

**9. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION – PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF LINKING STRUCTURE AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT LINKING STRUCTURE. INTERNAL ALTERATION OF EXISTING STONE STAIR. ALTERATION OF INTERNAL STAIR AND CONSTRUCTION OF WALL IN EXISTING ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION / BARN CONVERSION TO PROVIDE ACCOMODATION FOR A DEPENDANT RELATIVE. REMOVAL OF STUD PARTITIONS AND PARTIAL REMOVAL OF WALLING TO RELOCATE KITCHEN. EXTENSION OF EXTERNAL TERRACE AND WALL. FLUE TO WOODBURNING STOVE, EXTERNAL DOOR AND EXTERNAL LIGHTS AT MITCHELL FIELD FARM, UNNAMED ROAD FROM THE DALE TO CAM HEIGHT, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/1018/0907)**

**APPLICANT: PETER AND KIM TABERN AND BURKE**

**Site and Surroundings**

Mitchell Field Farm is located in open countryside 1.6km east of Hathersage and includes a farmhouse and range of traditional buildings.

The farmhouse is grade II listed and the farm is also recorded on the Peak District National Park Historic Buildings Sites and Monuments Record as part of the recent Historic England, Peak District Historic Farmsteads Project. It is an extant 17<sup>th</sup> century farmstead that is formed of a loose courtyard on one side of the yard (east) formed by agricultural buildings (already undergone residential conversion) and a detached farmhouse making up the northern side of the yard.

The site is located within the Eastern Moors and within the Enclosed Gritstone Upland Landscape character type. Small loose courtyard farmsteads, with small scale buildings to one or two-sides of the yard, as at Mitchell Field Farm are particularly characteristic of Landscape Character Area. All traditional buildings on the site remain extant.

The nearest neighbouring property is the remains of a former cottage now known as Smelters Cottage 300m to the north east of the site which has planning permission to be re-built to create a holiday let.

**Proposal**

This application seeks listed building consent for the demolition of the existing link structure and the erection of a replacement link and for external alterations including installation of roof lights, flue and the replacement of an external door.

Alterations to increase the size of the existing outside terrace are proposed including the removal of existing walling and steps and the erection new walling and steps.

An application for planning permission for the development has also been submitted.

The proposed link would have a similar footprint than the existing but have a different design approach. The existing eastern stone wall would be retained and the western elevation of the link would be glazed with frameless glass. The doors to the link would be either frameless glass or aluminium powder coated framed. The link would have a flat roof set below the level of the west facing wall with roof lights.

The roof light and flue would be installed on the west elevation of the two storey barn. The roof lights would be a bank of three sited at the ridge with the flue just above the eaves.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1. The proposed works would have a harmful impact upon the significance of Mitchell Field Farm and its setting. There are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm and therefore the proposals are contrary to Core Strategy policy L3, saved Local Plan policy LC6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

### **Key Issues**

- The impact of the proposed works upon the significance of the existing buildings and their setting.

### **History**

1989: Planning permission and listed building consent granted for alterations to building.

1989: Planning permission granted for conversion of shippon to utility cloakroom and porch and conversion of shed to garage.

1989: Planning permission granted for vehicular access.

1990: Planning permission granted for change of use of ground floor of barn to drawing, painting and art use.

1994: Planning permission and listed building consent granted for enclosed link between main house and barn.

1994: Planning permission and listed building consent granted for conversion of barn to ancillary domestic space.

2001: Planning permission granted for erection of stable building.

2018: Pre-application advice in regard to current proposals. Officers raised significant concerns about various aspects of the proposals and gave the following detailed advice.

*“The purpose of a link is to retain the historic separation between domestic farmhouse and ancillary agricultural outbuilding. It is essential that this separation is maintained. Were this distinction between the two to be removed, physically and/or visually, this would have a negative impact on the significance of the listed farmhouse, raising the status of the barn relative to the principal building, undermining the hierarchical relationship between the two and harming the significance of the listed building. The current disconnect between the two buildings is historic, therefore, and must be retained.*”

*The link itself is intended purely to provide a lightweight, discrete covered access from one building to the other, to enable the barn to be used as ancillary domestic space, as approved in 1994. Where such links are approved they are often considerably more lightweight and minimal than the existing at Mitchell Field: the reason this is wider than many is so that it did not interfere with the existing doorway at the east end of the south-west elevation of the farmhouse, whilst making use of the boundary wall with doorway which already existed between the north-east corner of the barn and the end of the farmhouse. Raising the status of this link would be unacceptable.*

Existing plans from when the link was constructed show that there was no doorway in the north-west gable wall of the barn, which was entirely blank. Existing plans from when the barn was converted show that the partition to ground floor at the south end of the barn was already existing, and was the only partitioning remaining within the barn at that time.

The staircase in the house is shown as of low significance in the pre-application enquiry but is in its historic location and is therefore part of the historic plan form of the farmhouse which is of high significance.

Increasing the footprint of the link would not be acceptable, as explained above. Raising the height of the stone wall to the north-east may not be acceptable: this appears to be an original feature. Any alterations to this would require a full assessment of its historic significance, a very strong justification and an assessment of the impact of the proposed alterations on its significance.

Glazing the south-west elevation of the link could potentially be acceptable, if this increases the light-weight appearance of the link and makes it more minimal and discrete. However, the glazing would need to be very simple and inconspicuous, to retain the appearance of a link. Note: the existing solid wall with single doorway effectively hides the link from view. Roofing the link with a solid material, as proposed (zinc) would reduce its light-weight appearance and form, which is unlikely to be acceptable.

At present both of the external doors to the north-east elevation are traditional, solid boarded doors. This helps to retain the historically robust, largely blank appearance of this elevation of the barn and the adjoining wall. Glazing either of these openings, as proposed, is highly unlikely to be acceptable. Blocking access to the farmhouse except from the barn (other than via the rear garden) would raise the status of the barn relative to the house, removing the clear distinction between farmhouse and ancillary outbuilding, and would not be acceptable.

The bank of roof lights to the barn roof would require a very strong justification and may not be acceptable. There is already quite a lot of glazing to the upper floor of the barn and the north-east elevation slot windows were added when the building was converted.

The proposed internal alterations to the farmhouse would not be acceptable. Whilst removing some of the post-1988 partitioning at the north-east end (some of which appears to be unauthorised) would be acceptable, the creation of openings in the original wall (to create a combined kitchen and dining space) would be unacceptable. This wall is of high significance and the alterations would remove a considerable amount of historic fabric and alter the historic plan form of the farmhouse and attached shippon, harming the significance of the listed building.

Removing part of the wall to create a WC would be unacceptable. This is the original C17th gable wall to the farmhouse, as evidenced by the quoins and different stonework visible in the north-west elevation of the listed building. It is of high significance and the proposals would both result in the removal of historic fabric and alterations to the historic plan form of the farmhouse, harming the significance of the listed building.

Removing almost the entire north-west gable wall of the barn would result in a considerable loss of historic fabric and an almost-total loss of the historic plan form of the barn and of its historic form in relation to the listed farmhouse, and would be unacceptable. Historically there was no opening in this gable wall. Any enlargement to the existing, inserted doorway would undermine the plain, simple, robust historic character of this gable end, and is highly unlikely to be acceptable.

Further subdivision of the barn at ground floor, by adding a new partition to create a utility/cloakroom would reduce the historic open-plan form of the barn and may be unacceptable.”

## **Consultations**

Highway Authority – No objections subject to all use remaining private and ancillary.

District Council – No response to date.

Parish Council – No objections and make the following comments.

The Parish Council felt that the changes to the cloakroom would have no detrimental effect and noted that the flue is to be installed within the building as far as possible. They were pleased to see that the glazed wall will be retained and improved to improve the visibility of the wall behind while also improving energy efficiencies in this area.

Historic England: Make no comment and suggest that the views of the Authority's specialist conservation adviser are sought.

PDNPA Conservation Officer: Objects to the proposal and makes the following comment:

- i. *"The removal of modern partitions within the former shippon (east bay), addition of new partitions to form pantry: acceptable as this work only affects modern insertions.*
- ii. *The creation of three openings in the solid masonry wall at ground floor between the former shippon and existing kitchen, to create a combined kitchen and dining space.*

*The widening of the existing doorway and the creation of two further openings in the very thick, original masonry wall between the former shippon and dwelling house, would completely remove the historic separation between these two functionally distinct units (domestic and ancillary), and would alter the historic plan-form of the historic building. The historic plan-form of the listed building is characterised by small, discrete, separate rooms, each connected only by a single doorway: the creation of a largely open-plan living space, as proposed, would be wholly non-traditional in a vernacular historic building of this age and type. The proposals would result in a very serious loss of highly significant historic fabric, much of it likely to remain from the earliest building on the site and of considerable evidential value.*

*There is no indication in the Heritage Statement that there was ever a fireplace in this wall as suggested in the application: even if a fireplace were to exist here, it would not have been open on the shippon side.*

- iii. *Creation of a cloakroom beneath the external stone steps:*

*The Design and Access Statement notes that there is already access into the void beneath the steps from within the farmhouse (i.e. through an opening in the original south-east external wall of the former shippon, below the first floor doorway into the former loft above). This opening is not shown on the 1988 existing or proposed plans, and is therefore likely to be an unauthorised alteration. The proposal is to create a doorway through this wall into the space beneath the external steps, to access a cloakroom. The unauthorised opening has already resulted in the removal of historic fabric: to create a full opening here would not only result in a further loss of historic fabric, but would confuse the historic plan-form of the listed building.*

*There is no objection to forming a cloakroom beneath the steps. However, the proposal to create an opening in the external wall of the former shippon would not be acceptable.*

iv. *Alterations to the link between the farmhouse and former barn:*

*It is essential that this historic separation between domestic farmhouse and ancillary agricultural outbuilding is maintained (visually) at Mitchell Field Farm, in order to retain the historic form of the farmstead.*

*The existing link utilises the historic boundary wall which runs between the farmhouse / former shippon and the detached barn (which enclosed the farmyard on its east side), and is hidden behind an additional wall constructed to the west side. When approved in 1994, the purpose of this additional wall was to retain the relationship between the two buildings. The width of the existing link was permitted so that it did not interfere with the existing doorway into the farmhouse. The doorway in the north-west gable wall of the barn, leading from the link into the barn, was inserted when the link was constructed – the original gable wall was blank.*

*The proposed alteration to the link includes fully glazing the south-west elevation. If the depth of the link were to be minimal, acting only as a passage-way between the two buildings and with no domestic ‘clutter’ added to the space, then this could be successful in enabling the buildings to still appear as detached. Unfortunately, however, the existing depth of the link has already resulted in it being used to house some domestic elements - bookshelves, etc.: this is currently hidden from view and therefore has no impact, visually, on the historic character of the farmstead and on the historic relationship between the two buildings.*

*Glazing the south-west wall, as proposed, would open this to view. Removal of the additional inner wall to the north-east side and replacement of the solid wall on the south-west side with glazing will increase the internal useable space within the link. It may, therefore, appear more as an extension to the domestic living space from the farmhouse than a discreet link between the historically detached farmhouse and separate barn.*

v. *Lowering the height of the gable doorway:*

*Although the doorway is a modern insertion, lowering it as proposed may take its threshold below the footings of the former barn, which would not be acceptable, as this could undermine the stability of the barn. Positioning the steps within the barn rather than the link may also impact on the footings, requiring excavation well below existing floor levels. Further investigation is required to assess potential impact upon footings.*

vi. *Alterations to the internal partitioning and staircase within the barn: acceptable as these are modern insertions.*

vii. *Insertion of roof light:*

*Roof lights are rarely found on barns and should be avoided if at all possible. There is insufficient justification for a roof light as proposed. The central space is open to the roof, and is shown as staircase/hallway and landing, i.e. circulation space. There are windows at first floor to the south west elevation, a number of slot windows let in light at high level across the north-east elevation and the central area will also receive borrowed light from the central south-west elevation glazed doorway.*

viii. *Proposed new flue: acceptable subject to agreement of exact position and height.*

ix. *A new door is proposed to the north east elevation.*

*The existing door is plain timber boarded and appears to retain original external hinges. The proposal is to replace this door with a new glazed door. This would not be*

*acceptable, the door should remain fully boarded externally, with any historic hinges / external pintles retained in situ.*

- x. *A number of lamps, floodlights, etc. have been installed without listed building consent and are unauthorised. The Design and Access Statement notes that existing lighting is to be replaced with more appropriate lighting: this is welcomed, but full details will be required before any new lighting can be approved.”*

**PDNPA Archaeology:** Makes the following comments about proposals and recommends that if permission is granted a condition is imposed to require a scheme of archaeological works to be approved and carried out.

*“The element of the proposals that have the greatest potential to result in groundworks and ground disturbance is the proposed extension of the link area. Notwithstanding the principle of increasing the size the extension from a planning and listed building perspective, from an archaeological perspective I am not overly concerned with the groundworks that would result from this, and would not seek any archaeological monitoring etc. as it is highly likely that much of the area was disturbed when the link originally went in. Similarly, the outbuilding is already converted, and the features and fabric that relate to its historic function will have already been removed, therefore I have no comments to offer on this element of the scheme.*

*However, I am concerned about the harm to the significance of the listed farmhouse from the proposed alterations to the central area, particularly:*

- *New openings through the wall between the current kitchen and utility room – due to the loss of historic fabric and features, changes to the plan form of the building, particularly a section of the building that the development of is not fully understood. The openings are also between two sections of building that were functionally separate, the north eastern range being a shippon, so not functionally linked, blurring the legibility of the historic function.*
- *The investigations to find a possible lost fireplace in this wall – it is not clear why it is believed that there was a fireplace in this location, and if there was elements would be built into the structure of the wall and removing large section of it could harm this feature.*
- *The creation of the cloakroom under the originally external stairs and into the interior space of the house through a once exterior wall.*

*This would result in harm to the historic and archaeological interest of the building, and in an area of the building with some of the greatest potential to hold the clues to unravel its history and development. I would question whether such changes are justifiable to improve the link between the spaces when there is already an existing link.*

*In accordance with NPPF para.190 local authorities should avoid or minimise any conflict between the conservation of a heritage asset and any aspect of a planning proposal. Therefore, my primary recommendation would be to remove this element of the scheme and maintain access through the one existing doorway, and not open up this wall further. I recommend that the Authority is guided by the advice of the Conservation Officer on the acceptability of these proposals with respect to the significance of the Listed Building.*

*Should the proposals be considered acceptable in the light of this advice, and with respect to planning balance, I advise that the archaeological impacts detailed above be addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological recording in line with NPPF para 199.”*

## **Representations**

### **Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: L3

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC6

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

In the National Park the development plan the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.'

Para. 172 of the NPPF says that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks.

Para. 184 of the NPPF says that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Para 189. of the NPPF says that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Para 190. of the NPPF says Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 190. of the NPPF says in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 193. of the NPPF says 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Para 194. of the NPPF says any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional.

Para 195. of the NPPF says where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

Para 196. Of the NPPF says 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

#### Development Plan

The Authority's conservation policies reflect the approach taken in the Framework. Policies L3 and LC6 together says that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of heritage assets and their setting and that 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. Policy LC6 gives specific examples types of alterations to listed buildings that are not acceptable.

#### **Assessment**

##### Principle of proposals

The property is a grade II listed building and is a designated heritage asset of national importance. Local and national policies are clear that while alterations and extensions to designated heritage assets such as listed buildings are acceptable in principle, the development must conserve or enhance the significance of the affected heritage assets.

In considering the proposals the Authority has a legal obligation to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

There is a strong presumption in policy against works that would have a harmful impact upon significance unless that harm can be demonstrated to be outweighed by public benefits arising from the development.

In this case Mitchell Field Farm is an established dwelling and has been extended in the past with a link constructed to facilitate the conversion of the two storey barn to additional living accommodation. There is no evidence to suggest that continued domestic occupation of the property is not viable or that the property is not habitable in its current form.

A heritage statement has been submitted with the application along with a further response from the conservation consultant to comments from the Authority's Conservation Officer. Detailed



consultation responses have been provided on the proposals by the Authority's Conservation Officer and Senior Archaeologist (these are provided within the consultation section of the report).

The farmhouse is known to date back to at least the 17th century and possibly earlier. The farm is an extant farmstead that is formed of a loose courtyard with the farmhouse on the northern side and agricultural buildings (now converted) on the east side. It is clear that the property is of historic significance but also of archaeological interest within the standing and buried remains of the buildings. This significance is not only important within the site and its close setting but also within the wider landscape because such small courtyard farmsteads are particularly characteristic within this landscape area and because all traditional buildings remain extant.

### Impact of proposals

#### Alterations to farmhouse:

There is no objection to the proposed removal of partition walls within the former shippon and the addition of new partitions to form a pantry because this work would affect only modern insertions and therefore would not harm the significance of the building or require alterations affecting historic fabric or the historic plan form of the building.

However there are concerns about the proposal to remove part of the external wall of the shippon – which would create additional space for the proposed cloakroom. This work would require the creation of an opening through this wall, which would then be closed off by a narrow modern section of wall. This work would require the removal of historic fabric and would have a harmful impact upon the historic plan form of the shippon and would therefore harm the significance of the listed building.

There is no objection in principle to the creation of a cloakroom beneath the external stone steps. However the removal of this section of wall is considered to be unnecessary and therefore there are no public benefits to justify the harm identified.

There are very significant concerns about the proposed creation of three openings in the ground floor wall between the former shippon and the farmhouse. These two rooms were historically separate and occupied for different functions at the farm (domestic and ancillary). The historic plan form of the listed building is characterised by small, discrete, separate rooms each connected by a single doorway.

The proposal would substantially alter the historic plan form of the building and significantly erode the historic separation between what were functionally two separate units. The proposal would also result in the loss of significant historic fabric which potentially remains from the earliest building on the site and therefore is of considerable evidential value.

The heritage statement says that plan form would still be readable, but the plan would nevertheless be significantly eroded and ultimately harm as would the discrete character of the rooms on either side of the wall. The proposed photographic recording could not mitigate the impact of works in any way. The NPPF is clear that recording cannot in itself justify works that would have a harmful impact. Similarly potential investigation of a possible fireplace or other openings within the wall does not justify or necessitate the proposed harmful alterations.

The proposed works would harm the significance of the listed building, this harm would be less than substantial. It is therefore necessary to consider whether any relevant public benefits of approving the works can be weighed against the harm in accordance with the NPPF. While it is acknowledged that the proposal would provide private benefits for the applicants there are no public benefits because the property is occupied as a dwelling house and there is no evidence that the proposed alterations to the wall are required to or the only means of securing or maintaining the optimal viable use of the listed building.

Replacement link:

The existing link is a modern structure and provides an internal link between the farmhouse and the converted barn along with access from the north east. Historically the character of the farmstead is a small loose range on the two sides of the courtyard and there is no evidence that the buildings were connected in the past.

There is no objection in principle to a replacement link structure however it is critical given the historic significance of the farmstead that the design conserves the historic separation between the domestic farmhouse and barn. The existing link structure retains the historic wall and is hidden behind a wall on the west side with only a single doorway to provide access. The intention of this design approach was to retain the relationship between the two buildings and avoid interfering the existing doorway into the shippon.

The proposal is to demolish the existing link and to erect a new link on a similar footprint of a different design. Changes to the internal floor levels and to the height of the doorway and steps up into the converted barn are also proposed. The west elevation of the proposed link would be glazed. The glazing is proposed to be frameless glass with folding doors but within frames separating the lower glazed areas, clerestory and glazing above the external steps. A flat roof would be behind the glazing and below the level of the historic wall.

There are significant concerns about the impact of the proposed design approach. The use of glazing means that the proposed link would from within the courtyard appear as a habitable domestic room rather than as a wall or simple functional link between the two historic buildings. This would result in the development appearing as a domestic extension positioned between the two buildings rather than a link. This would erode the historic relationship between the two buildings and the historic significance of the courtyard arrangement.

The proposal would therefore harm the significance of the farmhouse and barn and their setting. Potential alternative ways forward have been suggested to the applicant, including a replacement link of a similar design approach as the existing but with a flat roof set below the walls so that it is not visible or a smaller, or a narrower glazed link to effectively provide a corridor between the two buildings.

There is an existing link between the two buildings which is acceptable because of the design approach taken and there does appear to be alternative designs available which could conserve the significance of the buildings. Therefore there are no public benefits associated with allowing the proposed link which would have a harmful impact.

The proposal would also require changes to the floor level within the link and the re-positioning of the door opening from the link into the barn along with changes to the steps. This work would require excavation below existing floor levels and therefore has the potential to impact upon the footings of the barn and further assessment of this is required to allow the Authority to assess the potential impact of the proposal.

Alterations to converted barn:

There are no objection to the proposed alterations to the staircase within the barn or the proposed ground floor internal wall. The existing staircase is modern having being installed as part of the conversion and the proposed re-configuration will not have any adverse impact upon the significance of the barn. Similarly there are no objections to the new internal wall to form a kitchen to the residential annex.

Externally a replacement flue is proposed and there is no objection to the proposal provided that the flue pipe is finished matt black at the time of installation to minimise the impact upon the buildings and their setting.

There are significant concerns about the proposal to install roof lights to the barn. This building would not have had roof lights and in general terms are rarely found on agricultural buildings within the National Park. The proposed roof lights are of domestic design and character and would introduce a domestic element at odds with the character of the building. The best practice guidance from Historic England reflects this and advises the use of more sensitive alternatives including using borrowed light.

The first floor of the barn is already lit by glazed ventilation slits along with borrowed light from the openings at ground floor. Therefore while it is accepted that the proposed roof lights would provide additional light which would be a private benefit to the applicants that there are no public benefits that would justify the harmful impact they would have upon the significance of the listed building.

Finally, there are also concerns about the proposal to replace the existing door on the north east elevation of the barn with a new glazed door. This is a plain boarded door which appears to retain original hinges. The door therefore is reflective of the character of the building and makes a positive contribution.

There is no objection in principle to a replacement door if this is required, however design of the proposed fully glazed door is not appropriate because it would introduce a further domestic element which would harm the character of the barn. If a replacement door is required then a solid timber door of an appropriate design would be acceptable with the original hinges retained and re-used.

### Conclusion

Taken as a whole the proposed works would have a harmful impact upon the significance of Mitchell Field Farm and its setting. The Authority must give special consideration to the preservation of the listed building and any features it possesses in the determination of this application. Furthermore there are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm and therefore the proposals are contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3 and saved Local Plan policies LC4, LC6 and LC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the absence of any further material considerations it is concluded that the proposed works would harm the significance of the listed building and would be contrary to relevant policies in the development plan. Accordingly the application is 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

Author of Report – Adam Maxwell, Senior Planner