6 DCSE2004/0781/F - ALTERATIONS AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING HALL AT MUCH MARCLE MEMORIAL HALL, MUCH MARCLE, LEDBURY, HEREFORDSHIRE HR8 2NF

For: Much Marcle Memorial Hall Management Committee per Trevor Hewett Architects, 25 Castle Street, Hereford HR1 2NW

Date Received: 2nd March 2004 Ward: Old Gore Grid Ref: 65807, 33012

Expiry Date: 27th April 2004

Local Member: Councillor J.W. Edwards

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Much Marcle Memorial Hall lies on the eastern side of the B4024, within the village settlement boundary and the Much Marcle Conservation Area. The building is set back some 11 metres from the highway, with an open forecourt to the front of the building. Residential propeties are situated to the north, east and south of the hall and a playing field and primary school on the western side of the road. The existing building has a gable end facing the road with a porch and single storey elements set back on either side of the main section of the building. The building has rough casted rendered elevations with some brick detailing under a tiled roof.
- 1.2 It is proposed to extend the hall by way of a single storey extension to the northern elevation and altering the roof to the eastern elevation. The extension and alterations would provide a new entrance, including a ramp access, a meeting room, toilet facilities, store and stage at the rear of the hall. Five external ramps are proposed, one to each external door. The existing porch would be retained but the existing door opening would be glazed.
- 1.3 Amended plans have been received which include a car park layout for 14 spaces, 2 of which would be for the disabled. In addition it is proposed to plant a low hedge along part of the roadside boundary.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Guidance

PPG1 General Policy and Principles

PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

Policy CTC15 Preservation, Enhancement and Extension of Conservation

Areas

Policy T12 On-street Parking

2.3 Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Conservation Policy 1 Preserving or Enhancing Conservation Areas
Conservation Policy 2 New Development in Conservation Areas
Transport Policy 5 Boundary Treatments in Conservation Areas

Transport Policy 6 Protection of Listed Buildings

Transport Policy 10 Car Park Design
Transport Policy 11 Traffic Impact

Recreation Policy 31 Retention of Existing Community Facilities

Much Marcle Parish Design Statement

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan – Revised Deposit Draft

Part 1

Policy S8 Recreation, Sport and Tourism

Part 2

Policy DR1 Design

Policy HBA6 New Development within Conservation Areas

Policy RST1 Criteria for Recreation, Sport and Tourism Development

Policy CF6 Retention of Existing Facilities

3. Planning History

3.1 No relevant planning history.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 No statutory or non-statutory consultations required

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Transportation Manager has no objections to the amended plans subject to conditions.
- 4.3 Chief Conservation Officer No objections to the amended plans.
- 4.4 Environmental Health Officer recommends a condition regarding sound insulation.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Much Marcle Parish Council No objections to this application.
- 5.2 Four letters of representation have been received in respect of the original plans from David Beeching of Parting Grounds, C.C Cottage of Egattoc, R.B and M W Yorke of 10 Monks Meadow, Much Marcle and Ross-on-Wye and District Civic Society. The main points raised are:
 - Proposed extension would reduce the number of parking spaces by about eight.
 Functions using the car park already create parking problems resulting in cars parking on the road. This causes problems for agricultural vehicles, ordinary passenger vehicles and cars to pass on the narrow road.

- Increased use of the hall, including proposed introduction of pre-school classess, can only exacerbate the traffic problem.
- The proposed extension would impact upon our amenity, enclose our property and block out sunlight in the afternoon and evening (Egattoc). My property is not shown on the submitted plans, so would not necessarily have been considered.
- Not opposed to extension in principle and suggest an alternative that would be a compromise to my situation.
- In general the Memorial Hall Committee should be congratulated on their plans to extend and improve the building, but we have concerns regarding the treatment of the road side elevation. The proposal would relocate the main entrance and the porch and inscription 'The Great War Memorial 1921' would go and be replaced by a rather bland strip of rectangular glazing. We urge a design that retains a substantial part of the existing elevation.
- Concern regarding impact of increased usage, suggest a condition that the hall's management have as a prime consideration a duty of care and consideration with regard to environmental impact of their promotions on near neighbours.

Any comments received in respect of the amended plans will be reported.

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 main considerations in the determination of this application are the principle of extending the building, the affect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact upon highway safety and the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 6.2 Recreation Policy 31 of the Local Plan seeks to retain existing community facilities. It is considered therefore that proposals to improve existing facilities should, in principle, be supported.
- 6.3 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Moreover polices CTC15 of the Structure Plan and Conservation Policy 2 of the Local Plan state that new development should not adversely affect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.4 The proposed extension would result in the building being closer to the northern boundary, but no nearer to the road (western boundary). Furthermore the entrance into the building would be relocated from the existing porch on the western elevation to the extension. In terms of scale, mass, and design the extensions and alterations would complement the existing building. It is considered that due to the scale, mass, siting and design of the extension and alterations the resulting building would not appear cramped within the site. Amended plans have been received which would essentially retain the overall appearance of the porch, but would still not retain the existing plaque. There may be scope to relocate the plaque, possibly to within the building. Whilst it is regrettable that the plague would be removed, as the building is not listed it would not be reasonable to require that it be retained. The proposed car park layout would include the provision of a low box hedge to part of the boundary with the road. Together with the proposed 'T' markings to demark the spaces it is considered that it would represent an improvement to the appearance of the existing

forecourt area. Therefore the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Much Marcle Conservation Area.

- 6.5 At present the car park area is not marked out and has a large open access, some 28 metres, onto the B4024. Concerns have been raised regarding existing parking problems on and adjacent to the site. This problem is acknowledged in the Much Marcle Parish Design Statement, which states that 'When the Memorial Hall holds village functions, parking is sometimes inadequate.' (page 15). The proposed scheme would formalise the parking layout and provide a total of 14 spaces. The 2 disabled spaces would be sited next to the main ramped access. In addition new planting would reduce the width of the opening onto the highway. The Transportation Manager has no objections to the amended plans provided that hatching is provided between space 1 and the ramp, further planting is provided between space 9 and the footway to prevent doors opening onto the footway and a height limit is imposed on the planting to protect visibility. It is considered that these matters could be satisfactorily controlled by conditions. It could be argued that the scheme reduces the number of spaces within the site. However not all of the areas used for parking meet the Council's Adopted Standards and therefore may result in indiscriminate parking and potential for maneuvering that would be harmful to highway safety. The submitted scheme would formalise the parking arrangements, making provision for disabled parking and improve the safety of the access on to the 'B' classified road.
- 6.6 To the east of the hall lies a bungalow, 'Egattoc'. This property is set back between some 7 to 7.8 metres from the boundary with the rear of the hall. The proposed alterations and extension would not be nearer to the boundary with the property, but the height of the roof would be increased and the eastern elevation increased in length. The original plans proposed a half-hipped roof, however it was considered that this introduced a roof design that would not be in keeping with vernacular design and amended plans have been submitted revising it to a gable end. The openings on the western elevation of 'Egattoc' comprise a garage door and ensuite, utility room, cloakroom and open plan lounge/dining room windows. Due to the orientation of the hall, to the west of the 'Egattoc', the hipped roof design of the extension and the existing height of the building it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably overshadow or overbear the neighbouring property. The windows proposed would be at ground floor and by virtue of this and the mature boundary hedge the proposal would not impinge upon privacy.
- 6.7 The site has an existing and established use as a village hall. The proposal would however result in the building being enlarged and the northern elevation being in closer proximity to the boundary. A condition is recommended to ensure that construction is carried out in accordance with a scheme of sound insulation.
- 6.8 In conclusion it is considered that the proposal accords with Development Plan policies and would not adversely impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring property.

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.

3 B01 (Samples of external materials)

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

4 F02 (Scheme of measures for controlling noise)

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties.

Prior to the first use of the extension hereby granted the car park shall be laid out in accordance with the approved plans and in addition the area between the disabled car parking space 1 and the ramp shall be hatched and hedgerow planting carried out between car parking space 9 and the footway. The car park layout shall thereafter be retained and kept available for parking.

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

6 Any planting along the site frontage shall be maintained so that it does not exceed 0.6 metres above ground level.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Prior to the commencement of development the details of the species, size, position and planting numbers of the hedgerow planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the first planting season following the first use of the extension hereby granted. Any plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent t any variation. If plants fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5 year defects period.

Reason: In order to protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Informative:

1	N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission
Decision:	
Notes	5:

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.