

6 DCCE2004/3624/F - ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED DWELLING LAND ADJACENT TO 18 CONINGSBY COURT, CONINGSBY STREET, HEREFORD**For: Mr. B.H. Oseman, Axys Design, 30 Grove Road, Hereford, HR1 2QP****Date Received: 14th October, 2004****Ward: Central****Grid Ref: 51296, 40323****Expiry Date: 9th December, 2004**

Local Member: Councillor D.J. Fleet

1. Site Description and Proposal

1.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of a single dwelling. The application site falls between 18 Coningsby Court and Abbey Court. The application site is modest, being only 0.006 hectares in area, and is triangular in shape. The proposal involves the construction of a small, two storey, one bedroom dwelling.

2. Policies

2.1 Planning Policy Guidance:

PPG1 - General policy and principles
PPG3 - Housing
PPG13 - Transport

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan:

H2B - Location of housing (general)
CTC9 - Development criteria

2.3 Hereford City Local Plan:

ENV14 - Design
H3 - Design of new residential development
T5 - Car parking – designated areas

2.4 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan:

S1 - Sustainable development
S2 - Development requirements
S3 - Housing
DR1 - Design
H15 - Density
T11 - Parking provision

3. Planning History

- 3.1 HC87/0367/PO - Demolition of existing building on site and erection of 40 number single bedroom flats with landscape courtyard/car parking area. Application withdrawn 1st October, 1987.
- 3.2 HC88/0155/PO - Demolition of existing building on site and erection of 16 number town houses with landscaped courtyard/car parking area. Approved 20th September, 1988.
- 3.3 HC94/0330/PF – Demolition of existing buildings on the sit, erection of 18 dwellings. Approved, 16th November 1994.
- 3.4 HC94/0503/PO - High density residential development situated at Venn Hall Bindery, Coningsby Street/Canal Road, Hereford. Refused 23rd March, 1995. Appeal date - 17th April, 1996 (Appeal dismissed).
- 3.5 CE2000/0834/F - Proposed residential development of 4 no. 1 bedroom flats and 1 no. 2 bedroom flat, John Venn Hall. Refused 27th July, 2000.
- 3.6 CE2002/0890/F – Proposed development to form 3 flats with parking, John Venn Hall. Withdrawn 2nd October, 2002.
- 3.7 CE2002/2523/F – Proposed redevelopment to form 6 flats, John Venn Hall. Approved, 16th October, 2002.
- 3.8 DCCE2004/1736/F – Extension to driveway into previously planted area. Refused, 1st July 2004.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 None.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Head of Highways and Transportation raised no objection to the proposal.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Hereford City Council raised no objection to the proposal

Four letters of objection have been received from the following sources:

- Mrs. J.L. Johnson, 1 Coningsby Court
- J. Moulton, 18 Coningsby Court
- Mr. R. Price, 15 Coningsby Court
- Ms L. Harris, 11 Coningsby Court

The objections raised can be summarised as follows:

1. Addition parking and movement problems;
2. Loss/lack of landscaping;

3. Unacceptable design;
4. Disruption caused by building works;
5. Refusal of application DCCE2004/1736/F on landscaping grounds;
6. Potential for 'miscreants' and litter.

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

6. Officer's Appraisal

6.1 In planning policy terms, this application represents residential infill and in principle is acceptable. The issues associated are considered to be the design, visual amenity, residential amenity, loss of landscaped area, and highways issues.

6.2 In consideration of the residential amenity issues associated with this development, there will be no loss of privacy, no light loss, and no overbearing impact. It is considered that no neighbour will be directly affected by the physical presence of this development.

6.3 The loss of this landscaped area is a little regrettable but it is considered important to consider the wider implications of this proposal. Unlike application DCCE2004/1736/F, this application is not seeking an enlarged parking area. The decision taken on this application was quite appropriate and in no way questioned. In the case of this application however, a new dwelling is proposed and a dwelling can in fact be of benefit to the wider visual amenities of the locality. The existing situation on site is that Abbey Court and Coningsby Court are unfortunately contrasting developments. Their design styles differ to a relatively substantially extent and although detached from one another their relationship with one another means there is little to separate them leading to a harsh and conflicting context. This site therefore offers the opportunity to enhance this relationship. It offers the potential to link these properties in way that will enable an enhancement of the current relationship. The proposal has a flat roof, which is reflective of the dormer elements of Abbey Court. This roof type is also clean and uncluttered in this confined area. A ridged roof would have led to a visually complicated and undesirable appearance, enhancing the intrusiveness of this dwelling. The design details are reflective of Coningsby Court but also relate to Abbey Court. This building also breaks the current significant step between the rear elevations of these two developments. The value of the existing land is also considered limited. It is effectively dead space and its potential to act as an effective landscape corridor is considered limited. As it stands, the proposal is a modest and unobtrusive structure that will link its two neighbours into a more complete and satisfying whole.

6.4 Turning to highway matters, the courtyard area will provide space for two vehicles if required. The Head of Engineering and Transportation has raised no objection and in relation to the loss of landscaping the benefits of this development to the wider character and appearance of the area is, as noted above, considered to outweigh the harm.

6.5 The 'alley' is 0.3 metres wide and thus unlikely to be readily accessible for potential 'miscreants'. It is not considered that this site will act as a litter magnet any more than the rest of the area appears to do.

6.6 Appropriate conditions are proposed in relation to landscaping, construction times, and materials.

6.7 On balance this application represent an infill development increasingly typical of the City centre living concept. It will provide a small dwelling of attractive design without harm to neighbours, and to the benefit of the urban design character of the locality.

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.

2 B01 (Samples of external materials)

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

3 E16 (Removal of permitted development rights.)

Reason: (Special reason).

4 F16 (Restriction of hours during construction)

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents.

5 G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

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

6 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

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

7 G33 (Details of walls/fences (outline permission))

Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity.

8 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the courtyard area shown on the approved plans has been properly consolidated, surfaced, drained and otherwise constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter this area shall be retained as an open courtyard and kept available for vehicle parking as required.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure availability of parking provision as required.

Informatives:

1 HN1 – Mud on highway

2 HN4 – Private apparatus within highway

- 3 **HN5 – Works within the highway**
- 4 **N03 – Adjoining property rights**
- 5 **N15 – Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC**

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.