

18 DCNW2004/1931/F - TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO THE EXISTING DWELLING AT THE GREEN, BEARWOOD, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9EQ**For: Mr. & Mrs. K. Douglas per Mr. P. Titley, New Cottage, Upper Common, Eyton, Leominster, HR6 OAQ****Date Received:**
2nd June, 2004**Ward:**
Pembridge &
Lyonshall with Titley**Grid Ref:**
38376, 56166**Expiry Date:**
28th July, 2004

Local Member: Councillor R.J. Phillips

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The Green comprises an attractive, detached stone and brick built cottage, which occupies a relatively prominent location on the south side of an unclassified road in the small hamlet of Bearwood.
- 1.2 The established garden curtilage is located at the front of the property whilst, to the rear, is agricultural land upon which is located the dilapidated remains of a number of outbuildings.
- 1.3 The northern boundary of the site, from which the property is partially visible, is defined by a well established hedgerow. Access to the property is derived from a small gate to the rear of the house.
- 1.4 Planning permission is sought for a two-storey extension to the rear of the property, incorporating an entrance hall and lounge on the ground floor and ensuite bedroom on the first floor. The extension, as proposed, would extend some 8 metres from the rear elevation of the property and would be 5 metres wide. The demolition of the existing outbuildings is proposed as part of the extension scheme.
- 1.5 This is a re-submission, following the approval of a smaller extension, pursuant to Application Ref: NW2003/3289/F.

2. Policies**Hereford & Worcester County Structure Plan**

Policy H16A – Housing in Rural Areas

Policy H.20 – Housing in Rural Areas Outside the Green Belt

Leominster District Local Plan

Policy A56 – Alterations, Extensions and Improvements to Dwellings

Herefordshire UDP (Revised Deposit Draft)

Policy H18 – Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

- 3.1 NW2003/3239/F - Two-storey extensions and alterations. Approved 17th December, 2003.

4. Consultation SummaryStatutory Consultations

- 4.1 There are no statutory consultees

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Head of Engineering and Transportation raises no objection.

5. Representations

- 5.1 The comments of Pembridge Parish Council are as follows:

“Pembridge Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

That the scale of the proposed extension effectively doubles the size of the property, making it out of keeping in character with the surrounding, smaller properties. It is considered that the character of the hamlet needs to be protected, as well as its amenity.”

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The main issue for consideration in the determination of this application is the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing, unextended property.
- 6.2 Policy A56 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) establishes a number of criteria of which the importance of the scale and design of extensions and their dominance in respect of the original dwelling is considered to be of key significance.
- 6.3 The existing cottage comprises a very modest, two-bedroomed dwelling, which is notable for its very restricted width of approximately 3.9metres and limited overall ridge height of 5.5 metres. These constraints have had a particular bearing upon the siting of the extension, since the limited width has made extending to the side of the property unfeasible in view of the already cramped internal floor plan and layout.
- 6.4 The result is a general acceptance that a rear addition represents the only realistic means of extending the property and permission was granted for a partly two-storey and partly single-storey extension (NW2003/1931/F) on 17th December, 2003. The approved scheme limited the two-storey projection to 4.2 metres and introduced a visual break down to a single-storey element. The overall footprint is the same as now

proposed, but the scale of the approved scheme was considered to be reasonably sympathetic to the original cottage.

- 6.5 The scheme as now proposed represents a visually far more dominant proposal. The design is such that the ridge and eaves height would be identical to the existing cottage, but the width of the extension (5 metres) is greater than the existing (3.9 metres). This, combined with the interrupted roof and 8.3 metre projection of the extension, results in a wholly unacceptable and overwhelming addition, which fails to respect the scale and appearance of the cottage.
- 6.6 It is acknowledged that the principal (west) elevation remains unaffected by the proposal, but this is not sufficient justification for such a substantial extension, which would be visible from the unclassified road defining the northern boundary of the application site. In essence, it is considered that the scheme already approved, which followed detailed pre-application discussion, represents the realistic limit to extending this particular property.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- (1) The extension, by reason of its overall scale and design, would overwhelm the original structure and, as such, it would be contrary to Policy A56 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) and Policy H18 of the emerging Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft).**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.