed buildings would be bookend a large existing building to the eastern extent of the farm. The existing building is used as a lairage and parlour. The northern extension would be of the same ridge height, eaves height and span. The southern extension would be of the same rear eaves height and ridge height though the front (eastern) eaves would be lower

and the span moderately greater. A third building would be provided to the fore (east) of the existing building which is proposed for extension. It would be of a modestly greater height though the sharp drop in land levels to the east of the farmstead would result in the proposed detached building having a comparatively lower ridge and eaves AOD level than the existing building and its proposed extensions. The building would be seen in such context.

Views of the building would be largely obviated from Garway itself and the C1221, which links the village with the rest of the County, by virtue of existing intervening buildings at the farm. Public views of the buildings would however be available from the east as one approaches the site and Garway along the U71405. Land rises towards the village so that the farm occupies a higher land level than the road from which views are available. Thus the farm is prominent to views from this vantage point.

All three proposed buildings would be visible from the east as one approaches Garway along the U71405. However, by virtue of their comparatively similar AOD eaves and ridge levels in conjunction with their traditional agricultural appearance, the buildings would be read in the context of the existing farmstead immediately to its rear (west) minimising potential impact on this rural setting. On this basis, the building would not unduly impact on the character or visual amenity of the landscape as required by Policies LD1 and SD1.

### **Other issues**

The farm is well laid out with appropriate access to the local highway network. Thus the intensification of traffic movements would be modest and the proposed development would not unduly impact on the safety of flow of traffic on the highway network as required by Policies SS4 and MT1 of the Core Strategy.

The precise manner of use of the farm is well established. The extension to the farm is to the eastern extent existing enterprise. Thus buildings would be sited away from neighbouring dwellings. For these reasons the application is considered to, contextually, safeguard residential amenity as required by Policy SD1 of the Core Strategy.

### **Conclusion**

Agricultural development is supported in principle by the Core Strategy. Therefore and as no other harm has been found, particularly in terms of landscape, residential amenity and highway safety, the proposed development would accord with the Core Strategy and NPPF, and is recommended for approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**    PERMIT ☒    REFUSE ☐

### **CONDITION(S) & REASON(S) / REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL:**

1. C01
2. C07 – 7122/1, 7122/2, 7122/3

## Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.



Signed: ..... Dated: 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016

### TEAM LEADER'S COMMENTS:

DECISION:

PERMIT

☒

REFUSE

☐

Signed: ..... Dated: 24/5/16 .....