

**9. FULL APPLICATION – ALTERATIONS TO PROPERTY AND CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDINGS TO HOLIDAY, BED AND BREAKFAST, AND OFFICE USE. CONSTRUCTION OF PLANT ROOM, WASTE TREATMENT PLANT, ANCILLARY GARDEN BUILDINGS, AND GROUND SOURCE HEAT PUMP. ALTERATIONS TO SITE ACCESS. LANDSCAPING AND OTHER WORKS INCIDENTAL TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. STANTON OLD HALL, STANTON OLD HALL LANE, CONGREAVE (NP/DDD/1218/1134, MN)**

**APPLICANT: MR AND MRS MARK AND NIKI RAMSDEN**

**Summary**

1. The proposed development seeks to restore the listed buildings on the site whilst introducing some new uses in to them.
2. Subject to conditions the proposed works would conserve the heritage interest of the buildings in accordance with the Authority's adopted planning policies and national legislation.
3. The changes of uses proposed also accord with adopted policy, and the impacts associated with these new uses are compatible with the buildings and site, subject to conditions.
4. There are no further material considerations which would indicate that permission for the development should be refused.
5. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval. The scope of the proposed works is broad, resulting in the need for a large number of conditions – many to ensure that matters of detailed design conserve the buildings' significance.

**Site and surroundings**

6. Stanton Old Hall is a historic farmstead located in open countryside at Congreave, approximately one kilometre north-north-east of Stanton in Peak village. It occupies an elevated and isolated position on the south side of a valley, above the River Wye. The farmstead is accessed off a dog-leg bend along Old Hall Lane.
7. The property is Grade II listed and has a 17th century core, but may incorporate earlier fabric as documentary evidence suggests it has earlier origins. The east and central bays of the Hall are the oldest and these comprises a two and ½ (garret) storey structure, single cell deep with a two bay lobby entrance plan form. The front elevation of the Hall faces south. The property was extended to the west in the late 18th century and a series of alterations and remodelling were carried out over the following two centuries. It appears that the north-east wing was added at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, on the same footprint of an earlier wing. During the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century a number of unsympathetic and unauthorised works were carried out to the property.
8. The west end of the principal building is connected to a 19th century stable-block via a two storey link.
9. A detached barn of T-plan form stands to the south-west of the Hall. These structures appear to date from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the 1930s, the internal fittings of the ancillary buildings were stripped and their external shells altered.
10. The pigsty to the south-east of the Hall, more recently used as a store, was constructed

in the late 19th century.

11. The buildings on the site are constructed from locally derived gritstone with gritstone dressings. Stone slate or blue slate cover their gabled roofs. The different types of fenestration reflect the different building types, ages and adaptation.
12. The buildings are laid out in a loose courtyard arrangement with the yard (now a lawn), to the south-east.
13. Land falls to the north and north-east of the site, with the building levels following the topography.
14. East of the Hall are two rectangular fields; the south one was formerly an orchard.
15. The site is outside of any designated conservation area.
16. The property has no immediate neighbours.
17. The applicant has a lease on the property from Haddon Estate, who own it.

### **Proposal**

18. This application seeks permission for various alterations to the Hall, the agricultural buildings within its curtilage, and its setting – including the provision of some new ancillary buildings within the curtilage. Some changes to the scope of works have been made during the course of the application. As amended, the works comprise:
  - Internal works to the main house, including repairs, some alterations to internal features, and alteration to some external openings, and use of three bedrooms for bed and breakfast accommodation.
  - Replacement of the link between the main house and stable building with a contemporary link.
  - Internal layout changes to the attached former stable building, and external alterations including re-opening a former doorway and replacement of rooflights. It was originally proposed to convert this space to 3 holiday let units, including the introduction of an additional floor within the existing shell. This part of the proposal has since been omitted.
  - Conversion of western section of freestanding barn to office (first floor) and domestic storage (ground floor). It was originally proposed to convert both the first floor and some of the ground floor to office use. This has since been reduced to occupy only the first floor.
  - Conversion of eastern section of freestanding barn to one-bed holiday let.
  - Construction of underground plant room behind southern corner of freestanding barn.
  - Installation of ground source heating to field to the south of the property.
  - Changes to site access and parking area.
  - Provision of part-underground tractor/machine store. During the course of the application proposals to add a wooden greenhouse, summerhouse, and garden pergola were added to the proposals.

- Installation of a package treatment plant.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted and amended plans, subject to the following further conditions and modifications.
3. The development hereby approved shall be maintained as a single planning unit. The office space shall not be used for any other purposes. The store shall only be used as a store for domestic purposes.
4. The recommendations of the submitted protected species survey shall be followed at all times throughout the course of the development
5. The supplied grassland method statement shall be followed throughout and following the installation of the ground source heating system
6. Prior to the installation of the package treatment plant, details of the route and method of installation of all associated pipework shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
7. All retained trees shall be protected throughout the duration of works.
8. (a) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a scheme of archaeological works has been submitted to and approved by the Authority in writing, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and  
The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;  
The programme for post investigation assessment;  
Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;  
Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;  
Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;  
Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
  - a. (b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a).
  - b. c) Within a period of 12 weeks from completion of the development the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

- 9. Prior to the installation of any external lighting a scheme of such lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 10. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Authority, the development shall not be commenced until a detailed scheme of highway improvement works for the provision of improved passing opportunities on Old Hall Lane, together with a programme for the implementation and completion of the works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. No part of the development shall be brought into use until the required highway improvement works have been constructed in accordance with the approved details. For the avoidance of doubt the developer will be required to enter into a 1980 Highways Act S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority in order to comply with the requirements of this Condition.**
- 11. Before any other operations are commenced, the existing northern vehicular access shall be modified to Old Hall Lane and provided with a minimum width of 4.25m (0.5m added if bounded on one side, 1.0m if bounded on both sides), together with provision of a kerb line along the site frontage, located, designed, laid out, constructed and provided with 2.4m x 25m visibility splays in either direction, all as agreed in writing with the Authority, the area in advance of the sightlines being maintained throughout the life of the development clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to adjoining nearside carriageway channel level. For the avoidance of doubt the developer will be required to enter into a 1980 Highways Act S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority in order to comply with the requirements of this Condition.**
- 12. The proposed access drive to Old Hall Lane, the subject of the condition above, shall be no steeper than 1 in 15 for the first 10m from the nearside highway boundary.**
- 13. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 5m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only.**
- 14. The premises, the subject of the application, shall not be taken into use until space has been provided within the application site in accordance with the application drawings (ref: LU/\*CE/100/17123/F) for the parking and manoeuvring of residents' and visitors' vehicles (including secure cycle parking), laid out, surfaced and maintained throughout the life of the development free from any impediment to its designated use.**
- 15. At the commencement of operations on site (excluding demolition/ site clearance), space shall be provided within the site curtilage for storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading and unloading of goods vehicles, parking and manoeuvring of site operatives and visitors vehicles, laid out and constructed in accordance with detailed designs to be submitted in advance to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and maintained throughout the contract period in accordance with the approved designs free from any impediment to its designated use.**
- 16. The premises, the subject of the application shall not occupied until a bin store has been provided adjacent to the roadside, so bins can be stored clear of the public highway on collection day.**
- 17. Measures recommended with the submitted Travel Plan shall be implemented**

**prior to the holiday let and Bed & Breakfast uses commencing.**

- 18. Prior to any demolition of the existing link extension an assessment of the significance of the lower part of the south facing retaining wall shall be undertaken. Full details of this assessment and any proposed alteration to the south elevation of the new link extension required to accommodate its retention (should that prove necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority prior to the demolition of the existing link extension. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved design.**
- 19. Prior to the construction of the new link extension full details of the proposed junction between it and the host buildings (including appearance, materials, and fixings) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 20. Prior to the replacement or installation of any new windows or doors – and notwithstanding the submitted plans in the case of the bi-fold doors proposed in the north elevation of the Hall and the pitching window and double width opening to the west gable end of the former stable – full details of their design (including glazing, frame profiles, any glazing bars, opening details, furniture, finish, fixings, and new cills and lintels where applicable) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 21. The conversion of the internal recess in the west wall of the south projecting gable of the Hall in to a window shall be omitted from the development.**
- 22. Any new stonework or pointing required as a result of changes to the arrangement of external rainwater goods and other pipework shall match the existing.**
- 23. Prior to the installation of any flues, extracts, or vents of any kind full details of their routing, design, and positions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 24. Prior to the construction of the new opening (emergency exit) between bedroom 4 and the new link extension details of the opening (including door lintel, framework, and any steps) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 25. The glazed panes to the roof of the former stable building shall be either retained, replaced like-for-like, or replaced with an industrial type rooflight, details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority prior to installation. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 26. Prior the re-alignment of the rainwater goods attached to the former stable, amended details simplifying the routing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority prior to installation. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.**
- 27. Prior the installation of window (0HS1) amended details that revise its position,**

size, and detailing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.

28. The flue proposed to the rear roof slope of the former stable building shall be omitted from the development.
29. Prior to the construction of the external staircase to the south east gable of the barn full details of its design, including any proposed handrail, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
30. Prior to the construction of the plant room a methodology for its construction demonstrating how the structural integrity of the barn shall be conserved both during and following construction, and of a detailed design for the new stone walling, fencing, and any surfacing to the roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
31. Prior to its construction full details of the stone boundary treatment proposed adjacent to the north-west site entrance, including wall construction, capping, and any gate posts shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
32. Prior to their construction full details of the stone piers and gates proposed adjacent to the south-west site entrance, including pier construction, and gate design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
33. Notwithstanding the approved site plans, the gates between the stable building and barn are not approved by this permission.
34. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the construction of the garden/tractor store an amended scheme that simplifies the proposed walling and reduces the massing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed only in accordance with the approved details.
35. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the proposed greenhouse, summerhouse, and pergola shall be omitted from the development.

### **Key Issues**

19. The main planning considerations relevant to this application are:
  - Whether the principle of the proposed uses is acceptable
  - Whether the proposals would conserve the significance of the listed buildings and their setting
  - Whether the highway impacts of the development are acceptable

### **History**

2018 – Planning and listed building consent applications submitted for a similar scheme of works, but with a larger area of office space proposed – withdrawn prior to determination.

## 2015 – Listed building consent granted for repairs to main building

### **Consultations**

**Highway Authority** – Several consultation responses have been provided throughout the course of the application following amendments to the proposals.

Objection was originally raised based on the area of office and amount of holiday accommodation proposed. Both have since been reduced in scale.

In relation to the amended proposals the highway authority noted that Old Hall Lane is a single track road subject to the national speed limit and in the vicinity of the site is a series of s-bends on a relatively steep gradient, with the site remote from nearby settlements and facilities. They advise however that vehicle speeds are low due to the nature of the road at this location and in the absence of any accidents it is considered an objection highway grounds would be difficult to sustain. They recommended a number of further amendments be made to the proposals to further improve highway safety however, including additional parking space within the site, improved visibility from the northern access, installation of a kerblin, and adjustments to the verge to improve opportunities for passing places. Whilst it was suggested that these could be secured by conditions, officers did not have sufficient certainty that they could be achieved to be able to recommend such conditions (if the application was ultimately otherwise supported).

This culminated in the highway authority attending a meeting on site with the applicant and they have subsequently advised that they are satisfied that these measures can be achieved. As a result they recommend that they are secured by conditions, along with a number of more general highway-related conditions.

**Parish Council** – Raise concerns regarding increased traffic levels from the proposals, and how the site might be operated following any approved change of use after the current lease expires.

The Council also raise some concerns regarding physical works – including the addition of rooflights, provision of the new plant room, addition of a tractor store, and lack of details of proposed external lighting.

They also highlight discrepancies between application documents. These are addressed in the report where relevant and material.

**Authority's Conservation Officer** – Several detailed consultation responses have been provided throughout the course of the application, along with more informal advice. The conservation officer is broadly in support of the development and proposed use for the building, but recommends a number of changes and omissions to elements of the proposal and the reserving of some details. These are referenced as applicable in the assessment section of the report below. The full comments can be viewed on the Authority's website.

**PDNPA – Archaeology** – Changes to historic fabric will harm the historic interest of the buildings with new openings, blocking up of existing openings, subdivision of spaces, and the introduction of new features and fabric (wood panelling in the Drawing Room, the external steps in the position, but incorrect orientation, of a lost flight on the east elevation of the barn etc. Groundworks for drainage, the water processing plant, new electricity (and other services) and the radial array and flow pipes for the ground source heat pump have the potential to encounter, damage and destroy as yet undiscovered and unrecorded archaeological remains, as do internal groundworks (for repair, underfloor heating) within the historic core and north wing of the Old Hall. This will harm archaeological interest and evidential value of the site, but not the core significance of the site. It is unfortunate that such a large amount of excavation for

the proposed underground plant room extension has already taken place, as this removes any opportunity to consider the possible implications of this aspect of the proposal. Should the proposals be considered acceptable in the light of the advice from the Building Conservation Officer, and from a Planning perspective, I advise that the archaeological impacts of the proposed development detailed above can be adequately addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological recording and investigation. The full comments and recommended conditions can be viewed on the Authority's website.

**PDNPA – Ecology** – Has provided advice in relation to management of grassland to the south of the property that would be affected by the ground source heating installation, including a method statement. Advised that they wished to review an earlier report relating to bat interests prior to providing comment on the submitted bat report. This has not been made available (due to being deemed unnecessary by the inspecting bat consultant on the basis of recent reroofing of the building in question). A response to this from the Authority's Ecologist was requested but has not been received.

**PDNPA – Arboriculture** – Commented on the scheme as originally submitted, requesting an arboricultural assessment in relation to a package treatment plant that was proposed beneath a mature cherry tree. The package treatment plant has since been relocated outside of the trees root protection area.

**Historic England** – *“Based on the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation adviser.”*

**Natural England** – No objection.

### **Representations**

18 letters of representation has been received. 16 support the proposals whilst 2 object to them.

The grounds for support are:

- The development would save and restore and conserve the dilapidated historic buildings
- The extent of development proposed is necessary for the restorations to be viable
- The buildings should be put to viable use, with farming having ceased at the site many years ago
- The provision of holiday accommodation would support local businesses
- Whilst the passing road is narrow and winding, traffic is slow moving as a result and it is lightly trafficked, and the development would not harm highway safety

The grounds for objection are:

- Additional external lighting would harm the character of the locality
- The development would generate additional noise
- The site is not served by adequate infrastructure to support the commercial development proposed, with the road being narrow and steep, having limited passing opportunities, and having dangerous junctions and corners nearby, and with no footpath.
- Additional traffic on the lane would be dangerous to walkers, horse riders, and cyclists
- The current traffic levels detailed by the submission are exaggerated
- The current use of the site as a farm could be viable
- Some of the proposed alterations would harm the appearance or significance of the listed building
- It is not practical for bed and breakfast or holiday guests to be collected locally and brought to the site, as they would not have access to meals at the site.

- The property has been rented out on a repairing lease for decades without the necessity to change it from a residential property to a business concern
- The changes would have a detrimental impact on the property's quiet location, its setting in the countryside, and its unassuming presence

### **Main policies**

20. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L2, L3, RT2, E2, CC1, CC2.
21. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC10, DMC12, DMC13, DMT8.

### **National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance**

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.
23. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
24. Paragraph 189 advises 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.
25. Paragraph 193 states 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 (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.

### **Development plan**

26. Core Strategy policies 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.

27. Core Strategy policy DS1 outlines the Authority's Development Strategy, and in principle permits the conversion of buildings to provide visitor accommodation and office space.
28. Core Strategy policy RT2 says that proposals for hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation must conform to the following principles:
29. 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.
30. Appropriate minor developments that extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted.
31. New build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
32. Policy E2 of the Core Strategy addresses business development in the countryside. It states that proposals for business development in the countryside must take account of the following principles:
33. Businesses should be located in existing traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit in smaller settlements, on farmsteads, and in groups of buildings in sustainable locations. However where no suitable traditional building exists, the reuse of modern buildings may be acceptable provided that there is no scope for further enhancement through a more appropriate replacement building.
34. On farmsteads, or groups of estate buildings, small scale business development will be permitted provided that it supports an existing agricultural or other primary business responsible for estate or land management. The primary business must retain ownership and control of the site and building, to ensure that income will be returned to appropriate management of the landscape.
35. Business use in an isolated existing or new building in the open countryside will not be permitted.
36. Proposals to accommodate growth and intensification of existing businesses will be considered carefully in terms of their impact on the appearance and character of landscapes.
37. Ancillary retail operations must be small scale and principally offering for sale goods which are produced at the premises.
38. 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.
39. 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.
40. Core Strategy policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites,
41. 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.

42. 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.
43. 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.
44. Development Management Policy DMC7 addresses development affecting listed building, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and address how their significance will be preserved. It goes on to detail specific aspects of development that will not be supported when dealing with applications affecting listed buildings. It advises that the only exceptions to this are where any resulting harm is less than substantial in terms of impact on the character and significance of the Listed Building and its setting; and where it is also offset by the public benefit from making the changes, including enabling optimum viable use, and net enhancement to the Listed Building and its setting.
45. It also states that where change to a Listed Building is acceptable, an appropriate record of the building will be required to a methodology approved in writing by the Authority prior to any works commencing.
46. Policy DMC8 states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
47. Development Management Policy DMC10 addresses conversion of heritage assets, permitting this where the new use would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquility, dark skies, or other valued characteristics.
48. Policy DMC12 addresses sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological
49. Importance. It states that where these are not internationally or nationally designated sites or protected species development will only be permitted where:
  - (i) significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the population of the species or habitat concerned is maintained; and
  - (ii) the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh any adverse effect.
50. Development Management Policy DMC13 addresses the protection of trees, woodland or other landscape features put at risk by development. It states that trees and hedgerows, including ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, which positively contribute, either as individual specimens or as part of a wider group, to the visual amenity or biodiversity of the location will be protected. Other than in exceptional circumstances development involving loss of these features will not be permitted.

51. Finally, it states that trees, woodlands and other landscape features should be protected during the course of the development.
52. 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**

### **Current use of the site**

53. Whilst the land around Stanton Old Hall continues to be farmed, it is understood that the property has not operated as a working farm for many years. Until the applicants took up the current leasehold from the owner – Haddon Estate – the property had stood empty for some time, having previously been rented on a ‘repair lease’ (i.e. a lease where the leaseholder bears responsibility for the repair and maintenance of a property in exchange for a reduced rent).
54. It has fallen in to a poor state of repair, with the Estate advising that previous tenants have not put in the level of maintenance that the property requires, and with more significant capital investment now required.
55. Although some restoration works to the main house have commenced under a previous listed building consent dating from 2015, the property remains in a generally poor state of repair throughout.
56. It appears that the existing farm buildings are no longer suitable for modern agricultural use. The scope for erecting new modern agricultural buildings in the setting of these listed buildings is also extremely limited as it would have a substantial and harmful impact upon their setting. As such, there is little prospect of the site being returned to any significant or viable agricultural use.
57. The barn has no viable use and this puts it at risk of further dereliction and, potentially, loss.
58. Given its listed status and the contribution that it makes to the significance of the farmstead, the archaeology of the site, the built environment, and the landscape of the area, this would be highly regrettable.
59. It is important, therefore, for a viable use for the building to be found and the current application proposes new uses for this building, as well as introducing an additional bed and breakfast use in to part of the main house.
60. How each of the proposed uses aligns with adopted planning policy is discussed in the following sections of this report.

### **The principle of change of use of barn to holiday let**

61. Core Strategy policy RT2 supports the change of use of a traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit to serviced or self-catering holiday accommodation, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside.

62. This position is supported by policy DMC10, which addresses conversion of heritage assets. This states that it is necessary for a building to be a heritage asset to be suitable in principle for conversion to a residential use. It permits the conversion of such buildings where the new use would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies, or other valued characteristics.
63. In this case, the building proposed for conversion is listed by virtue of its curtilage relationship to the main property. As a result the building is part of a heritage asset of national significance, and its conversion as proposed therefore complies with policies RT2 and DMC10 in principle.

#### The principle of change of use from barn to office use

64. Annotations on the amended plans and documents relating to floor area for conversion to office use are contradictory – most likely arising from the fact that the area of office floor space proposed has been reduced, and not all related references have been updated. We have confirmed that only the first floor of the barn is now proposed for conversion to a single unit of office accommodation, and this amounts to 72m<sup>2</sup>. That could be secured by condition if permission was granted.
65. The Local Plan generally seeks to steer new business development to settlements rather than the countryside, for reasons of sustainability and landscape impact.
66. Policy E2 does make some provision that is relevant in this situation however. It states that for groups of estate buildings small scale business development will be permitted provided that it supports an existing agricultural or other primary business responsible for estate or land management. It notes that the primary business must retain ownership and control of the site and building.
67. Whilst the site is currently leased, the buildings would remain in the ownership of the Haddon Estate and the conversion and restoration of the buildings would support the management of the wider estate in the longer term.
68. In addition, as only a single unit of office accommodation is proposed this would not become the principal use on the site (as policy E2 seeks to avoid), being small in scale when considering the site as a whole.
69. On that basis the office use is concluded to comply with policy E2.
70. Following recent changes to the use class order, an office falls within the new E use class. This covers a broad range of commercial, business and service uses. Buildings with established class E use can change use freely within class E without the need for planning permission. Whilst the site is suitable for office use as set out above, because of its remote location it would not be suitable for other uses within class E, such as a retail shop. A condition restricting the use to an office only is therefore recommended.

#### The principle of change of use of part of the main house to bed and breakfast accommodation

71. Core Strategy policy RT2 supports the change of use of a traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit to bed and breakfast accommodation, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside.
72. This position is supported by policy DMC10, which addresses conversion of heritage

assets. This states that it is necessary for a building to be a heritage asset to be suitable in principle for conversion to a residential use. It permits the conversion of such buildings where the new use would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies, or other valued characteristics.

73. In this case, the building is listed. As a result the building is of national significance, and its conversion as proposed therefore complies with policies RT2 and DMC10 in principle.

#### Intensification of use of the site resulting from the changes of use as a whole

74. The lawful use of the site as a whole is as a single dwellinghouse and associated farmstead.
75. It is clear that the proposed changes of use would result in an intensification of use of the site. These new uses would though all be contained within existing buildings, not extending the site or resulting in additional buildings that might harm the setting of the listed buildings.
76. There are no neighbours that would be adversely affected by the increased intensity of use of the site.
77. On this basis, subject to the development conserving the listed building and their settings and conserving highway safety – both discussed below – it is concluded that the increased intensity of use would not have any adverse planning impacts.
78. In terms of noise impacts on the tranquillity and character of the countryside, those associated with the proposed uses would be less likely to generate significant noise than if the property was to be used for its current lawful agricultural use. On that basis there are no concerns regarding noise impacts.

#### Impacts of the proposed works on the significance, character and appearance of the buildings

##### Main Hall

79. External changes are primarily limited to changes to openings around the buildings, with roof and other repair works having been undertaken pursuant to the listed building consent granted in 2015.
80. It was originally proposed to remove a set of French doors to the rear (north) elevation, replacing these with a window. The French doors are a modern intervention and their proposed replacement with a window was welcomed. The amended plans submitted since seek to retain the opening, replacing the doors within it. The existing doors are lawful, having been granted consent by an earlier permission, and as a result an objection to their retention cannot reasonably be upheld. However, the conservation officer advises that the proposed bi-fold doors will harm the building's significance. It is therefore recommended that notwithstanding the submitted plans, details of the new doors would need to be reserved by condition if permission was granted.
81. It is proposed to replace a number of windows around the building, to which the Authority's conservation officer has raised no objections subject to detailing, which could be reserved by conditions. It is also proposed to convert what is currently an internal recess in the west wall of the south projecting gable in to a window. Whilst the

application suggests that this may have previously been a window there is no evidence to that effect, and its introduction would result in some minor harm to the buildings archaeology and significance through loss of fabric and loss of legibility of the original function and layout of the property. It is therefore recommended that this proposed intervention be omitted by condition if permission is granted.

82. A number of rooflights originally proposed have since been omitted on amended plans, which is welcomed.
83. Rationalisation of external pipework is also proposed; this is welcomed subject to any new stonework and pointing that might be required matching the existing; this could be secured by condition if permission was granted.
84. Proposed internal alterations have been addressed by the listed building consent application that has been considered in parallel to this planning application.

#### Replacement link

85. There is an existing link between the main hall and the stable building. This is mostly a 20<sup>th</sup> century addition, which has been constructed from stone with a slate roof. It serves to weaken the historic visual separation of the two buildings.
86. It is proposed to demolish this link, and replace it with a fully glazed link. This would much better serve to distinguish the two buildings. The lower part to the south retaining wall of the existing link may have earlier origins, and so it is recommended that a more detailed assessment of this wall is undertaken prior to the link being constructed, as it may be desirable to integrate this in to the new design. This could be secured by condition if permission was granted.
87. The link would cut across a former pitching hole opening in the stable wall; however, the same is true of the existing link roofline and so the impact here would be neutral.
88. Other matters of details such as the treatment/fixing of the junction between the link and host buildings would also need reserving by condition.
89. Proposed internal alterations have been addressed by the listed building consent application that has been considered in parallel to this planning application.

#### Former stables

90. Externally, the changes are generally limited to re-opening former openings, replacement windows, and consolidation of rainwater goods. There are no objections to these works subject to conditions. An unauthorised lean-to to the rear would be demolished, which is welcomed.
91. A flue is proposed to project through the rear roof slope of the building. As shown it appears as a tall and modern projection through the roof and we agree with the conservation officer's assessment that this detracts from the building's appearance. It is also unclear whether this represents the size at which it would need to be built, as it appears narrower than would be expected for a flue serving a wood-burning stove. Nevertheless, as shown it would result in unnecessary harm to the building, with the only justification being that the fire provides a centrepiece/focal point of the room it would serve. It is therefore recommended that this be omitted from the scheme by condition if permission is granted.

### Barn

92. The replacement of windows and doors within existing openings is proposed. The plans originally showed the existing windows incorrectly, but have since been amended. Subject to securing the detailed design of all replacements by condition there is no objection to these works.
93. It is proposed to reinstate a former external staircase to a first floor doorway on the south-east end of the building. Subject to an appropriate treatment this would conserve the significance of the building.
94. Proposed internal alterations have been addressed by the listed building consent application that has been considered in parallel to this planning application.

### Plant room

95. A new underground plant room is proposed outside of the south eastern corner of the barn. The excavation to facilitate this has already been undertaken without consent. It would be preferable for the plant room to be located within the ground floor of the barn, avoiding the need for new development in the setting of the listed building.
96. The applicant has put forward a number of arguments for the provision of the new below-ground plant room being a better option. Firstly, that according to the submitted heritage assessment the option of installing the plant room in the existing building would cause significant harm to the character of the ground floor of the building and also require damage to be caused to where service runs would break-through the wall and floor fabric. It also notes that there would also be an increased risk of damage from water damage, or fire should a fault occur within the plant room. The latter is true of any use requiring electricity or water supply to the building. The identified harm to the building that would arise from installing plant in the existing building is a material consideration however; feeding pipework in to and out of an entirely new structure would avoid such harm.
97. Visually, the impact of the plant room as proposed on the setting of the barn and hall would be small. Due to the rising ground adjacent to the barn the only evidence of the plant room once the land above it is restored would be a new stone-faced wall with door to the south to grant access in to it, and estate fencing above to the raised edges. This would have a very limited impact on the setting of the listed buildings. On that basis the proposals are acceptable.
98. This is subject to the submission of a methodology for the construction of the plant room that demonstrates how the structural integrity of the barn would be conserved both during and following construction, and of a detailed design for the new stone walling, fencing, and any surfacing to the roof of the plant room being agreed. These matters could be reserved by condition.

### External works - general

99. The application proposes the demolition of the retaining wall opposite the front elevation of the Hall, and rebuilding it like for like. This wall contains a 17th century date-stone, probably re-sited from the house, and other features including the base of a cheese press. The retaining wall was constructed before July 1948 and it forms part of the curtilage of the structure. The listing protection afforded to the principal building therefore extends to the wall. The application does not include a conservation structural engineer's report setting out why the proposed works are necessary; and if the whole of the wall requires dismantling. Without this information, this aspect of the proposed

works cannot be assessed. As a result it is recommended that this element of the works is omitted by condition if permission is granted.

100. New boundary treatments and timber gates (to the north of the stable building and south of the barn) are proposed, and raise no objection subject to details being agreed.
101. The existing metal fencing and gates between the stable building and barn were installed prior to the current tenant taking occupation of the property and are unauthorised. The submitted site plan shows these retained with alteration to open up a pedestrian access to the southern end, where stone infill currently exists. However, no elevation plans of the gates or proposed modifications have been submitted and so this element of the works cannot be fully assessed, nor could it be properly secured if permission was granted. It is therefore recommended that this element of the scheme be omitted by condition in the event of approval of the application.

#### External works - Garden buildings

102. A garden store is proposed to the eastern edge of the site. The conservation officer advises that it would be preferable to keep all structures close together rather than extending the site in this direction. However, the openings in the ground floor of the barn aren't large enough to allow access for the machinery required and it is difficult to see how a further new building could be more closely related to the hall without having a greater impact on its setting.
103. The proposed store is mostly underground. It would benefit from some simplification in terms of its integration and reduction in size, but subject to these being controlled by condition it would have a very low impact on the appearance of the grounds of the property.
104. A wooden lean-to greenhouse, Edwardian summerhouse, and green oak pergola are all shown on the proposed site plans, but no elevation plans have been submitted to further show their design. The conservation officer raises concerns that these will detract from the setting of the listed building, but there is insufficient information on which to fully assess them. As a result it is recommended that they are omitted from the development by condition if permission is granted.

#### External works - Ground source heat pump

105. These works would be set away from the listed building and below ground, having no impact on its significance, according with DMC7. The ecological implications and environmental benefits are discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

#### Summary of heritage and design matters

106. In summary, the site is currently in a dilapidated state and the proposed conversion would reinstate it in a sympathetic manner. As a result, subject to the conditions detailed above, the development would conserve the significance, character and appearance of the buildings subject to conditions. The development therefore complies with policies L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, and DMC10.

#### Landscape impacts

107. The scheme broadly involves works within the shells of the existing buildings and below ground. Changes to the roadside frontage are the only addition that will have particular visibility from outside of the site. The proposal for stone walling and timber gates here would not appear out of keeping with the general locality, subject to appropriate

detailing.

108. The installation of external lighting for parking areas or of the buildings in this unlit rural location could harm its character. It would therefore be necessary to secure such lighting by condition if permission was granted.
109. Subject to this the development would conserve the character of the landscape as required by policy DMC3.

#### Amenity impacts

110. There are no neighbouring properties adjacent to the site whose amenity could be prejudiced by the proposed development.
111. If the site was split into independent planning units following in the event of permission being granted though, amenity issues could arise.
112. This is because of the relationship of the buildings to each other. The proximity of the buildings to each other, the position of openings, and the shared access to them means that there would be overlooking between what would be the holiday let, the main house, and the office. This would harm the privacy of the occupiers – most notably of the main house. For this reason it would be necessary to secure the development as a single planning unit by condition if planning permission was to be granted.
113. Overall, and subject to the condition discussed above, the development would conserve amenity in line with policy DMC3.

#### Highway impacts

114. The highway authority state that Stanton Hall Lane is a single track road subject to the national speed limit and in the vicinity of the site is a series of s-bends on a relatively steep gradient, with the site remote from nearby settlements and facilities. They note that the nature of the surrounding highway network is restricted, but that vehicle speeds are low and there are no accidents recorded for the location.
115. Having reviewed the submitted technical transport note, they advise that the proposals may result in an increase in traffic on the basis of 100% occupation of the holiday accommodation and office – but that there would be some benefit arising from a reduction in the number of slow moving agricultural vehicles that would come about from removing the agricultural use of the site.
116. The submitted supporting documents have some inconsistencies in terms of vehicle movements and parking requirements relating to the proposed office use, with different documents indicating different staffing numbers. However, the highway authority have assessed the proposals based on the size of the office space proposed rather than the applicant's current business or intentions (which could change, of course).
117. There are also likely to be occasional vehicular visits to the site relating to servicing of the package treatment plant and back up oil boiler, which are discounted by the submitted transport note. These would be infrequent visits however, and so have no significant bearing on the assessment of highway safety.
118. The highway authority raised concerns about the parking and exit visibility arrangements of the development as originally proposed, principally related to the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the size of office space proposed, the positioning of parking to the south of the barn where exit visibility is poor, and in relation

to limited exit visibility from the main site entrance to the north.

119. The applicant has subsequently liaised with highway officers at length to amend the proposals to improve highway safety.
120. Commenting on the amended plans, and following a recent site meeting with the applicants, the highway authority now advise that the arrangement has been improved, with the size of office being reduced, and changes being made to the position and angle of the main site access and relocation of parking spaces away from the southern barn to this northern area. Having visited the site they are confident that additional necessary measures to further improve visibility from the site access and to improve opportunities for vehicles to pass each other could be secured by conditions.
121. In terms of parking provision, the number of spaces proposed was reduced when the proposal was amended to reduce the amount of office space proposed. The highway authority subsequently advised that it was insufficient for the proposed uses, and it has been changed again, now providing the following:
  122. 2 spaces for the main house (2 bedrooms)
  123. 3 spaces for the bed and breakfast accommodation within the main house (3 bedrooms)
  124. 3 spaces for the office unit
  125. 1 space for the holiday unit (1 bedroom)
126. The highway authority have raised no objection to the parking provision as now proposed.
127. The highway authority also highlight that whilst it may not be the current owners intention to operate the office as a totally separate office (it is proposed as the base for their own business), an unrestricted permission could allow this and potentially increase traffic to the site. They advise that a condition to secure the site as a single planning unit would reduce the risk of this happening at a later date sufficiently that a highway objection could not be upheld.
128. A Travel Plan has also been submitted by the applicant, which details initiatives and targets that will be used to reduce travel to the site by car, including pick-up of guests from local train stations, provision of bikes for communal use, cycle storage, and provision of local travel information to guests. The highway authority advise that their colleagues in the Sustainable Travel team have reviewed the document and conclude it is fit for purpose, recommending that its implementation be secured by condition if permission is granted.
129. Clearly, the provisions of this document will not remove all vehicular travel to the site. Whilst those staying in the holiday let unit could be self sufficient – with cooking facilities proposed within the unit – those staying in the bed and breakfast accommodation would not. The applicant advises that they would be able to offer meals to those utilising the bed and breakfast accommodation, but that could not reasonably be controlled. In concluding that it is fit for purpose though, the highway authority recognise that it is likely to help reduce vehicular movements associated with the development.
130. Overall, whilst recognising that the development may increase traffic movements at the site, the highway authority consider that a highways objection could not be sustained based on the current level of development and parking proposed, subject to conditions.
131. As noted above, one such condition is the need to secure the site as a single planning

unit. As discussed in the amenity section of this report, above, a condition retaining the site as a single planning unit would be required on grounds of amenity if permission was granted anyway, and so the development would comply with the requirements of the highway authority in this regard too.

132. In addition to the matter of vehicular use of the highway there are several footpaths that emerge on to the road close to the location of the property, indicating walkers are likely to be present at times on this section of road – although this would be likely to be mostly only for short distances as they cross the road between footpaths. As detailed above however, the highway authority are satisfied that adequate visibility from the site access can be provided to ensure highway safety, and they make no objection to the proposals on the grounds of an increased intensification of use of the road. Therefore there is no objection to the development on grounds of an increased risk to non-vehicular users of the highway.
133. Overall, based on the above assessments and subject to the conditions recommended by the highway authority, the development would conserve highway safety and provide sufficient parking levels in accordance with policy DMT8.

#### Ecological and tree impacts

134. A bat survey has been submitted in support of the application.
135. It found no evidence of bats roosting in the barn, despite recording bat activity around the buildings. It nevertheless makes recommendations for roosting features to be included in the barn as part of the development, to ensure habitat is available for bats.
136. The submitted survey does not deal with the main house and attached stable, which were eliminated from requiring assessment by and April 2018 survey on the basis that those buildings had recently been completely re-roofed.
137. The Authority's Ecologist requested details of a previous bat scoping report relating to the main house and stable to be submitted in order to make an assessment of impacts of the proposals. However, as noted above, the submitted survey states that the previous survey ruled out bat roosting in these buildings as they had recently been entirely re-roofed. Further, they would be subject to no further notable works as part of the current proposals, and nor would uses within these buildings change. With that in mind, further comment was requested from the Ecologist but has not been received.
138. Overall it is concluded that subject to the recommendations of the submitted bat report being followed, these interests would be protected.
139. The Authority's Ecologist has also provided advice in relation to the grassland to the south of the building group, which would be the site for the ground source heating pipes. They have advised that part of this grassland is of high ecological quality. They have prepared a short method statement for works to follow to ensure that this area is sufficiently managed by the proposed works; this could be secured by condition if permission was granted.
140. The proposals as originally submitted included the siting of the package treatment plant beneath the canopy of a mature tree at the northern edge of the site. The Authority's Tree Officer advised that they would require an arboricultural assessment and further detail of the installation in order to be able to make an assessment of impacts. The plant has since been moved away from the tree. Of the two feeds to it (from the house and barn), one would also avoid passing close to mature trees. The other would appear to still be routed within the RPA of a mature tree however. In the event of permission

being granted it is recommended that a condition be imposed to submit and agree details of the routing and excavation method of this pipework in order to ensure that it does not result in harm to the tree interests of the site.

141. A condition to require tree protection during works should also be imposed if permission is granted, to accord with policy DMC13.
142. Subject to the conditions securing the matters above the development is concluded to conserve the ecological and tree interests of the site in accordance with policies L2, DMC12, and DMC13.

#### Archaeological impacts

143. The Authority's Archaeologist advises that changes to historic fabric will harm the historic interest of the buildings with new openings, blocking up of existing openings, subdivision of spaces, and the introduction of new features and fabric. They also advise that groundworks for services have the potential to encounter, damage and destroy as yet undiscovered and unrecorded archaeological remains, as do internal groundworks within the historic core and north wing of the Old Hall. Whilst they advise that this will harm archaeological interest of the site, they conclude that it would not harm its core significance. They conclude that the archaeological impacts of the proposed development detailed above can be adequately addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological recording and investigation, should the development be concluded acceptable in the overall planning balance.
144. In terms of the planning balance, the scheme would result in the significant planning benefit of repairing and providing long term viability for the buildings, which would serve to secure their repair and maintenance.
145. Given the level of archaeological harm identified, we conclude that these benefits would outweigh the archaeological harm in this instance.

#### Sustainable building and climate change

146. Because the buildings are listed, there are some limitations on the types of carbon reduction measures that can be introduced; retrospective insulation in particular can harm significant, character and breathability. More efficient modern glazing systems would also be inappropriate.
147. Underfloor heating is proposed throughout the property however, which is an efficient form of heating that would reduce energy usage.
148. The proposals also make significant provisions for the introduction of renewable energy provision, proposing a ground source heating array as noted earlier in this report. That would meet all of the heating needs for the property, with an oil fuelled boiler installed as a backup only. This would make a significant contribution to reducing the property's carbon footprint.
149. Further, the site is currently served by a springwater source, but has no facilities for storing the water or filtration at source. Given the fluctuating nature of springwater supply and the impact of this on pressure and availability, this has implications for water usage at the property, particularly given its size. Rather than moving to a mains water connection though, the application includes facilities for the storage, filtration (in tanks within the plant room) and continued use of the springwater as the property's main water supply. This represents sustainable development, removing the environmental costs associated with the supply and purification of mains water.

150. These measures improves the environmental credentials of the property and the development it concluded to comply with policies CC1 and CC2.

### **Conclusion**

151. The buildings have not had a viable use for a number of years, and as a result investment in their upkeep has waned and their condition has deteriorated. Their physical restoration would secure their short-term future, but that is likely to require viable uses within them before being economical. The proposed uses accord with planning policy and provide such viability.
152. Further, we conclude that subject to conditions and when taken as a whole the proposal will conserve the significance, character and appearance of the buildings, neighbouring amenity, highway safety, and the ecological interests of the site in accordance with policies L2, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, and DMC10.
153. There are no other policy or material considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be refused.
154. We therefore recommend the application for conditional approval.

### **Human Rights**

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

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

156. Nil
157. Report Author: Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner (South)