

7. FULL APPLICATION – RENOVATION OF HOUSE AND CONVERSION OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE (CAFE), TOWN END COTTAGE, GRINDON (NP/SM/1020/0979, MN)

APPLICANT: DR ALEX FORRESTER

Summary

1. The proposal is to renovate the existing house and to extend the living accommodation in to the attached agricultural buildings, whilst also providing an 8m² café area in part of one of the agricultural buildings.
2. The buildings affected are concluded to represent heritage assets and the principle of their conservation through conversion is supported by planning policy. Subject to conditions, the proposed alterations (as amended) to facilitate conversion and changes to the existing dwelling, are considered sensitive to the appearance and character of the buildings and are supported.
3. The principle of the proposed café use is also acceptable in planning policy terms and the proposed scale of the cafe, the alterations proposed to the building, and the proposed site layout are considered to maintain highway safety and the amenity of other residential properties.
4. Other associated works within the application site area are also concluded to have acceptable planning impacts.
5. There are no other policy or material considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be refused. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Site and surroundings

6. Town End Farm is located at the eastern edge of Grindon village on Weags Bridge Road. It is accessed from the road over a strip of verge that is outside of the applicants ownership.
7. The property is a small cottage in a linear range with an attached cow house with hay loft over. The cottage has a rear single storey offshot. A small 'workshop' is attached to the north east gable of the range. A further agricultural barn, formed as a shippon of the neighbouring property (but not in it's ownership) is positioned south west of the house and facing the road.
8. The neighbouring property of Grove Cottage is attached to the north west gable of the road-facing barn. The access to Buckfurlong Farm faces the property on the other side of the road, although the property itself is set well back from it. The site has no other residential neighbours.
9. The site is located within the Grindon conservation area.
10. The Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation and Hamps and Manifold Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest lie approximately 350m north east of the site.

Proposal

11. The application proposes renovating the house and extending the living accommodation in to the attached agricultural shippon and lean-to. The renovation includes both internal and external alterations to the building, as well as the provision of a package treatment plant for the treatment and disposal of waste water, and the installation of an air source heat pump.
12. Conversion of the currently-freestanding barn to provide 8m² of café seating area, and cycle storage is also proposed within it. It is proposed to construct a link extension between this building and the main house as part of these works.

RECOMMENDATION:

13. That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:
 1. **3 year time limit**
 2. **In accordance with the amended plans**
 3. **Hard and soft landscaping of the site, including parking spaces and surfacing to be reserved and subsequently approved parking to be set out prior to the use of the café commencing**
 4. **Dwelling and café to be maintained as a single planning unit**
 5. **Cafe opening hours limited to 9am to 6pm daily**
 6. **Extent of café use limited to that identified on the approved floor plans**
 7. **No external extraction, refrigeration, ventilation or other plant or machinery associated with the café use to be installed without the Authority's prior written approval**
 8. **No business use other than the café use to be granted by the permission**
 9. **Scheme of archaeological monitoring and recording to be approved prior to commencement**
 10. **Recommendations of the protected species report to be complied with**
 11. **Proposed climate change mitigation measures to be incorporated**
 12. **Effluent purification measures for package treatment plant to be implemented at time of installation and maintained thereafter**
 13. **Conditions to secure detailed design matters**

Key Issues

14. The main considerations are summarised as:
 - Whether the extension of the dwelling and conversion of barn to café use are acceptable in principle

- Whether the proposed works would conserve the character, appearance, and heritage significance of the buildings
- Whether the development would conserve neighbouring amenity
- The impact of the development on highway safety
- The environmental impacts of the development

History

15. No relevant history.

Consultations

16. Highway Authority – Initially advised that the proposals could not be considered to have a severe effect on the highway but that proposed parking provision was unclear. Requested drawings clarifying the parking arrangements.
17. The application was subsequently amended, changing the originally proposed café/shop to a café only and reducing its size to 8m². This was to ensure that parking provision within the site accorded with recommended parking standards. A potential civil issue relating to access across part of the land immediately in front of the site, raised in a letter of objection, led to further amendments to the proposed parking layout.
18. In response to these latest plans the highway authority advise that they have no objections to the proposals, subject to appropriate surfacing of the parking spaces.
19. They also note that whilst two parking spaces are proposed in association with the cafe in accordance with adopted parking standards, even if only a single space were proposed for the cafe, this would be only a single space short of adopted standards and an objection on highways or parking grounds could not be considered reasonable and could not be sustained at appeal, given the very small size of the proposed café.
20. District Council – No response at time of writing.
21. Parish Council – Welcome the renovation of the property but object to the proposed café use on the grounds of:
- The impacts of loss of privacy, increased levels of noise, disturbance, light and smells for neighbouring property, with whom the development shares a party wall;
 - The proposed location, and suitability of the domestic package treatment plant;
 - The impact of increased traffic, reduced vehicle access and implications for road safety;
 - There are concerns for the capacity of infrastructure available as no public toilets are available in Grindon;
 - Concerns that café furniture and the café use will extend outdoors
 - Limited details regarding the kitchen, which is to be for both domestic and business use
22. Natural England – Initially required additional information relating to control of phosphorus levels in the discharge from the package treatment plant. This information was subsequently provided and Natural England makes no objection subject to the proposed mitigation being secured.
23. PDNPA – Archaeology – Advise that from an archaeological perspective they would equate the level of harm arising from changes to the building and groundworks to be minor in scale overall, and that if done sensitively the core significance of the site will remain. They note that this harm must be taken into account as a balanced planning

judgement is reached. They recommend design changes to minimise this harm, and these have been incorporated in the amended plans that have subsequently been submitted. They also advise that a scheme of building recording and archaeological investigation should be secured by condition if permission is granted.

24. PDNPA – Ecology – Advise that the applicant should follow the mitigation and compensation plan contained in the submitted Bat Survey Report.

Representations

25. Letters of objection have been received from 12 parties, with one letter of support also received. The objections are made on the following grounds:

- The impacts of loss of privacy, increased levels of noise, disturbance, light and smells for neighbouring property, with whom the development shares a party wall;
- The proposed location, and suitability of the domestic package treatment plant;
- The impact of increased traffic, reduced vehicle access and implications for road safety and quality of life of local residents
- Insufficient parking space within the site for the proposed uses
- The development will increase visitor numbers to the village, leading to associated parking problems and the need for additional signage throughout the village;
- The café use will encroach in to the space in front of the shippon
- The business use will extend to the operation of guided cycle tours and repairs from the site
- There would be an overbearing presence on common boundaries
- Over-development in the conservation area
- Impacts on local wildlife

26. The letter of support states that they welcome the occupation of a derelict building and the provision of a local amenity that will further enhance the village.

Main policies

27. Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, CC1, L1, L2, L3, E1

28. Development Management policies: DMH10, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DME8

29. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales:

- Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
- Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public

30. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the national parks.

National planning policy framework

31. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was first published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National

Park the Local Plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Local 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 Local Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.

32. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'
33. Paragraph 189 states 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.
34. Paragraph 190 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
35. Paragraph 197 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
36. Paragraph 198 continues that local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
37. Paragraph 199 advises that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Local Plan

38. Core Strategy policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable

development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.

39. Core Strategy policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
40. Core Strategy policy DS1 details the development strategy for the National Park. For the purposes of planning policy Grindon is a named settlement in Core Strategy policy DS1. In such settlements the policy supports extensions to existing buildings, and conversion for business uses, preferably through the re-use of traditional buildings.
41. Core Strategy policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
42. 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.
43. Core Strategy policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.
44. 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.
45. Development Management policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring applications to clearly demonstrate their significance and for 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. It also states that proposals likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological and potential archaeological interest should be supported by appropriate information that identifies the impacts or a programme of archaeological works to a methodology approved by the Authority.
46. Development Management 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. Policy DMH7 addresses extensions and alterations, permitting these provided that the proposal does not:
 - (i) detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings; or

- (ii) dominate the original dwelling particularly where it is a designated or non-designated cultural heritage asset; or
 - (iii) amount to the creation of a separate independent dwelling; or
 - (iv) create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to, the landscape or any other valued characteristic; or
 - (v) in the case of houses permitted under policy DMH1, exceed 10% of the floorspace or take the floorspace of the house above 97m²
48. It also states that proposals for house extensions involving the conversion of adjoining buildings and by the provision of new ancillary buildings must also satisfy policy DMH5. This policy addresses ancillary dwellings however, and because the level and nature of extension would not amount to the provision of an ancillary dwelling, this policy is not applicable in this instance.
49. Development Management policy DME8 addresses design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots. It states that where development for employment purposes is acceptable in principle, it will only be permitted where every practicable means is used to minimise any adverse effects on the valued characteristics and amenity of the surrounding area. Particular attention will be given to:
- (i) visibility from vantage points; and
 - (ii) site access, vehicular circulation and parking; and
 - (iii) site layout and use of open space surrounding buildings; and
 - (iv) storage of vehicles or other equipment; and
 - (v) landscaping and other screening, and whether, in the landscape proposed, it is an appropriate method to mitigate adverse impact on the landscape; and
 - (vi) noise and proposed times of operation.
50. It also states that where necessary, planning conditions will restrict future growth and intensity of the activities on site.

Assessment

Principle of development

51. In relation the proposed alterations and extensions to the dwellinghouse, policy DS1 is supportive of these in principle. Policy DMH7 is also supportive of extensions – including through conversion of adjoining buildings – and sets out criteria which must be met and are addressed as applicable in the following sections of this report.
52. The conversion of part of the barn to a café is also supported by policy DS1 in principle, because the site is within one of the settlements named in this policy and represents the change of use of a traditional building to a business use. Policy DME8 sets out requirements for employment sites, which are considered as applicable in the following sections of this report.

Design and appearance

53. Whilst in a poor state of repair, the property is a historic and traditionally designed agricultural workers cottage in a linear range with an attached cow house with hay loft over.
54. Externally, the proposals work broadly with the property's existing openings and layout.
55. As originally submitted, the proposed link between the house and barn was much deeper in plan than now proposed and was to be built as a solid infill, with sheet roofing. This was considered to undermine the historic separation of the house from the barn,

and to therefore harm the sites character. The size has since been reduced and material changed to include a fully glazed front wall, creating a much more recessive and lightweight link that better conserves the appearance of the site.

56. Windows proposed to some openings have also been amended during the course of the application, based on our feedback and that of the Authority's Archaeologist. As amended, the proposed window designs better retain the distinction between the original residential and agricultural parts of the building, and are of a type that is appropriate in both cases. The number of rooflights proposed has also been reduced (from 4 to 2), and now have a much reduced impact on the buildings roof plane.
57. A flue for a wood burning stove is proposed through the roof of the road-facing barn. Whilst not a typical feature of buildings of this character, it is positioned to the rear roof slope and would not project beyond the ridge, minimising its visual impact.
58. In conclusion, the scheme would broadly conserve the character and appearance of the property as required by planning policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 and would secure the repair and long term conservation of the buildings.
59. As a result, the appearance of the landscape and conservation area would also be conserved, according with policies L1, DMC3, and DMC8.

Archaeological impacts

60. The Authority's Archaeologist advises that the buildings are of historic and archaeological interest. They note that the proposed development requires changes to the fabric of the buildings, and that this will result in some dilution of their agricultural character. They recommend a number of changes to the scheme as submitted (including changes to the link, windows, and rooflights) to minimize this harm – all of which the amended plans have taken account of.
61. They also advise that the proposed drainage works have the potential encounter and destroy previously unrecorded below-ground archaeological remains relating to the historic and development of the building and the site.
62. They advise that the overall archaeological harm arising would be minor in scale, and that subject to being carried out sensitively the core significance of the site would remain. They recommend conditions to secure this, and appropriate archaeological recording of the site to further mitigate the identified harm.
63. This harm must be weighed against the benefits of the conservation of the buildings that would be secured by the proposed conversion, as required by the NPPF. These benefits are that the development would secure the remaining historic, archaeological, and vernacular interest of the buildings for the foreseeable future; without such intervention it is highly likely that they will fall in to further disrepair and ultimately collapse.
64. The scheme has already been amended to minimise the archaeological impacts, is generally well considered in its approach to working with existing openings and floor plans. Further, it is difficult to see a scheme coming forward that would result in significantly lower archaeological impacts than those arising from the amended proposals.
65. On this basis it is concluded that subject to conditions that secure the appropriate assessment and recording of the sites archaeological interests, the benefits of conversion would outweigh the archaeological harm arising. The development is

therefore concluded acceptable in relation to policies L3, DMC3, and DMC5 when having regard to the planning balance as set out by the NPPF.

Amenity impacts

66. The property already has a lawful residential use, and the agricultural buildings could also be used for the purposes of agriculture; although this is relatively unlikely given that the property is apparently no longer associated with any landholding, and also given the size and nature of the buildings.
67. The proposed development would remove the agricultural use from the site though, reducing the likelihood of noise or odour impacts for neighbouring properties that could arise from such use.
68. The continued use of the dwelling with its proposed extended floorspace would not significantly alter the amenity impacts from those that would arise if the property were to be occupied as a dwelling without such expansion. One rear window in the property that currently serves the cowhouse would become a window to a primary living space (living room), but is positioned facing the very end of the neighbouring garden where existing mature planting would prevent any significant loss of privacy.
69. The café use would introduce a new use to the site, in a building adjacent to and adjoining the neighbouring property.
70. No kitchen area is proposed in this space and it is expected that the allocated seating space and layout would allow for a maximum of 8 customers to be accommodated at any one time, over two floors. There would therefore be no large groups, and opening times would be restricted to between 9am and 6pm 7 days per week.
71. On that basis the use would generate very limited noise and disturbance. Further, there would be no overlooking of the neighbouring property from within the building, and the existing tall garden wall and planting would minimise any loss of privacy as visitors were to arrive.
72. Were the area of café floorspace to be extended – and particularly if the land immediately in front of the barn was used to provide additional covers – then it is possible further amenity impacts could arise however. It would therefore be necessary to secure the café floorspace as it is proposed in the application by condition, if permission was granted.
73. Based on the size of the café and the fact that its kitchen facilities amount only to utilising those of the dwelling it is not anticipated that any commercial extraction, cooking, or refrigeration equipment would be required. For the sake of clarity though, and to prevent any adverse amenity impacts that could arise from such installations, it is recommended that a condition be imposed restricting such installations.
74. It is accepted that the cafe use may result in a minor increase in the number of people on foot or in vehicles passing the neighbouring property, but this would not result in any significant harm to their privacy, based on the scope of the use proposed and the fact that this elevation of the property is already open to public view.
75. We understand that the applicant operates a business offering guided cycle tours. He has advised that it is not his intention to operate that business from the premises, but that such tours would meet at the agreed remote starting location. He may however invite those taking part to visit the café during or following a tour. This would be within the scope of the café use however, if that was to be approved. For the sake of clarity, it is recommended that if permission is granted a permission is imposed to clarify that the

café use is the only business use approved by the decision – because other uses could give rise to amenity impacts over which the Authority would wish to retain control.

76. The hours of proposed operation for the café, 9am to 6pm, are daytime hours that would not give rise to any additional amenity concerns. Late or early opening times could give rise to greater amenity impacts, at times when it would be expected that the locality would be quieter and when nearby residents are sleeping. It is therefore recommended that a condition is imposed to restrict operating hours to those proposed, if permission is granted.
77. An air source heat pump is proposed to the rear of the house. This would be positioned approximately 16 metres from the neighbouring dwelling, and around 8m from the closest point of their garden, and would be partly obscured by a side wall at the rear of the house. Whilst it is likely that the pump would be audible from some parts of the neighbouring garden on occasion, it would not be audible within the building and where audible this would not be at such volume as to prejudice their enjoyment of their property. Weight is also given to the fact that an air source heat pump could be installed under the property's existing permitted development rights, in a position much closer to the neighbouring dwellinghouse. Overall, there is no objection to the air source heat pump installation on grounds of amenity.
78. A package treatment plant is also proposed. Being almost entirely underground and generating little noise in any event, this would not adversely affect neighbouring amenity.
79. Overall, it is considered that the amenity impacts of the development would comply with the requirements of policy DMC3 and DME8.

Highway impacts

80. As originally proposed the scheme included 20m² of shop space and a 49m² café. This would require 9 parking spaces, based on the advice of the highway authority. 4 spaces were proposed, but only 2 of those were on land in the applicants control; the other two were on a verge in front of the property believed to be common land. As a result, only two spaces could be secured.
81. The scheme was then revised to omit the shop and to reduce the café to the much smaller size of 8m², and the site layout was adjusted to accommodate parking for 4 vehicles. The highway authority raise no objections to the proposals as amended.
82. Officers note that this parking provision complies with adopted parking standards of 1 space per 4m² dining area for cafes, and also provides the requisite 2 spaces for the dwelling. As a result, the development is not considered to result in any significant adverse highway impacts.
83. This is subject to the property remaining a single planning unit; parking (as well as amenity) conflicts could arise were the dwelling and café under different control. This could be secured by condition if permission was granted.

Ecological impacts

84. The application is accompanied by a protected species report, which found some evidence of bat roasts within the buildings. The report proposes retaining some of these roasts, reinstating some following works, and replacing others – with temporary roost provision (bat boxes) also being provide whilst works are carried out.

85. The Authority's ecologist is satisfied that these measures are acceptable, and it is therefore concluded that the development would protect the ecological interests of the site as required by planning policy L2 if these measures were secured by conditions.

Climate change mitigation

86. A number of measures are proposed to improve the carbon footprint of the existing building. These include the installation of an air source heat pump, double glazing and internal shutters to replacement windows, and the use of sustainable insulation (glasscrete for flooring, cork for walls, wool for roof spaces). Heating controls are to be zonal and wood-burning stoves are also proposed.
87. These measures would make a significant contribution towards reducing energy usage, and to ensuring that the development uses and supplies energy efficiently.
88. Subject to securing these measures by condition, the application is therefore concluded to comply with policy CC1.

Other matters

89. A new 10 person package treatment plant is proposed. Some representations query the capacity and position of this in terms of its compliance with building regulations. We have received confirmation from the officer at the relevant building control authority that they have visited the site and are satisfied that the proposals are acceptable to them. Natural England have raised no concerns in relation to the capacity of, or potential pollution from, the proposed plant subject to conditions to secure the water purification measures proposed.
90. The café would include accessible toilet facilities for customers, placing no additional demand on – or for – local facilities.
91. Concerns about waste disposal from the site have been raised by some parties, relating to the proposed café use. Given the size of the proposed café, it is anticipated that levels of refuse could be accommodated relatively easily through existing domestic bins and bin collections.
92. The neighbouring property has raised concerns that the site boundaries denoted on the submitted plans cannot be assumed to be accurate, due to both sites having previously been in sole ownership and boundary lines having not been clearly defined historically. As there is no evidence to show that the boundaries shown are not accurate however, and because the granting of planning permission would not change land ownership or rights of access in law, it is considered that this is a civil matter that would need to be resolved by the landowners, not through the planning process.

Conclusion

93. The restoration of the historic stone buildings is welcomed. Subject to securing the amended plans, building recording, and design details by condition the scheme would broadly conserve the group and provide a viable long term use for them, supporting their conservation.
94. The proposed café use complies with adopted planning policy, and is of such scale that it is concluded to have acceptable amenity, highway, and other planning impacts.
95. There is otherwise no conflict between the intent of policies in the Local Plan and Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no

other material considerations that would indicate planning permission should be refused.

96. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner (South)