

**10. FULL APPLICATION – ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING INCLUDING PARTIAL CHANGE OF USE TO HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, DEMOLITION OF GARAGE, AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT GARAGE WITH ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION ABOVE – DALE HEAD, LIFFS ROAD, BIGGIN (NP/DDD/0419/0333, MN)**

**APPLICANT: SIMON JOHNSON AND KATE BUTCHART**

**Summary**

1. The proposed development seeks to remodel the dwellinghouse and to convert part of the dwellinghouse – formerly a barn – to holiday accommodation. It is also proposed to remove the garage currently adjoined to the property and replace this with a larger freestanding garage with accommodation above within the curtilage of the property.
2. Subject to conditions the development would enhance the character of the property, and would provide holiday accommodation in accordance with the Authority's adopted planning policies. It would not result in significant adverse planning impacts.
3. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval.

**Site and surroundings**

4. Dale Head is a 19th century former farmstead, originally with a loose courtyard arrangement, with one side of the yard formed of agricultural buildings and the detached farmhouse facing on to the yard from another.
5. The buildings have subsequently been extended and adjoined and taken in to use as a single dwellinghouse. A modern lean-to extension and garaging has also been attached to the southern end of the former barn.
6. The building sits in a large plot to the west of Liffs Road, outside of the village of Biggin.
7. The nearest neighbouring properties are those fronting on to Liffs Road, aligned opposite Dale Head on the eastern side of the road.
8. The site is not within a conservation area.

**Proposal**

9. Alterations to the house are proposed, including the extension of an existing rear lean-to, alterations to openings, and changes to internal layout. As part of the changes part of the former barn would be converted to a self-contained holiday let unit.
10. Changes to the curtilage and erection of a two storey garage/ancillary accommodation building are also proposed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:**

1. **3 year implementation period.**
2. **Development to be carried out in accordance with specified amended plans.**

3. Existing garaging to be demolished in accordance with the submitted plans prior to the accommodation in the new garage building being taken in to use.
4. Alterations to openings within the eastern wing of the building to be undertaken prior to its conversion to holiday accommodation.
5. Holiday occupancy restriction and holiday accommodation and main house to be retained as a single planning unit.
6. Restrict further sub-letting of the property including accommodation in new garage.
7. Scheme of archaeological monitoring to be agreed.
8. Scheme of tree planting to be agreed prior to the felling of any trees.
9. Tree works to take place only outside of the bird breeding season.
10. Design of solar panels to be agreed.
11. Hard landscaping details to be agreed.
12. Conditions to secure parking and site access improvements.
13. Conditions to secure architectural detailing and materials.
14. Sample panel for stonework for the garage to be approved.

### **Key Issues**

11. The main planning considerations relevant to this application are:

- The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the building
- Whether the conversion of part of the building to holiday accommodation complies with the Authority's recreation and tourism policies
- The archaeological impacts of the development
- The impact of the development on highway safety
- The impact of the development on neighbouring amenity
- The impact of the development on trees

### **History**

12. In the 1970s the barn and farmhouse were extended and joined by a single storey extension and at this time the barn was taken in to use as part of the house. Later remodelling and extension of the 1970s link during the 1990s took this part of the building up to two storeys.

### **Consultations**

13. **Highway Authority** – No objections subject to no additional commercial letting of the property, and to conditions securing site parking and access improvements.
14. **Parish Council** – Object to the proposal. They are in support of creating a safer entrance to the property and of the internal alterations proposed. However, they have concerns regarding other parts of the proposal, including:
  - Relocating and replacing windows, which they consider not to relate sympathetically to

- the property, which was apparently a former bone mill.
  - The proposed garage is out of keeping with the area and the character of the building due to the levels of glazing.
  - They also note the location of the garage as being an issue, but do not provide reasons for this.
15. **PDNPA Archaeologist** – *“The buildings at the site were first converted in the 1970s, and have undergone considerable alteration, and much of the historic interest they once had has been lost. I therefore have no comments on the changes to the buildings. The groundworks associated with the development, particular those to the east of the buildings, which are required for the construction of the garage, the entrance and access, landscaping and associated services, has the potential to encounter and destroy belowground archaeological remains related to the development of Biggin and Biggin Grange in the medieval period. This would result in permanent and irreversible harm to the archaeological interest and evidential value of the site.*
16. *Should the proposed development be considered acceptable with respect to planning balance, then this harm needs to be addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological monitoring, recording and investigation, in accordance with the NPPF.”*
17. **PDNPA Tree Conservation Officer** – The property is not in a Conservation area and there are no TPO’s within the site. As per the report submitted most of the trees are of low to relatively value except for one pine tree, which is moderate. The loss of the trees would have a short term effect on the landscape but future planting of new and native species would mitigate for the trees removal in the longer term. Would like to see a plan of the proposed replanting secured by condition.

### **Representations**

18. Two letters of representation have been received.
19. One of these advises that they have no objections to the proposal.
20. The other objects to the proposal on the following grounds:
- The new garage building would be directly in front of their lounge window, and would be too large and would reduce their privacy due to the arrangement of openings
  - The increased traffic levels generated by the development would reduce highway safety
  - The loss of trees
21. The objection letter also advises that they would not wish to see the site driveway be re-located to be in front of their property. This does not form part of the current proposal.

### **Main policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L2, L3, and RT2.

Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMH7, DMT8.

### **National planning policy framework**

22. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority’s Core Strategy 2011 and the Adopted Development Management Policies. 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 government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

#### Development plan

23. Core Strategy polices GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 together say that all development in the National Park must be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty and that the Sandford Principle will be applied where there is conflict. Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon and development which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, siting, landscaping and building materials, design in accordance with the Design Guide and the impact upon living conditions of local communities. Core Strategy policy GSP4 highlights that the National Park Authority will consider using planning conditions or obligations to secure the achievement of its spatial outcomes.
24. Core Strategy policy DS1 outlines the Authority's Development Strategy, and in principle permits the conversion of buildings to provide visitor accommodation.
25. Core Strategy policy RT2 says that proposals for hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation must conform to the following principles:
  - A. The change of use of a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit to serviced or self-catering holiday accommodation will be permitted, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside. The change of use of entire farmsteads to holiday accommodation will not be permitted.
  - B. Appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted.
  - C. New build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
26. Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
27. Core Strategy policy CC1 requires development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land and resources, to take account of the energy hierarchy, to achieve the highest standards of carbon reduction and water efficiency, and to be directed away from flood risk areas.
28. Core Strategy policy CC2 states that proposals for low carbon and renewable energy development will be encouraged provided that they can be accommodated without adversely affecting landscape character, cultural heritage assets, other valued characteristics, or other established uses of the area.
29. Development Management Policy DMC3 requires development to be of a high standard that respects, protects, and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place. It also provides further detailed criteria to assess design and landscaping, as well as requiring development to conserve the amenity of other properties.

30. Development Management Policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.
31. Development Management Policy DMH7 addresses extensions and alterations to dwellings, stating that these will be permitted provided that the proposal does not:
- detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings; or
  - dominate the original dwelling particularly where it is a designated or non-designated cultural heritage asset; or
  - amount to the creation of a separate independent dwelling; or
  - Create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to, the landscape or any other valued characteristic.
32. Development Management Policy DMT8 states that off-street parking for residential development should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that on-street parking meets highways standards and does not negatively impact on the visual and other amenity of the local community. It notes that the design and number of parking spaces must respect the valued characteristics of the area, particularly in conservation areas.

## **Assessment**

### Principle

33. Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouses – including new ancillary buildings - are acceptable in principle under the provisions of policy DMH7.
34. In terms of the proposed holiday let use, policy RT2 supports the conversion of buildings to holiday accommodation only where they are of historic or vernacular merit.
35. The part of the building proposed to be converted to holiday accommodation was formerly a barn, and was converted to additional living accommodation in the 1970s. It is historic, having been present on the site since at least 1880.
36. The Authority's Archaeologist identifies the buildings as being of only low historic interest however, due to having undergone extensive conversion and alteration. We agree that the conversion to domestic accommodation did, regrettably, result in a significant loss of its vernacular and agricultural character.
37. The current proposal includes reversing many of these domestic alterations however and, on the basis of this and the buildings age, it is considered to have sufficient historic and vernacular interest to comply with policy RT2.

### Design – alterations to openings in the dwellinghouse

38. The dwellinghouse comprises a former farmhouse and former barn. Previously separate adjacent buildings, they were joined together by extensions that were approved when the barn was taken in to use as additional accommodation in the 1970s, and again in the 1990s.
39. The conversion of the barn in the 1970s resulted in a significant loss of character. This is principally due to the additional of multiple large, domestic openings to the building,

including double and triple casement windows and a large bay window. Plans from the time of the works show the previous openings to be fewer and much smaller, as would be typical of such a building.

40. The joining together of the buildings has also resulted in some harm to their appearance and legibility as previously separate buildings of different function – although the 1990s alterations to the 'link' extension (which increased it to two storeys in height) did at least serve to bring its appearance more in line with the parent buildings.
41. The current application seeks to improve the appearance of the building by reversing a number of the alterations made in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and also proposes making some contemporary alterations.
42. The alterations to the front elevation of the western wing of the building are limited to fully glazing what is currently a door set within a large opening, and dropping the cill of an existing window to convert it to a door opening. These are small changes that would have a low impact on the building's appearance.
43. To the front elevation of the eastern wing (i.e. the former barn), the arrangement of openings would be altered to reflect a more agricultural appearance. The casement and bay windows are proposed to be removed and simpler, more modest openings are proposed in their place.
44. Whilst this results in something of a pastiche of the former barn that may not be appropriate on a better preserved heritage asset, it is considered that in this case it marks a significant enhancement to the appearance of the property and re-introduces a distinction between the character of the farmhouse and former barn.
45. A similar approach has been taken to the treatment of the rear elevation of the former barn –with the exception of the introduction of a two storey glazed opening. Whilst simple in form and detail, this contemporary intervention is not otherwise reflective of the buildings former character or general solidity.
46. However, it has been positioned approximately on the junction of the original barn and the 1970s/1990s extension, which has been built on to the northern end of it. As such, it serves to help visually distinguish the historic and more modern development.

#### Design – extension to dwellinghouse

47. It is proposed to extend the existing lean-to the rear of the western wing of the building, continuing it along its current line. This would remain subordinate to the house and follow a traditional form.
48. In terms of its detailed design, a fully glazed corner is proposed to this part of the building. This is not reflective of the overall solidity of the building, but is limited to a subordinate section of the building and to the rear, where it has less impact on the property's overall appearance.

#### Design – demolition of garage and new replacement building

49. The removal of the current garage from the site would represent a significant enhancement to its appearance. It is at odds with the former agricultural character that other parts of the proposal seek to restore, and due to its positioning it is at odds with the linear form of this part of the building.
50. A new, larger replacement garage building is proposed which would also include living

accommodation ancillary to the main house at first floor level. This is acceptable in principle under the Authority's policies. It would not be in line with policy for this to be used for holiday letting and this can be controlled by condition.

51. In terms of its form the building is broadly typical of local outbuildings, being rectangular, one-and-a-half storey, and with an external stair. It is also proposed to be stone built with a slate roof, reflecting the local building traditions.
52. At first floor the western gable would be entirely glazed to afford views out across the fields. This glazing would be recessed well back behind the stone walls forming the front and rear of the building. At the pre-application stage we advised that it would be preferable for the building to take a more traditional appearance and, whilst some changes have been made to its design, this element does still complicate the appearance of the building and is a non-traditional element in an otherwise traditionally detailed building.
53. Changes within the curtilage include creating a new hardstanding area behind the former barn to provide access to the new ancillary building and a parking and turning area. Details for the surfacing of this area have not been provided, but could be reserved by condition if permission was granted to ensure an appropriate appearance.
54. The area to the front of the building would be re-laid as a large paved area. The area is currently broken up by paths and planting and the proposed works here would result in some enhancement, better reflecting the former yard arrangement that would be typical of I-shaped farmsteads.

#### Design – in summary

55. Many parts of the proposed works would serve to improve the character and appearance of the property – the improvement to the arrangement and type of openings, the changes to the layout of the property's curtilage, and the demolition of the attached garage building.
56. The large glazed areas, in isolation, would be unlikely to be supported though. It does help that and that the contemporary glazing is carried throughout the proposal in several places (on the extension, rear elevation of barn, and the new outbuilding) to help it appear a considered part of the design, but it nevertheless does not reflect or respond to the building's character.
57. The applicants' agent has been clear that they wish to maintain these elements to secure light in to the building though, and so we must consider the scheme as a whole.
58. Taking account of the significant enhancements proposed elsewhere, it is considered that these alterations can be supported in this instance as the scheme as a whole still conserves the character and appearance of the building as the enhancement outweighs the compromises of the modern glazing, complying with policies L3, DMC3, DMC5, and DMH7.
59. In order to help ensure that the benefits of the overall scheme are realised – and that the less desirable elements are not undertaken in isolation – it would be necessary to secure phasing of the development by condition, requiring the demolition of the garage to be undertaken prior to the new ancillary accommodation being brought in to use.
60. Further, because the view that the former barn is suitable for conversion to holiday accommodation rests upon the enhancements to its appearance being undertaken it would also be necessary to secure these prior to the building being taken in to use as

holiday accommodation. This could be secured by condition.

#### Impacts on the character and appearance of the landscape

61. The property is visible from outside of the site, most closely from Liffs Road when approaching from the north and south.
62. In these views the main property would have an improved appearance if the development was carried out.
63. The new building would be read as a typical stone outbuilding, as the contemporary glazed element would not be apparent from these directions.
64. The development would therefore conserve the landscape character of the area as required by policies L1, and DMC3.

#### Archaeological impacts

65. The Authority's archaeologist advises that the site is of archaeological interest, and has potential for below ground archaeological remains related to the development of Biggin and Biggin Grange in the medieval period. They note that in the surrounding fields there are various earthworks and boundary features of likely medieval date, associated with either the Grange or the medieval hamlet at Biggin (first documented in 1233). These linear earthworks likely represent boundaries marking the edge of the grange, the extent of the open fields associated with the village, and some of them may define the extent of the medieval road. These linear earthwork features have been recorded on a number of archaeological surveys in the 1990s and 2000s.
66. On this basis the Archaeologist advises that the groundworks associated with the development, particular those to the east of the buildings, which are required for the construction of the garage, the entrance and access, landscaping and associated services, has the potential to encounter and destroy belowground archaeological remains related to the development of Biggin and Biggin Grange in the medieval period.
67. They advise that this would result in harm to the archaeological interest and evidential value of the site and therefore advise that if the development is approved that the archaeological impacts detailed above be addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological monitoring, recording and investigation.
68. In weighing the conclusions of the Archaeologist, we must also consider the benefits of the development – notably the improvements that would be made to the appearance of the building and its setting. We must also acknowledge that the archaeological impacts – if they were to occur – would not result in the complete loss of archaeological interest or understanding of the area as the potentially present features identified by the Archaeologist as being of interest are also present in the fields around the site.
69. On balance, we consider that subject to conditions securing the appropriate recording of any encountered below ground archaeology the planning gains that the development would deliver would outweigh the archaeological harm in this instance.

#### Amenity impacts

70. The proposed holiday let unit would share the access and amenity space of the main house. Due to its relationship with the main house there is also the potential for overlooking and a loss of privacy for the occupiers of both. It would therefore be necessary to ensure that the holiday accommodation and house remained as a single



planning unit so that the owners retain control over these potential impacts.

71. A neighbour has raised concerns regarding the potential for their property to be overlooked from the windows of the new ancillary/garage building. The closest of the neighbouring houses on the other side of Liffs Road is 24 metres from the nearest point of the proposed building however. Given these distances and the proposed uses of the buildings there is no concern that the development would prejudice the privacy or other amenity of any nearby residents, complying with policy DMC3.

#### Highway impacts

72. The use of part of the dwellinghouse as a holiday let unit would introduce further traffic movements to the site – something to which the highway authority initially objected due to the site's substandard access.
73. However, as the applicants' appointed highway consultant subsequently pointed out, it is likely that up to three rooms in the property could be let out on a bed and breakfast basis without a material change of use of the building having occurred – and therefore without planning permission or other control by the highway authority.
74. On that basis, the highway authority have removed their objection subject to the improved access and visibility shown on the proposed plans being achieved, and subject to any permission preventing the commercial letting of further rooms within the building.
75. The site includes ample parking space for the proposed development.
76. We have no other highway safety or amenity concerns regarding the proposal and therefore conclude that the development would have acceptable highway impacts and would comply with DMT8, subject to the conditions recommended by the highway authority being imposed.

#### Tree impacts

77. The construction of the new ancillary/garage building and landscaping works proposed require the felling of a number of trees.
78. The submitted tree survey identifies these as being generally low value specimens, and recommends mitigating planting is undertaken. The Authority's tree conservation officer has reviewed the proposal and is satisfied that the trees affected are not significant specimens and that impacts would be acceptable subject to securing a scheme of replacement planting. This could be secured by condition if permission was granted.

#### Climate change

79. The general upgrading of the building with modern window openings is likely to improve its thermal efficiency, helping improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions as planning policy requires of new development.
80. In addition, solar panels are proposed to the roof slope of the new ancillary/garage building. This is welcomed, with planning policy encouraging the provision of renewable energy measures where they can be accommodated without adverse planning impacts. Subject to an appropriate design the panels would not result in harm to the appearance of the built environment – being positioned on a building of contemporary appearance and stood separate from the traditional buildings on the site. They would also be seen in very limited wider view, conserving the character and appearance of the landscape in the locality.

## **Conclusion**

81. We conclude that as amended the proposal will enhance the character and appearance of the building and its setting and that the proposed development and uses accord with adopted planning policy in other regards, subject to conditions.
82. The level of archaeological harm identified is considered to be outweighed by the overall enhancements to the character and appearance of the building that the development would result in.
83. There are no other policy or material considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be refused.
84. We therefore recommend the application for conditional approval.

## **Human Rights**

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

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

86. Nil

**Report Author:** Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner (South)