

6. FULL APPLICATION - FOR EXTENSION OF EXISTING GRISTONE BARN AND DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO FORM ONE DWELLING AT SHATTON FARM, SHATTON LANE, SHATTON (NP/HPK/0920/0874, AM)

APPLICANT: MR RICHARD BRUCE

Summary

1. Nether Shatton Farm is located at the south-western end of Shatton.
2. The proposal is for the extension of the existing stone barn and demolition of redundant agricultural buildings to form a single market dwelling.
3. The development would harm the character and appearance of the existing barn, the site and its surroundings and would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Nether Cottage
4. The application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. Nether Shatton Farm is situated at the south-western end of the hamlet of Shatton, south of Bamford and the A6187. The eastern end of the hamlet is a relatively suburban development of 20th century houses. The historic core of the hamlet is a more traditional cluster of buildings at its south-western end. Shatton Lane runs through Shatton, running past the application site and eventually continuing onto Shatton Edge.
6. The application site is on the eastern side of Shatton Lane as it rises up the southern slope of the valley side, at the southernmost edge of the settlement. It includes a range of modern and traditional agricultural buildings which are now redundant. The site contains a traditional gritstone barn, with a gritstone roof, situated on the roadside frontage with a post-war agricultural building immediately to the rear of this building.
7. The traditional barn was re-built following the grant of planning permission for conversion in 2013. The re-building of the barn with extensions to create a market dwelling was granted planning permission in 2016. Since the 2016 permission was granted separate operations have taken place to raise the eaves and ridge height of the barn and alter an opening in the southern gable. This work appears to have been undertaken in 2018 and does not benefit from planning permission.
8. The approved development includes the demolition of the non-traditional agricultural sheds on the site and the erection of a new extension to the side of the barn which would be partially dug into the ground levels to the south of the barn and the erection of a detached garage.
9. There are neighbouring residential properties to the west and north. The property to the north 'Nether Cottage' is Grade II listed (named Shatton Cottage on the listing description).

Proposal

10. Redevelopment of Shatton Farm to form one market dwelling.
11. The plans show that the existing modern agricultural buildings would be demolished and the ground level to the rear of the stone barn lowered to facilitate the construction of extensions. The work undertaken to raise the roof of the barn would be retained and the barn converted.

12. The stone barn would provide a hallway, W.C, kitchen and dining space at ground floor and a single bedroom at first floor. A second staircase within the barn would provide access to a further mezzanine.
13. A two storey 'L' shaped extension is proposed to the rear of the stone barn, connected to it by a single storey glazed link. The extension would provide a hallway and lounge at ground floor and four bedrooms at first floor with one shared bathroom and two en-suite bathrooms.
14. Two parking areas are proposed one to the south of the site and one to the east with two access points from the north and south of the stone barn. The stone barn and extensions would form a courtyard garden area with lawn beyond up to the adjoining fields.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. **The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing barn, the site and its surroundings and would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Nether Cottage contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1; Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10; the Authority's adopted design guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

15. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle.
16. The impact of the proposed development.

Relevant Planning History

17. 2013: NP/HPK/0113/0072: Planning permission granted conditionally for change of use of barn to dwelling, demolition of redundant agricultural buildings and erection of garage, store and earth covered residential extension.
18. ENQ: 23500: Pre-application advice in regard to amendments to the above scheme. At the site visit Officers became aware that the traditional barn had been re-built and therefore the 2013 permission had not been (and now could not be) implemented.
19. Enforcement 15/0061: Relating to demolition and re-build of barn.
20. 2016: NP/HPK/1115/1115: Planning permission granted conditionally for change of use and extension of a reconstructed barn to dwelling, demolition of redundant agricultural buildings and erection of garage and store (part retrospective).
21. 2019: NP/HPK/0519/0456: Redevelopment of Shatton Farm to form one dwelling. This will entail the extension of the existing gritstone barn and the demolition of the redundant agricultural buildings. Planning permission refused for the following reasons:
 1. *The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings and would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Nether Cottage contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1; Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10; the Authority's adopted design guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

2. *The proposed development would result in overlooking from occupants of the dwelling towards the neighbouring property Nether Cottage. This would result in a significant loss of privacy to habitable rooms and the garden of Nether Cottage which would harm the privacy and amenity of occupants contrary to Core Strategy policy GSP3 and Development Management policy DMC3.*
3. *Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development would achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency in order to mitigate the causes of climate change contrary to Core Strategy Policy CC1 the Authority's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Climate Change and Sustainable Building' and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Consultations

22. Highway Authority – Make the following comments.
23. *"It is not clear from the proposals whether the existing southern vehicular access is proposed to be modified. From the proposed site plan (0304.002 Ref F) it is clear that some modification would be required to access all the parking spaces, with this also likely to require relocation of an existing 'Restricted Byway Ahead' sign. This current application also removes space within the site for vehicles to manoeuvre.*
24. *Emerging visibility from the sites existing accesses are extremely limited, primarily by the barn to be converted. However, the application proposals appear to completely remove the existing agricultural buildings within the site apart from the ones to be converted. The Highway Authority is therefore satisfied that the application constitutes the complete removal of any agricultural activity from the site and this is considered to be an equitable exchange of traffic generation for the proposed single dwelling.*
25. *It is appreciated that passing vehicle speeds and volumes are low on the fronting public highway due to Shatton Lane's general layout and the sites remote location. However it is recommended that the northern access be closed as part of the proposals. Similarly, in view of the limited visibility it is recommended that space be provided within the site to enable vehicles to manoeuvre within the site, so as to both enter and exit in forward gear. With the applicant being in control of sufficient land to provide manoeuvring space within the site.*
26. *Based on the above, it is considered the risk of danger to highway users would be no greater than at present. Before making my formal recommendations I would be obliged if you could ask the applicant to revise the proposal in view of the above comments and in the meantime please hold the application in abeyance until revised plans have been submitted.*
27. *You may wish to ask the applicant to address the above comments and submit a revised drawing which I will be happy to comment upon in due course. Alternatively, provided that you are satisfied that a satisfactory layout can be controlled by conditions, there are no highway objections to the proposal from the highway point of view, subject to conditions being included in any consent granted in the interests of highway safety."*
28. Borough Council – No response to date.
29. Parish Meeting – No response to date.

Representations

30. No letters of representation received to date.

Main Policies

31. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, CC1, DS1, L1, L3 and HC1
32. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10, DMT3 and DMT8

National Planning Policy Framework

33. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management policies (2019). These policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. The development plan is up-to-date and therefore is afforded full weight in decision making.
34. Para 79. Of the NPPF states that planning decision should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless there is an essential need for a rural worker, the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its setting, involve the subdivision of an existing dwelling or where the design is of exceptional quality.
35. Para 176. 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.
36. Para 194. Of the NPPF 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.
37. Para 195. Of the NPPF 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.
38. Para 199. Of the NPPF 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.
39. Para 200. Of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.

40. Para 202. 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.
41. Para 203. Of the NPPF 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.

Core Strategy Policies

42. Policy DS1 sets the development strategy and says that in the country side conversion or change of use for housing is acceptable in principle.
43. 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).
44. 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.
45. Policy CC1 requires development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. CC1 D. and E. require development to achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
46. 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. Policy L3 requires development to conserve or where possible enhance the cultural heritage of the National Park.
47. Policy HC1 says that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. New housing can be accepted where it would meet eligible local need for affordable housing, provides for key rural workers or is required to achieve conservation and or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.

Development Management Policies

48. Policy DMC3 says that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is 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. DMC3 B. sets out various criteria which will be taken into account.

49. Policy DMC5 says that planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. DMC E. says that if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect of the development on the significance, character and appearance of the heritage asset and its setting, the application will be refused.
50. Policy DMC5 says that planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate how their significance will be preserved and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
51. Policy DMC10 A. says that the conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:
- i. it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision or other alterations to form and mass, inappropriate new window openings or doorways and major rebuilding); and
 - ii. the building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not compromise the significance and character of the building; and
 - iii. the changes brought about by the new use, and any associated infrastructure (such as access and services), conserves or enhances the heritage significance of the asset, its setting (in accordance with policy DMC5), any valued landscape character, and any valued built environment; and
 - iv. the new use of the building or any curtilage created would not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics.
52. Policy DMC10 B. says proposals under Core Strategy policy HC1CI will only be permitted where:
- i. the building is a designated heritage asset; or
 - ii. based on the evidence, the National Park Authority has identified the building as a non-designated heritage asset; and
 - iii. it can be demonstrated that conversion to a market dwelling is required in order to achieve the conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.
53. Policies DMT3 and DTM8 require safe access and adequate parking to be provided for development.

Adopted supplementary planning documents

54. The Authority adopted design guide is relevant as is the Authority's adopted supplementary planning guidance on climate change and sustainable building.

Assessment

Principle of the development

55. The proposal is for the re-development of the site to create a market dwelling. The site is located on the edge of Shatton which is not a named settlement (policy DS1), therefore our policies would only support the development if it was demonstrated to be required to achieve conservation and / or enhancement of a heritage asset (policies HC1 and DMC10).
56. The property is not listed, a scheduled monument or within a conservation area and therefore is not a designated heritage asset. A heritage statement has not been submitted with the application to assess the significance of the site or buildings or its relationship with and setting of the nearby grade II listed Nether Cottage. This is contrary to the requirements of policy DMC5.
57. The roof height of the barn has been raised without planning permission and this application seeks the retention of the enlarged barn along with the re-development of the remainder of the site.
58. The 2016 planning permission represents a material fall-back position because it has been implemented and remains extant. The 2016 permission allows for retention of the stone barn (in its original lower configuration) along with extensions to create a market dwelling. In determining the 2016 application, we concluded that despite being re-built, the stone barn remained important for the street scene and for the setting of the adjacent grade II listed Nether Cottage. We therefore concluded that the 2016 development remained necessary to achieve the conservation of the site and its surroundings.
59. The current application is not supported by a heritage statement (other than in relation to the fields around the site) but does include a design and access statement and the submitted drawings and visuals do allow an assessment of the impact of the development to be made. Therefore, the lack of a heritage statement contrary to policy DMC5 is not a reason to refuse the application, taking into account our previous decisions on the site.
60. Therefore, the key issue is the impact of the development, or in other words whether the development is required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of the stone barn and the impact upon the surrounding area, including the setting of the grade II listed Nether Cottage.

Impact of development

61. The proposed design approach for the stone barn differs to that approved by the 2016 scheme. The original barn was re-built but the 2016 scheme to retain the re-built barn was nevertheless approved on the basis that the overall proportions, form, height, materials and external appearance of the barn closely reflected the original structure and this was considered an important element of the significance of the barn.
62. Since the approval of the 2016 scheme the barn has been further altered without the benefit of planning permission. The eaves and ridge height of the barn have been increased. This application seeks to retain these alterations to the roof of the barn as part of the scheme along with an alteration to the opening in the southern gable.
63. The proposed increase in the eaves and ridge height of the barn and changes to the opening in the southern gable are noticeable and significantly change the overall proportions and scale of the building. The proposed increase in eaves and ridge height of the building has unnecessarily eroded the architectural and historic significance of the building.
64. The application again proposes to demolish the modern agricultural buildings, and this is welcomed in principle but in itself does not offer any benefit over and above the 2016 scheme.

65. The development would include significant lowering of ground levels to the rear of the stone barn. The application states that this is to remove 'built up ground', however it is not clear that this is the case. Land to the south and east of the site is rising and the levels at the site generally meet up with the surrounding natural levels. While elements of the modern farm buildings are built up, there is no clear indication that the ground levels more generally are built up or that lowering the levels would restore natural levels.
66. Lowering the ground levels would in fact appear to result in significant changes at the rear of the site between the proposed levels and the existing adjacent field levels, which would necessitate a steep bund or a retaining wall. The submitted plans do not indicate how the transition between the site and the adjacent fields or changes in level would be treated.
67. A substantial amount of spoil would be removed to facilitate the proposed change in levels and the application proposes to deposit this material in the fields to the east of the site. These fields appear to retain a natural level gently sloping down to the northern boundary. It is unclear what type or volume of material would be deposited here and what impact this would have upon the topography of the fields. However, given the existing topography it is considered likely that development associated with depositing spoil could create obvious changes to the landform and potentially harm the landscape of the National Park.
68. The application proposes extensions to the stone barn to provide the majority of the proposed residential accommodation. The design approach and location of the proposed extensions are significantly different to those approved in 2016 and more similar to the scheme, which was refused planning permission in 2019. We have significant concerns about the scale of the extensions, their visual impact, design and impact upon the historic relationship of the site with Nether Cottage and its setting.
69. The proposed extensions would form a substantial two storey 'L' shape range to the rear of the barn, which in terms of volume and footprint would be significantly larger than the existing stone barn. The proposed extensions would be visually prominent from the lane and from the public footpath adjacent to the site and affect the setting of Nether Cottage.
70. The formation of an 'L' shape range would also erode the historic relationship between the site and the adjacent Nether Cottage by introducing a range of buildings that do not relate well to the historic functional relationship between the two sites and by introducing a new built form that would erode that character.
71. The form and character of the proposed extensions would also introduce domestic window and door fenestration which would be alien in character to both the stone barn and the adjacent Nether Cottage.
72. The footprint of the extensions is similar to that approved in 2016; however, the design of the extensions approved in 2016 take advantage of the ground levels of the site by taking a 'non-building' approach for the majority of the extensions. This effectively hid the mass and volume of the extensions leaving the stone barn to remain the dominant building on the site and without affecting or eroding the historic functional relationship with Nether Cottage.
73. The 2016 scheme therefore would have a much less significant visual and landscape impact compared to the proposed development.

74. We therefore consider that the proposed development would be of an inappropriate scale, siting and design and would harm the stone barn and the site and the setting of Nether Cottage. The proposed development would result in the replacement of one inappropriate form of development (the existing dilapidated agricultural buildings) with another. The scheme would also harm the existing barn by raising its height and altering its traditional form and massing.
75. Therefore, the development would not achieve the conservation or enhancement of the building or its setting and is contrary to our housing and conservation policies.
76. There are no objections in principle to an alternative scheme of extensions, however it is critical that any scheme retains the stone barn as the dominant building and conserves its historic relationship with Nether Cottage and its setting.
77. There is no evidence that the current proposals are the only means of creating a market dwelling on this site or achieving the enhancement that would result from the demolition of the dilapidated agricultural buildings.

Impact upon amenity of neighbouring properties

78. The nearest residential property to the site is Nether Cottage (the grade II listed property described as Shatton Cottage). This property is located to the northern boundary of the site and the principal elevation of that property faces south towards the application site. Nether Cottage is set at a lower level than the application site with its access, parking area and front garden located between the cottage and the application site.
79. The proposed extensions would face towards Nether Cottage at a distance of 18m. The elevation facing towards Nether Cottage would be blank other than the ground floor glazed link and two roof lights. Given the relatively blank fenestration of this elevation, there are no concerns that occupants of the development would overlook Nether Cottage. Given the orientation and facing distance there are also no concerns that the development would result in any significant loss of daylight, sunlight or be overbearing.
80. The proposals would therefore not harm the amenity, security or privacy of any neighbouring property.

Other issues

81. The scheme would retain both access points and proposes to create a third access point into the fields to the south of the site. The 2016 scheme proposed to close the southernmost access with a new stone wall and retained the northern access point, which continued into the fields.
82. The Highway Authority raise no objection to retaining the southern access if there is sufficient space within the site for vehicles to park and turn. The Highway Authority do however recommend that if the southern access is to be retained that the northern access is permanently closed.
83. Therefore, there is no objection in principle to retention of either the northern or the southern access if the other is closed. This has been discussed with the agent but the most recent drawings retain both access points.
84. We consider that the highway issues can be resolved in principle with the imposition of planning conditions to specify alterations and agreement / implementation of vehicular access along with other conditions recommended by the Highway Authority. Therefore, we agree with the Highway Authority that in principle the development would not harm highway safety and be in accordance with DMT3 and DMT8 in this respect.

85. There is no evidence to indicate that the development would impact upon protected species bearing in mind that the stone barn has been recently re-built. Therefore if permission was granted similar conditions would be recommended as previously in respects of avoiding the breeding bird season and incorporating habitat enhancements.
86. The amended plans show that the scheme would incorporate a ground source heat pump, solar photovoltaic panels and electric vehicle charge points. The application also proposes to retain spoil on site where appropriate.
87. The proposed heat pump, solar panels and charge points are welcomed as these would reduce energy consumption related to heating, hot water and electricity and significantly reduce carbon emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change. We also welcome charge points as a means of encouraging and providing infrastructure to accelerate the uptake of electric vehicles. The retention of spoil on site is acceptable in principle if spoil does not harm the landscape or the environment.
88. The details also indicate that groundwater and rainwater harvesting would be utilised as part of a grey water system. This is welcomed in principle if full details were approved and implemented.

Conclusion

89. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings and would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Nether Cottage contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 and HC1; Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10; the Authority's adopted design guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
90. The proposed development would not harm amenity, highway safety or the biodiversity of the National Park; however, these issues do not offset or outweigh the other impacts of the development. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan and having taken into account all other material considerations accordingly the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

92. Nil

Report Author: Adam Maxwell, Senior Planner