

# DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

## APPLICATION NUMBER

### 220643

The Old Post Office, Staunton On Arrow, Leominster, HR6 9HR

---

**CASE OFFICER:** Mr Matthew Neilson

**DATE OF SITE VISIT:** .....

**Relevant Development  
Plan Policies:**

**Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy  
Policies:**

**SS6** Environmental quality and local distinctiveness

**LD1** Landscape and townscape

**LD4** Historic environment and heritage assets

**SD1** Sustainable design and energy efficiency

**Titley Group Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP):**  
**NDP failed at referendum and as such carries no weight**

**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

**Chapter 2** Achieving sustainable development

**Chapter 11** Making effective use of land

**Chapter 12** Achieving well-designed places

**Chapter 16** Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

**Relevant Site History:**

**P214403/L** – Erection of summer house – approved Jan 2022

**P214402/FH** – Erection of summer house – approved Jan 2022

**P211831/L** – repairs to timber frame and associated infill –  
approved July 2021

## CONSULTATIONS

	Consulted	No Response	No objection	Qualified Comment	Object
Parish Council	X	X			
Historic Buildings Officer	X		X		
Press/Site Notice	X	X			
Local Member	X		X		

## **PLANNING OFFICER'S APPRAISAL:**

### Site description and proposal:

The Old Past Office in Staunton-On-Arrow is Grade II listed, timber framed cottage of traditional construction and proportions. The building has suffered from a lack of appropriate maintenance for a number of years and as such the fabric of the building has been eroded by water ingress to the timber frame and failure of the brick infill panels. This proposal is for the necessary repairs to the timber frame as well as replacing the brick infill panels.

### Representations:

**Historic Buildings Officer** – No objection

**Summary:** No objection is raised on heritage concerns. The application would result in no harm to the significance of the heritage asset, including any contribution made by its setting. As such it accords with all relevant local and national policies relating to built heritage.

**Site:** The Old Past Office, Staunton-On-Arrow is a grade II listed timber framed cottage of traditional construction and proportions. It likely dates to the late C17 or early C18 but has been altered and extended in subsequent centuries in distinct phases. Although likely originally constructed as a dwelling, it was adapted for use as a post office at some point during the C19 or C20. However by the time it was listed in the late C20 it had reverted back to use as a private dwelling.

There are two other listed buildings in relatively close proximity of the application site; Church of St. Peter approx. 100m south and Staunton Old Hall, approx. 200m north, both grade II listed buildings. The remains of a medieval motte, scheduled as an ancient monument also lie approx. 100m to the south. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed changes, the application will have no impact on these identified heritage assets. The site does not lie within the designated boundary of a conservation area.

**Significance:** The historic and architectural interest of The Old Post Office lies in its vernacular form and surviving historic material, as well as its former use as a post office for the village. Its later alterations, such as the full length, ground floor bay sash windows are a good demonstration how existing buildings were adapted to reflect changing architectural tastes over time. It serves as a good surviving example of tradition construction techniques and its fabric will hold important archaeological data. It also demonstrates how life in small rural villages has changed over time.

### **Comments:**

#### The proposal:

The application proposed the installation of structural pentice boards and timber frame repairs.

#### Assessment:

Following the recent granting of consent for timber frame repairs and replacement infill panels, (ref: 211831) and commencement of this work, further areas have been identified that require attention. This is a common occurrence within this context as it can be difficult to ascertain the full extent of repairs until some opening up has taken place.

The proposed work has been supported by a detailed written analysis and would constitute a minimal and reversible approach to the repair of the building.

Structural pentice boards have the benefit of maintaining the existing fabric while re-introducing the necessary structural integrity to the frame. They can also help deflect rainwater away from the building helping it remain dry and can be removed at any point with minimal disruption to fabric. As such, this approach can be supported as beneficial to the fabric and longevity of the building. Minor repair/replacement of later timbers to the north elevation would be considered appropriate repairs.

Email correspondence with the agent/applicant regarding the sole plate to the north elevation (referred to as location H in the supporting report) which has been replaced with brick. Although not highlighted in the application, the intention is to reinstate the sole beam in order to reintroduce lateral support in this area. This would be supported.

**Local Member** – Councillor Phillips was notified of the recommendation but no request was made for the application to be redirected to planning committee.

Pre-application discussion:

Advice provided by Andrea Brislane (18/02/2022)

Constraints:

Road No. C1023  
Listed Building – Grade II  
Contaminated Land – Adjacent  
PROW – Nearby  
SSSI Impact Zone  
NE Priority Habitat - Nearby

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 (CS). It is also noted that the site falls within the Titley Group Neighbourhood Area, failed at referendum. At this time the policies in the NDP can be afforded weight as set out in paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which itself is a significant material consideration.

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (the 2012 Regulations) and paragraph 33 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires a review of local plans be undertaken at least every five years in order to determine whether the plan policies and spatial development strategy are in need of updating, and should then be updated as necessary. The Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted on 15 October 2015 and a review was required to be completed before 15 October 2020. The decision to review the Core Strategy was made on 9th November 2020. The level of consistency of the policies in the local plan with the NPPF will be taken into account by the Council in deciding any application. In this case, the policies relevant to the determination of this application have been reviewed and are considered to remain entirely consistent with the NPPF and as such can be afforded significant weight.

In considering the details of the scheme, it is acknowledged that the site and building forming the subject of the application are sensitive ones in heritage terms. The building is listed at Grade II. Accordingly, the duties placed upon the Local Planning Authority by Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to (inter alia) have special attention to the disability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the listed building and conservation areas is of particular pertinence. In this regards policy LD4 of the Core Strategy is also of relevance, which requires amongst other things to ensure that new developments 'protect, conserve, and where possible enhance heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to their significance through appropriate management, uses and sympathetic design, in particular emphasising the original form and function where possible'. Further relevant design requirements are found at policy SD1, which requires that proposals take into account the local context and site characteristics. Moreover, new development should be designed to maintain local distinctiveness through incorporating local architectural detailing and materials and respecting scale, height, proportions and massing of surrounding development, while making a positive contribution to the character of the area. The principles set out in policy LD1 is also of pertinence in terms of the impact of the proposal on the townscape and designated conservation area.

As the proposed development refers exclusively to works performed on the interior of the structure and will improve the viable use of the site this application will be appraised against Policy LD4 of the HCS, paragraph 202 of the NPPF and section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

As the Historic Buildings Officer has noted, the proposed works are necessary in order to preserve the heritage asset and the supporting documents provide sufficient detail in regard to method. The repairs and works proposed in this application represent less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and would therefore represent an overall benefit for the public by securing its viable use. Therefore, the proposed development complies with Policy LD4 of the HCS and policy E2 of the local Neighbourhood Development Plan, and accords with paragraph 202 of the NPPF and section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The proposal complies with planning policy, notably LD4 of the HCS, the local member has been updated and the application is justified as sustainable development in accordance with

policy SS1 of the HCS. The application is therefore recommended for approval with conditions attached.

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

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

CE7 – Listed Building Consent Time Period

C07 – Drawing No. Repairs Schedule and Repairs to Timber Frame documents received 23/02/2022, Timber Assessment dated February 2022, Location Plan dated 14 December 2021 and Application Form dated 23/02/2022




Signed:

Dated: ...18/05/2022.....

**TEAM LEADER'S COMMENTS:**

**DECISION:**    **PERMIT** ☒    **REFUSE** ☐

Signed:  ..... Dated: 19/5/22

Is any redaction required before publication?    No