



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 07 January 2025

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1850/W/24/3346833

Whitehall, Peterchurch, Hereford HR2 0RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by John Olley against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is P232420/F.
 - The development proposed is described as “this application seeks Planning Permission for the erection of an agricultural style, steel-framed portal building on land adjacent Whitehall, Chapel Lane, Peterchurch, and associated drainage.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a parcel of land to the east of Whitehall, a 2-storey dwelling located on Chapel Lane, to the east of a small cluster of dwellings. The site is located within an undulating rural landscape enclosed by hedgerows. This affords the site and its surroundings a tranquil and verdant character. The land which borders the site to the south is at a lower level than the appeal site. Given this, the site is highly visible within the surrounding landscape in views from the south.
4. The appeal proposal relates to the erection of an agricultural style, steel-framed portal building. The building would be used for the storage of equipment and light industrial operations in association with the appellant's business. The building would have a height of approximately 6.6 metres and a footprint of approximately 242m². The building would be timber clad with metal profile sheet roofing and would have an appearance consistent with agricultural buildings in the area.
5. There is a suggestion that the appeal site does not form part of the residential curtilage of Whitehall. Whether or not that is the case, given the limited visual and spatial separation between the site and this dwelling it clearly forms part of the setting of Whitehall.
6. The building would be utilitarian in appearance and its form and massing would contrast markedly with the traditional residential form and scale of Whitehall. Additionally, the building would, by virtue of its height and bulk, appear as an unduly prominent new built feature in the landscape. The impact of the

development's excessive scale and height would be most prominent in views across the valley to the south, and the top part of the building would also be visible above the hedgerow in views from Chapel Lane. In these views the building would represent a large and visually prominent structure which would be harmful to the verdant character of the area. The use of neutral and green external materials would fail to disguise the proposal's excessive height and bulk.

7. My attention has been drawn to other agricultural buildings in the area. However, there is no suggestion that these buildings appear as prominent features within the landscape. I therefore afford these buildings to which my attention has been drawn limited weight in this decision.
8. The proposed building would result in a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to those aims of Peterchurch Neighbourhood Plan (2017) Policy P6 and Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) Policies SS1 and LD1 which collectively seek to protect the scenic beauty of the area and ensure that site selection is influenced by the landscape.

Other Matters

9. The appeal proposal would enable the appellant to securely store machinery associated with their business, thereby reducing the risk of theft. It is also stated that the proposal would enable the expansion of the appellant's business. However, I have no substantive evidence before me that other, less harmful, alternative solutions could not meet the same aims. I therefore attach limited weight to these considerations.
10. It is suggested that the proposal would result in the tidying up of the appeal site. Whilst this may be the case, there is no suggestion that this is dependent on the appeal proposal or that the site could not be tidied up in any event. I therefore afford limited weight to this as a benefit of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR