

## **2 DCSW2003/2308/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSION ACONTREE HOUSE, BARRACK HILL, LITTLE BIRCH, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR2 8BA**

**For: Mr & Mrs Johnson per Hook Mason, 11 Castle  
Street, Hereford, HR1 2NL**

**Date Received: 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2003      Ward: Pontrilas      Grid Ref: 5066 3257**

**Expiry Date: 24<sup>th</sup> September, 2003**

Local Member:    Councillor G. W. Davis

### **1. Site Description and Proposal**

- 1.1 Acontree House is on the western side of the unclassified road (u/c 71609), also known as Barrack Hill. The stone and rendered dwelling house is sited 25 metres into this site that inclines north-westward toward Aconbury Reservoir.
- 1.2 It is proposed to extend the previously extended dwelling house, on the north-western end of the building, i.e. away from the unclassified road (u/c 71609). This will entail erecting a two-storey natural stone faced extension that is aligned parallel with the original cottage, i.e. approximately east to west. The building measured externally is 8.1 metres long and 4 metres wide. The original dwelling is 4.1 metres wide and as extended is 11.5 metres long. An additional single storey link is proposed in a recess on the north-eastern side of the building. The first floor accommodation provided are 2 bedrooms.
- 1.3 A previous proposal for a two-storey extension which was 0.5 of a metre longer, together with a porch addition was refused under delegated powers and is currently the subject of an appeal.

### **2. Policies**

#### **2.1 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan**

- Policy CTC.2    -      Area of Great Landscape Value  
Policy CTC.9    -      Development Criteria  
Policy H.20     -      Housing in Rural Areas

#### **2.2 South Herefordshire District Local Plan**

- Policy GD.1     -      General Development Criteria  
Policy C.8       -      Development within Area of Great Landscape Value  
Policy SH.23    -      Extensions to Dwellings

### **3. Planning History**

- |     |          |  |   |                   |
|-----|----------|--|---|-------------------|
| 3.1 | 31953    | Alterations and additions to existing cottage                                    | - | Approved 21.09.71 |
|     | SH865/78 | Extensions, additional dining, kitchen, bathroom, bedroom and hall accommodation | - | Approved 08.02.79 |

SH366/79	Extension, providing porch, cloakroom and additional kitchen area	-	Approved 26.06.79
SW2002/2312/F	Two storey extension and alterations to dwelling, and change of use of agricultural land to residential use	-	Withdrawn 08.10.02
SW2002/3777/F	Change of use of agricultural land to residential use	-	Granted 06.02.03
SW2002/3778/F	Two storey extension	-	Refused 06.02.03

#### 4. Consultation Summary

##### 4.1 No statutory or non-statutory consultations required.

Responses by internal consultees that raise material planning issues are summarised and considered in the Officers Appraisal.

#### 5. Representations

##### 5.1 In a letter that accompanied the application, the applicant's agent raises the following main points:

- revised scheme follows meeting on 17th June and subsequent telephone message on 21st July, 2003
- length of extension (2-storey) reduced by 500mm, both gable faces now set back from building line of existing house
- reduction in eaves overhang (currently forming a porch to second entrance) to a conventional eaves depth. Has the effect of raising eaves level at this point as ridge level is fixed given the headroom required on first floor link
- redundant, inappropriate modern chimney will be removed from the east elevation.

##### 5.2 Aconbury Parish Meeting make the following observations:

"The majority feeling in the parish was to raise no objection to the original proposal, so we see this slightly reduced plan as another act in this peculiar saga and find no problem with the proposed building.

A resident in the vicinity of the site is adding his own perspective to the saga, and we enclose his views on the screening aspect of new and existing hedge and trees"

##### 5.3 Two letters have been received, one a letter of support, the other of representation from:

Mr. K. Newman (Church Property Steward, Little Birch Methodist Church), Hill View, Barrack Hill, Kingsthorpe, HR2 8AX  
Mr. & Mrs. R. Derham, Upper House Farmhouse, Barrack Hill, Kingsthorpe, HR2 8BA

##### 5.4 In a letter of support the following main points are raised:

- as a church see no reason why planning permission should not be granted
- property is hidden from our view, and other nearby properties
- not a sound issue, given distance

5.5 In a letter of objection, the following main points are raised:

- plans fundamentally same as before, save for approximately one foot being shaved off northern extension, therefore in respect of area/volume concerns raised in previous letters still remain
- removal of clump of trees, exposes view of Acontree House/extension, disturbs setting of our Listed building
- size of extension excessive, addition in 90s appears to quadruple size of pre 1948 (original) house
- current proposal further 65 metres square larger than original house. Notwithstanding double garage erected in 90s
- concern that given applicants are doctors, an application may follow for a group practice. There are 5 separate reception rooms on ground floor, suggesting surgeries, boundary change allows for a car park.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Southern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

## **6. Officers Appraisal**

6.1 The proposal raises three issues, one is the impact on the setting of Upper House Farmhouse, a listed building, the possibility of an alternative use for the dwelling in the future, and lastly and most importantly, the principle of allowing a further extension to this already extended dwelling.

6.2 It is not considered that the loss of trees, which has already occurred, is a matter on which the local planning authority could have intervened, given that the trees are not protected by being in a Conservation Area, curtilage of a listed building or protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The proposal site and dwelling does not constitute part of the curtilage of Upper House Farmhouse.

6.3 The second issue is the one relating to a possible alternative use. This would require planning permission, and would need to be determined on its merits at that time. However, it does not preclude the local planning authority from determining the current proposal on its merits as an extension to a previously extended dwelling house.

6.4 The main issue is the final one listed above, and that relates to the principle of further extending the dwelling. The extensions have been revised slightly by removing a covered porch area on the west elevation and by reducing the length of the two-storey block that is linked to the existing dwelling by an additional ground floor area and by a link that is lower than the ridge height of the two-storey extension and the existing dwelling. The extension has an almost identical width, i.e. 4.1 metres to the original cottage and the same height, therefore it provides a good architectural conclusion to the building when viewed from the east or west. It would not be viewed from the roadside.

6.5 Policy SH.23 contained in the Local Plan states that extensions should be in keeping in terms of mass, scale, design and materials with the existing dwelling and that the existing dwelling remains the dominant feature. It is evident that the materials and design are satisfactory, indeed it will enhance the setting of the building. It will not detract from the setting of this part of the Area of Great Landscape Value, as required by Policies C.8 and GD.1, again contained in the Local Plan. The extension would not

become the dominant feature in relation to the original dwelling. Therefore the proposal satisfies the provisions of Policy H.20 contained in the Structure Plan.

6.6 It is considered that on balance the extension would fulfil the criteria of policies for extensions. In the refusal for the slightly larger extension than currently proposed it was stated that the original cottage is already not the dominant feature, this would still continue to be the case. It has been extended eastward and north-westward such that the front or roadside elevation has lengthened such that the original cottage has absorbed into the extended building. It is not possible to identify the original cottage when viewing the dwelling from the highway. The current proposal can be dealt with on its merits as a structure that does not materially detract from the 'original' dwelling, it in fact brings the different elements of previous extensions to a satisfactory architectural conclusion.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission) )**

**Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

- 2. A06 (Development in accordance with approved plans )**

**Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.**

Decision: .....

Notes: .....

.....

**Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.