

19 DCSE2004/3644/F - NEW DWELLING AT LAND ADJOINING 1 DOWARD PLACE, GOODRICH, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR9 6HY**For: Mr. C. Winney per Andrew Last, Brookside Cottage, Knapton, Hereford, HR4 8ER****Date Received: 18th October, 2004 Ward: Kerne Bridge Grid Ref: 57526, 19287****Expiry Date: 13th December, 2004**

Local Member: Councillor Mrs. R.F. Lincoln

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site, an irregularly shaped area of land of about 0.14 ha, forms part of the garden to the side of 1/2 Doward Place. It is on the east side of the road leading from Goodrich to Coppett Hill and about 50 m from the Dry Arch Bridge. It is proposed to erect a detached dwellinghouse on this plot. In form this would comprise two gabled sections facing the road, with a linking section, less deep than and with a roof at right angles to the gables. The southern gabled section would be asymmetrical and significantly larger than the northern gable, with the principal rooms lit by south facing windows and dormer windows. The walls would be of facing bricks render and the roof clad with grey/blue slates. The house would be sited about 8 m back from the highway and close to the northern apex of the plot. It would contain 4 double bedrooms with an integral garage on the ground floor.
- 1.2 There are houses immediately to the north and to the west on the opposite side of the road. The former comprise two, 2-storey houses arranged one behind the other with double, parallel ridges; the latter are bungalows. To the south and east is open countryside which falls steeply to the River Wye. Adjoining the north east boundary of the site is part of the garden of 2 Doward Place.
- 1.3 Planning permission (SE2002/2285/F) for a new dwelling on this site was refused permission in 2002 for the following reason:

The proposed development would overload the public sewerage system and therefore would exacerbate pollution problems. It has not been demonstrated that an alternative foul drainage system would be suitable. The proposal would conflict therefore with Government advice in DETR Circular 3/99 and policies H.16A and CTC.9 of the Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan and policies C.40, C.43, C.47, GD.1, SH.8 and SH.14 of the South Herefordshire District Local Plan.

2. Policies**2.1 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan**

Policy H16A	-	Housing in Rural Areas
Policy H18	-	Residential Development in Rural Settlements
Policy CTC1	-	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy CTC2	-	Area of Great Landscape Value

2.2 South Herefordshire District Local Plan

Policy C4	-	AONB Landscape Protection
Policy C5	-	Development within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy C8	-	Development Within Area of Great Landscape Value
Policy C43	-	Foul sewerage
Policy SH6	-	Housing Development in Larger Villages
Policy SH8	-	New Housing Development Criteria in larger Villages
Policy SH14	-	Siting and Design of Buildings
Policy T3	-	Highway Safety Requirements
Policy GD1	-	General Development Criteria

3. Planning History

3.1	SE2002/2285/F	New dwelling	-	Refused 16.12.02
	SE2003/0814/F	New vehicular access	-	Approved 17.03.03
	SE2003/3903/F	New dwelling and change of area of land	-	Withdrawn 04.02.04

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

- 4.1 Environment Agency raised concerns in relation to the previous planning application (ref. SE2003/3903/F) on the proposed method of foul drainage (proposed septic tank discharging to a soakaway), as Goodrich is a sewered area. Connection to the mains sewer is the most sustainable option. The Agency are on the understanding that the mains foul sewerage system is at capacity, however the LPA should pursue this option as it is the most sustainable method of disposal.

If it is demonstrated (based on cost and feasibility) that a connection to the mains sewer is impractical then a non-mains drainage method will be assessed in line with DETR Circular 3/99 (Planning Requirements in respect of non-Mains Sewerage).

If the LPA decide to accept a non-mains foul drainage scheme (with the view to a future connection of the development into the foul sewer), it is requested that they consult with Welsh Water to satisfy themselves of the certainty of the site being able to receive such a mains sewerage connection. The LPA might consider negotiating an advancement of such a mains drainage connection with the utility company (Welsh Water) through an appropriate 106 obligation.

- 4.2 Welsh Water have no comment to make on the application.
- 4.3 English Heritage do not wish to make any representations.

Internal Council Advice

- 4.4 Traffic Manager recommends that any permission should include conditions regarding the access and parking/turning.
- 4.5 Conservation Manager advises that is some distance from the main area of archaeological sensitivity in Goodrich (Castle and Priory) but recommends a condition to allow observation and recording.

5. Representations

- 5.1 Parish Council has serious objections to this development. Despite the adjustment in levels the house remains on the skyline and will still have a very significant and detrimental effect to the view up towards the Dry Arch from Kerne Bridge. The proposed dwelling is far too large for the site and not in line with the guidelines for smaller villages within the Unitary Development Plan.
- 5.2 6 letters of objection have been received. In summary the following reasons are cited:
- (1) House would be too large for plot - it would be totally out of scale with and dwarf the 4 adjoining cottages. It is doubted if it would fit into the area available but no stated dimensions to be able to check,
 - (2) it would be out of keeping with this very old village; the style would be completely out of place,
 - (3) no need as plenty of this size houses on the market in Goodrich,
 - (4) site is very sensitive visually being in AONB and with panoramic views from Kerne Bridge of Goodrich Castle, Dry Arch Bridge and Coppett Hill - very few buildings intrude into this view but the proposed house will, spoiling the skyline. One objector thinks that a sandstone house with slate or stone roof which was lower than parapet of Dry Arch Bridge would be more acceptable - site is very close to this old bridge, built in 1824,
 - (5) loss of privacy especially to the garden of 2 Doward Place part of which is already overlooked by no. 1 and the new house would overlook the remainder,
 - (6) loss of light to garden of no. 2 later in day and to house on opposite side of the road,
 - (7) Loss of views from nearby houses of Goodrich Church and countryside,
 - (8) Loss of trees and hedge to form access and new planting will not automatically generate a new wildlife habitat,
 - (9) Wider access, with no turning area so vehicles may reverse onto highway; inadequate parking and road parking dangerous so near junction; more vehicles on narrow highway - all these factors would increase traffic hazards,
 - (10) Not big enough area for septic tank,
 - (11) Lead to ribbon development up Coppett Hill,
 - (12) Enormous groundworks would be necessary which would seriously disrupt flow of traffic on highway and cause noise and inconvenience,
 - (13) Retaining wall appears to extend into Beech hedge which is part of 2 Doward Place.

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 application site is within the defined settlement of Goodrich and in principle therefore is a suitable site for residential development. One of the main issues raised by the proposal however is the effect on the character of the village and the natural beauty of the Wye Valley AONB. The plot has a wide frontage although it narrows to the rear. The house would be set back from the highway with a hedge along at least part of that frontage. It would have a similar ridge height to 1 and 2 Doward Place and would be sited about 8 m from these properties. 1-4 Doward Place are very close to the highway and occupy much of the frontage between the application site and the

junction with the access road to the Castle. 1 and 2 Doward Place being joined form a substantial building with prominent gables. For these reasons it is not considered that the proposed house, although close to the rear boundary would appear too large for its plot or out of character with the area.

- 6.2 It is accepted that the view from Kerne Bridge of the Castle and adjoining landscape is very attractive which could be marred by one house inappropriately sited or designed. Indeed one modern house does project above the ridge which screens most of the village from Kerne Bridge. The proposed house would be seen from the valley particularly, from the Kerne Bridge – Goodrich Road to the west of Flanesford Priory. The land falls away immediately to the south east of the application site and even with extra planting could not readily be screened. The applicant has agreed to reduce the massing of the southern end of the building and alter the detailed design and the house can also be set at a lower level of its plot. These measures will help to limit the visual impact of the proposal.
- 6.3 A second issue is the effect on the amenity of neighbours. The main problem here is overlooking of the garden of 2 Doward Place. The applicant has agreed that the house should be further from the boundary with that property and that the first floor bedroom window would be obscurely glazed. This part of the sizeable garden of 2 Doward Place is somewhat detached from the house itself and it is not unusual to be overlooked in these circumstances. The new house also intrudes in front of the end, south elevations of 1 and 2 Doward Place with windows facing towards the new house. Although there are no windows in the latter looking north this is not ideal. Nevertheless it is not considered that the loss of amenity is so serious as to justify refusal of planning permission.
- 6.4 The third issue is drainage. As noted above the mains sewerage system is overloaded and it was for this reason that planning permission was refused in 2002. The additional land should allow a septic tank system to operate effectively and Policy C43 of the Local Plan does allow for alternative to mains drainage where this is not practicable. The Environment Agency also appears to have softened its rigid objection to non-mains drainage in areas which have this facility. It would be possible to require a change to mains drainage once the system is upgraded through a planning agreement. However this may be unreasonable as currently there are no definite plans for these works to be undertaken.
- 6.5 Of the other concerns raised it should be noted that the Traffic Manager considers the formation of a new access for this house to be acceptable given the speed of traffic and relatively low traffic flows. Loss of views is not considered to be grounds to refuse permission.

RECOMMENDATION

That subject to the submission of amended plans showing reduced massing and altered relationship to northern boundaries of site, the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions considered necessary by officers:

- 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. B01 (Samples of external materials)

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

3. G01 (Details of boundary treatments)

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

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.

6. F48 (Details of slab levels)

Reason: In order to define the permission and ensure that the development is of a scale and height appropriate to the site.

7. F18 (Scheme of foul drainage disposal)

Reason: In order to ensure that satisfactory drainage arrangements are provided.

8. E18 (No new windows in specified elevation)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

9. E19 (Obscure glazing to windows)

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

10. E16 (Removal of permitted development rights)

Reason: To ensure the character of the original conversion scheme is maintained.

Informative(s):

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

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.