

**5 DCNW2004/1921/F - PROPOSED EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS AT YATTON MARSH FARM, YATTON, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 9TP****For: Mr. P. J. Lukeman per Mr. P. M. Enticknap,  
Sunrise Cottage, Green Lane, Pembridge, Hereford,  
HR6 9EL****Date Received: 25th May 2004****Ward: Mortimer****Grid Ref: 43473, 66903****Expiry Date: 20th July 2004**

Local Member: Councillor Mrs. L.O. Barnett

**1. Site Description and Proposal**

- 1.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of two, two-storey extensions to Yatton Marsh Farm, Yatton. The existing property is a relatively modest detached dwelling located in the open countryside, outside any area of specific restrictive development plan policy. The dwelling has a historic core, evident internally. Substantial alterations have since taken place. A number of outbuildings surround the main dwelling house.
- 1.2 The existing property has a core footprint that is square in shape. This central element includes a kitchen, WC, and dining room at ground floor, with two bedrooms and a landing/bedroom at first floor level. Beyond this is there is a single storey extension at ground floor level to the south, and a modest lean-to addition west, wrapping in part around to the north. The proposal involves a two storey extension to the east, inclusive a north facing gable, and a two storey extension to the south with a footprint slightly larger to that of the existing single storey addition.
- 1.3 This proposal represents the culmination of an extended period of negotiations and revision.

**2. Policies****2.1 Leominster District Local Plan**

Policy A2(D) - Development in the open countryside  
Policy A9 - Safeguarding the Rural Landscape  
Policy A24 - Scale and Character of Development  
Policy A54 - Protection of Visual Amenity

**2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)**

Policy DR1 - Design  
Policy H18 - Alterations and extensions

**3. Planning History**

None identified

#### 4. Consultation Summary

##### Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

##### Internal Council Advice

4.2 Head of Engineering and Transportation advises no observations

#### 5. Representations

5.1 Parish Council commented on the revised plans as follows:

*“At a meeting of the Parish Council this week the above referenced plans were reviewed.*

*The council continue to have serious reservations about the acceptability of the proposed development on the following grounds:*

- 1. the extension is too large in relation to the existing building*
- 2. the proposals will substantially change the character of the building*
- 3. the proposed extensions and modification to the exterior appearance would make the house stand out in the countryside.*

*Aymestrey Parish Council requests that the planning department hold a site meeting so that the impact of the proposed works can be better appreciated before a decision is made.”*

5.2 Neighbours - No responses received

5.3 In response to the parish comments the applicant has written and commented as follows:

1. The design has been revised to reflect the advice of the Planning Officers
2. The existing dwelling has no architectural merit to protect
3. Design intends to create an more desirable property appearance

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

#### 6. Officers Appraisal

6.1 The adopted Leominster District Local Plan and the emerging Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan accept the principle of residential extensions, subject to the details of the proposal. In this instance, in consideration of the remote location of the site, it is suggested that design, scale, and impact upon the landscape are the principle issues for consideration.

6.2 The design now proposed is similar to that originally proposed. A number of design solutions have been explored with this property, with the main concerns being design and scale related. Planning policy dictates that the scale and character of existing properties should be protected. In this instance the proposed extensions clearly

create a new and substantially larger dwelling of an entirely new character. However, when one considers the protection of a dwelling, it is important to ascertain the value of the current built form, the features to be preserved, the character to be reflected and the design concept to be pursued, so as to preserve the character of the existing property and ensure the retention of the original dwelling as the dominant element of the resultant property. Here, it is evident that the existing property has been poorly altered and extended. The dwelling has no apparent front or back or sides. It has no features of value to be preserved or reflected. The design is not a good or even a bad example of any particular period or architectural style. The dwelling cannot be easily extended to allow for enlarged accommodation. The stance to be taken in these circumstances is, it is suggested, somewhat different. It is considered that in instances such as this the most important thing do is satisfy the following question:

*'Is the design and scale acceptable for the site and locality?'*

6.3 The locality is rural in character with neighbouring properties varying significantly in design, scale and age. The proposed enlarged dwelling would not be inappropriately large in this context and, within its site, will not appear excessive in size. The design of the proposed dwelling is not unattractive and creates a property with features, aspects, and character. It is suggested that it would not appear uncharacteristic in the locality and would not prove harmful to the landscape in which it is set.

6.4 There are no issues of residential amenity associated with this proposal, and no highway related concerns.

On balance, although the large size and new design concept are noted, it is considered that this proposal is acceptable. The existing dwelling is a material consideration to the extent that its protection through planning policy is not appropriate. The proposal dwelling does not harm any matters of acknowledged importance.

6.5 In response to the Parish Council's final sentence, all sites are visited prior to determination.

## 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 A07 (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.**

**Informatives:**

- 1 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

Decision: .....

Notes: .....

.....

**Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.