

**7. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION – REINSTATEMENT OF FARMHOUSE AND BARN TO SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE – GREAVES HEAD FARM, NETHER LANE, BRADSHAW (NP/K/0317/0324, P.6105, 30/3/2017, 409802 / 407353, MN)**

**APPLICANT:** Keyland Developments Ltd

**Site and Surroundings**

The former farmstead of Greaves Head is located on the northern slope of a remote area of Pennine upland in the Upper Holme Valley between the A635 to the north and Marsden Clough to the south. Bilberry and Digley reservoirs are located approximately half a kilometre south east of the application site. The area is characterised by a mixture of moorland, reverted farmland and pastureland.

The farmstead includes a former farmhouse and barn, which have most recently been used as sheep shelters. The buildings are in a dilapidated state of repair, as are many of the crumbling stone walls of the field boundaries in the surrounding area.

The buildings are Grade II listed, and as such are designated heritage assets.

Access to the site is gained via a track known as Nether Lane, which is a public bridleway forming part of the Kirklees Way and the West Yorkshire Way. The property lies some 1.6km along the track from where it joins Acres Lane, the nearest adopted highway to the east.

Records indicate that settlement in the area dates back at least as far as the 15<sup>th</sup> century, that by the 16<sup>th</sup> century there were at least 5 settlements, 10 by 1785, and by 1851 there were in excess of 20.

However, the area is now mostly deserted apart from the ruins of one or two surviving farmsteads, the isolated Goodbent Shooting Lodge to the west, and a single dwellinghouse that lies adjacent to the public highway approximately 1.6km to the east.

This abandonment arose because the area forms part of the water catchment for Digley Reservoir which, over the course of the 1930s and 1950s, led to their forced abandonment and in most cases demolition to ground level. Greaves Head, along with the similar nearby site of the former farmhouse of Bartin, is one of the few structural remnants of this landscape, alongside drystone walls in varying states of repair and the surviving low remains of other demolished structures.

The Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), The Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area (SPA), and the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are all located approximately 180m south of the site and also approximately 900m to the north west, covering large areas of land in these directions. Expansive areas of land designated as Natural Zone in the Authority's Development Plan are located to the north, east and south of the site approximately 250m to the north west and 150m to the south at their closest points.

The landscape is also recorded within the Authority's Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record (HBSMR) and the regional West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record.

In addition to the adjacent bridleway, a number of other footpaths bisect the area to the north, west, and east of the site.

Large expanses of open access moorland are present to the north, west, and south of the site. At the closest point, to the south, this land is approximately 200m from the application buildings.

There are no immediate neighbours to the buildings due to their isolated position.

### **Proposal**

To convert the former farmhouse and barn to a single dwellinghouse.

The proposal includes repair and rebuilding work to both buildings, and the creation of a small curtilage between the two.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

- 1. By virtue of the proposed building works and proposed use, the development would result in harm to the historic and architectural significance of the listed buildings, contrary to the Act, Development Plan policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, LC6, LC15, and LC16 and to the heritage conservation policies of the Framework.**

### **Key Issues**

The Authority must, by virtue of Section 16 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

### **History**

1993 – Planning application and listed building consent application for alterations and conversion of listed building to dwelling withdrawn prior to determination.

1994 – Planning permission and listed building consent refused for alterations to farmhouse and conversion of barn to ancillary workspace, garage, and flat.

1994 – Appeal against refusal of the 1994 planning application dismissed on the grounds that the intensive nature of the development would be likely to result in a wide range of domestic and other activities together with several parked vehicles appearing in and around the site.

The Inspector concluded that the range of activities would have no functional relationship with the former use of these farm buildings or the surrounding open farmland and would therefore harm the agricultural setting of the listed buildings. As these activities would be very visible from the public bridleway and from further distant viewpoints the Inspector also concluded that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. The Inspector also concluded that the lengthy unmade access track was unsuitable for the increase in traffic generated by the proposed scheme and that this would cause conflict with and seriously diminish the peaceful enjoyment of other recreational users. Furthermore, the Inspector recognised that the buildings were considered worthy of preservation and accepted that a residential use was likely to be the only likely viable use. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector acknowledged that this would be likely to result in the buildings being left vacant and falling further in to dereliction, and could result in approval being sought by the owners for their demolition. However, the Inspector was of the view that the buildings are of little architectural merit and that their significance in terms of their historical function would be seriously compromised by the refurbishment process. In conclusion, the Inspector considered that the benefits of retaining the natural beauty of the landscape, both for its own sake and for its recreational value, outweighed the desirability of preserving the listed buildings.

1998 – Listed building consent granted for conversion of barn to workspace and garage, and reinstatement of original dwelling to form ancillary accommodation. A planning application for a

development of the same description was submitted alongside the listed building consent application, but was withdrawn prior to determination

### **Consultation**

Kirklees Council – Public Rights of Way (PROW) – Consider the submission to include insufficient assessment of the impact of the development on public rights of way.

Recent works to the public bridleway have been undertaken without authority of this council as the highway authority for the public bridleways; those works have included the importation and use of unauthorised non-vernacular surfacing materials.

Public bridleways are relatively scarce in Kirklees and the network north of Digley reservoir is one of the area's main resources for riders and merits adequate protection.

Much of the access from Acre Lane is narrow, with insufficient space for the passing of two vehicles, and insufficient for passing of even vehicle and rider over a number of lengths (e.g. White Walls Lane over a length of 180m+). Intensification of use of this access by motor vehicles would have a negative effect on public bridleway use and peaceful enjoyment of this special part of the PDNP within Kirklees.

Kirklees Council – Development Control – The application should be determined in accordance with your development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Holme Valley Parish Council – No response at time of writing.

PDNPA – Conservation - Two detailed responses have been provided and can be read in full on the Authority's website. These responses are summarised as follows:

The proposed structural works are highly intrusive, involving underpinning, dismantling and rebuilding walls on new foundations and dismantling and rebuilding parts of walls, as well as the replacement of roof timbers. Underpinning should not be carried out unless absolutely essential, due to risks of differential movement between underpinned sections of the building and other more flexible parts to which it is attached.

The structural works, overall, would result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric, degree of alteration and harm to the character and significance of the listed buildings, and would not, therefore, be acceptable.

The proposed reintroduction of a residential use at Greaves Head Farm will introduce a domestic curtilage to the listed buildings which has not been present since listing, including parked cars, movement of vehicles, and other associated paraphernalia. Such residential and domestic 'clutter' would be incongruous within this natural landscape, and would have a negative impact on the immediate curtilage and setting of the listed buildings, harming the significance of these heritage assets.

PDNPA – Archaeology – Two detailed responses have been provided and can be read in full on the Authority's website. These responses are summarised as follows:

The conservation of the listed buildings and the wider landscape are outcomes that should be sought and supported. However, in order for this to be achieved a scheme must conserve the heritage values and significance of these designated heritage assets, and also its wider landscape setting, which in this case is a relict farming landscape that is a heritage asset of importance in its own right.

There are major concerns about both the level of intervention to the physical fabric of the buildings required to achieve this scheme, and the impact of the proposed development on this historic character of the landscape.

With respect to the works to the buildings, these will have a large impact on the surviving historic fabric, and the authenticity of the buildings, resulting in harm to the historic and archaeological interest of a designated heritage asset.

With respect to the historic landscape, as unoccupied buildings the site is integrated within its surrounding very open and agricultural landscape. This is an important aspect to the setting of the Listed Buildings, and is important in its own right.

The introduction of a residential and domestic use into this landscape would introduce elements that are out of place, incongruous and are harmful to this important example of relict landscape that reflects the development of aspects of the Southern Pennines' farming and rural economy from the medieval period onwards.

### **Representations**

28 letters of representation have been received, including group letters from the Kirklees Bridleways Group and The British Horse Society.

These all object to the proposal. The reasons for objection are varied, but mostly relate to impacts that are not material to the consideration of a listed building consent application.

The only matter raised that is considered material to this application is that the buildings contribute to the appearance of the area in their current state and should be retained as such. It is reasonable to interpret from this that they are considered to have heritage value in their current condition by some objectors.

### **Main Policies**

#### **Development Plan**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L3

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC6, LC15, LC16

Core Strategy policy GSP1 requires that all development should be consistent with the National Parks legal purpose and duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Parks; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public.

GSP2 supports development that would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park, noting that proposals intending to enhance the Park must demonstrate significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and undermine the achievement of other policies. Furthermore, it states that work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.

Policy GSP3 sets out the principles and finer criteria for assessing impact on valued characteristics stating that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal.

Policy GSP4 covers the use of Planning conditions and/or legal agreements to achieve the spatial outcomes in the plan.

Policy L3 seeks to ensure the National Park's historic built environment is conserved and enhanced for future generations and sets out three criteria under which the current application should be assessed because of the potential impacts on cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, and historic significance:

- A. Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
- B. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
- C. Proposals for development will be expected to meet the objectives of any strategy, wholly or partly covering the National Park, that has, as an objective, the conservation and where possible the enhancement of cultural heritage assets. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the Cultural Heritage Strategy for the Peak District National Park and any successor strategy.

Listed buildings are addressed by Local Plan policy LC6, which states that any applications for development must clearly demonstrate how the building will be preserved and enhanced and why the development is desirable or necessary.

Policy LC15 and LC16 address heritage and archaeological assets respectively. They state that when considering development proposals that could affect such assets their national and local significance, their protection, enhancement and preservation, and the need for the development to be on the site in question will all be taken in to account. They note the importance of retaining heritage assets in situ and, in the case of archaeological assets, the requirement for the implementation of appropriate scheme for archaeological investigation prior to and during development.

These policies are consistent with the wider range of conservation and design policies in the Development Plan, which promote high standards of design and support development proposals that would be sensitive to the locally distinctive character of the site and its setting and the valued characteristics of the National Park.

#### Other Supporting Supplementary Planning Documents and Policies

The Peak National Park Design Guide and its technical supplement The Building Design Guide

#### National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.

The Framework re-iterates the legislative position of the Authority's Development Plan, identifying that this remains the starting point for decision making and that development that accords with an up-to-date Development Plan should be approved, and development that conflicts with it should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraph 115 confirms that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight.

Part 12 of the Framework deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment with paragraph 132 stating, amongst other things, that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It notes that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. It also advises that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that as heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 134 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

The National Planning Policy Guidance was published in 2014 to support the framework.

### **Assessment**

#### ***Impact of the development on the heritage significance of the buildings and their setting.***

In design terms the buildings would largely be unaltered, externally at least, from their original appearance. Some changes to the design – such as the omission of rooflights – have been made during the course of the application. The internal works to the house seek to largely reinstate original form and layout. More internal works are proposed within the barn, adding subdivision and a partial first floor to facilitate its occupation. Whilst it would be preferable to keep this space open without additional subdivision, the impact of this on the overall significance of the group of listed buildings is considered to be relatively low; much of the barns significance is in its external appearance and its relationship to the house and wider former agricultural landscape. It is also noted that some partitioning and the introduction of a first floor was previously accepted when the Authority granted listed building consent in 1998. On this basis this intervention is considered acceptable.

Therefore, subject to control of materials, design details, and method of works there would be no objections to the proposals on grounds of design.

The amount of underpinning and rebuilding work proposed is significant however; the submitted structural survey recommends that it would be necessary to take down and rebuild the eastern gable wall and the first floor of the southern wall of the house, and the southern wall and corner of the eastern wall of the barn. Underpinning is proposed to the northern, western, and southern walls of the house.

The Authority's Conservation Officer has advised that this level of underpinning could potentially further undermine the buildings' long-term stability, and the Conservation Officer and Senior Archaeologist consider that the loss of historic fabric and significant degree of rebuilding would detract from the buildings' historic and archaeological significance and authenticity.

It has not been established at this stage whether the works required to convert the building to a habitable condition could be undertaken in a less intrusive or harmful manner that conserves the significance of the buildings. It would therefore not be appropriate to control such works by condition, as the actual requirements could fundamentally affect the acceptability of the proposal.

There are also substantial concerns in regard to the impact of the proposal on the setting of the listed buildings.

The Authority's Conservation Officer and Senior Archaeologist advise that, as listed, the buildings form more of an integral part of the natural environment than would be the case if restored and lived in, and that the extension of the natural environment right up to the walls of the buildings is a key part of the setting of the buildings. They consider that this makes a positive and

important contribution to their significance as listed. They consider that introducing a curtilage, which would likely include parked cars, vehicle movements, and other domestic paraphernalia, would harm this setting and that of the significance of the listed buildings.

This accords with the conclusions of the 1994 appeal decision, where it was considered that the proposed range of activities would have no functional relationship with the former use of these farm buildings or the surrounding open farmland and would therefore harm the setting of the listed buildings.

On this basis it is not accepted that the reinstatement of the buildings as dwellinghouses would be in the heritage interests of the site, even if it would preserve the buildings themselves – which the current scheme would not. Instead, it would detract from the historic and archaeological significance of the buildings and their setting.

The proposed works and proposed use therefore fail to preserve the buildings, their settings, and their features of historic interest.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed scheme is not considered to conserve the buildings or their settings due to the amount of intervention proposed and the impacts of the proposed domestic use.

The proposed works and development are therefore contrary to the Act, to Development Plan policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, LC6, LC15, and LC16 and to the heritage conservation policies of the Framework.

There are considered to be no wider public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm and for this reason the proposal is also contrary to the provisions of the NPPF in so far as it relates to the conservation of heritage assets.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

### **Human Rights**

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

### **List of Background Papers** (not previously published)

Nil