16 DCSE2004/0969/F - PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT WYE VIEW, BULLS HILL, WALFORD, NR. ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE.

For: Mr. G. Millfield per AGS Development Consultants, Corse Grange, Corse, Gloucestershire, GL19 3RQ

Date Received: 17th March, 2004 Ward: Kerne Bridge Grid Ref: 58749, 19615

Expiry Date:12th May, 2004

Local Member: Councillor Mrs. R.F. Lincoln

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application property is a small two-storey garage with garden situated on Bulls Hill. The site slopes steeply downwards to the front of the house, where there are further residential properties and upwards immediately at the rear, which is part of a wooded area.
- 1.2 It is proposed to extend the property by building a gabled, two-storey building at right angles to the main axis of the existing house with a narrow linking section, plus a small porch/wc with mono-pitched roof at the rear. The main part of the extension would be 3.6 m wide x 7.7 m deep. It would be of timber frame construction with the front gabled mainly glazed between the timbers and the side and rear having rendered panels. As the bank to the rear would be partially cut away a timber walling system (Permacrib) with stone fill would be constructed to retain the steep bank.
- 1.3 It is also proposed to install a sewage treatment plant to the south of the existing house.
- 1.4 Access to the property is along a narrow track of about 50 m long.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Guidance

PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

DOE Circ 3/99 - Planning Requirements in respect of Non-Mains

Sewerage Systems

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

Policy CTC1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy CTC2 - Area of Great Landscape Value

Policy H20 - Residential Development in Open Countryside

2.3 South Herefordshire District Local Plan

Policy C5 - Development within AONB

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Policy C8 - Development Within Area of Great Landscape Value

Policy SH23 - Extensions to Dwellings
Policy GD1 - General Development Criteria

3. Planning History

3.1 No recent applications have been submitted relating to this property.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency advice has not yet been received.
- 4.2 Forestry Commission states that the scale of the proposals is such that there will be no effect on the woodland and consequently we have no comment to make on this occasion.

Internal Council Advice

4.3 Head of Engineering and Transportation has no objection to the grant of permission.

5. Representations

- 5.1 The applicant's agent makes the following submission:
 - (1) The existing cottage is a very modest one-bedroomed dwelling and it is our intention to extend it to a two-bedroomed family dwelling, again of modest size.
 - (2) The proposed is designed so as to stand away and be subservient to the existing form and is designed to have an appearance, which is in contrast to the original character. In its extended form, its scale and mass is similar, possibly slightly smaller than the surrounding dwellings. Furthermore due to its location it is virtually unseen.
- 5.2 Parish Council agreed that this cottage needs renovation. They were concerned with:
 - (1) the size of the proposed extension in comparison with the original dwelling,
 - (2) the materials to be used and the glass frontage affecting the privacy of the lower dwellings,
 - (3) the roof of the original dwelling should match that of the extension

In addition the Parish Council has supplied the following comments by a local resident:

- (1) The site plans are reversed from the actual layout.
- (2) To her best knowledge, there is no existing septic tank on the site.
- (3) Storm water drains straight on to the ground by the cottage.
- (4) There is an almost constant wet patch inside the house between the sitting room and kitchen spring?

- (5) She queries the ownership of footpath shown unless the new owner has come to an agreement with a neighbour (at Killara?).
- 5.3 One letter has been received from A.M. Wadley, Starryway, Cherrytree Lane, Bulls Hill, Walford, Ross on Wye, HR9 expressing serious concern about the proposed drainage for the following reasons:
 - (1) There has never been any provision for foul water or storm water disposal at this cottage.
 - (2) The previous occupant, an old lady, never had a toilet. In fact she never had mains water until approximately 5 years ago when a sink was installed which drained into a very small rudimentary pit in front of the house.
 - (3) At the bottom of Wye View garden behind our house exists a 4-metre high gabion supporting wall. During the construction, I was informed by a geotechnical engineer that it would be difficult to put a septic tank on land above use because of possible fould water dispersal through these gabions.
 - (4) This site is very steep. Drainage considerations are of paramount importance here.

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 two issues to be considered are (1) whether the proposals would harm the natural beauty of this part of the Wye Valley AONB and (2) whether the sewage treatment plant would result in environmental pollution and localised flooding. With regard to the first issue it is accepted that the extension would be sizeable in relation to this small cottage. Nevertheless because of its positioning and the steep bank and woodland to the rear it is not considered that the extended house would be intrusive in the landscape. The design and external materials are different from this stone cottage but are felt to be complementary. The proposal also ensures that the existing cottage remains discrete and does not merge into the extension. Although elevated above adjoining properties there is sufficient distance to ensure that the amenities of neighbours would not be harmed. It is considered therefore that proposal complies with policies for extensions to rural dwellings.
- 6.2 According to the representations there is no adequate drainage system and the proposed treatment plant is preferred to a cesspit. The effluent from such a system should not cause pollution but no information has been submitted to indicate that it could be dispersed acceptably within the application site. Further details could be required by planning condition however and the system only be approved if it can be shown that it would work effectively.

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 A09 (Amended plans)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the amended plans.

3 B01 (Samples of external materials)

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

4 G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

5 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

Notwithstanding the approved drawing the sewage treatment plant shall not be installed until full details of the system, including percolation tests, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent environmental pollution and flooding.

Informative:

1 N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission

Decision:	 	 	
Notes:	 	 	

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.