

7. FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF OUTBUILDINGS TO DWELLING AND FORMATION OF RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE AND USE OF EXISTING FARMHOUSE. REPLACEMENT OF PORCH WITH GLAZED LINK FROM THE FARMHOUSE TO THE OUTBUILDINGS, EXTENSION AND ALTERATION OF THE OUTBUILDINGS INCLUDING REPLACEMENT OF THE NISSEN HUT TO FORM A FAMILY HOME. REPLACEMENT OF THE STABLES. AT WRIGHTS FARM, CLAYHOLES ROAD, KETTLESHULME (NP/CEC/0522/0645 SPW)

APPLICANT: MR MARK HEYES

Summary

1. The proposal would create a new dwelling via extending and altering the existing outbuildings on the site. This is contrary to the policies of the development plan because this would harm the character, appearance and significance of these heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to the policies of the development plan which relate to heritage assets and those which relate to new housing. In addition the existing dwelling on the site is proposed to become a residential annexe ancillary to the proposed new dwelling. Having assessed the nature, scale and function of the proposed residential annexe it is concluded it would be an independent dwelling and therefore contrary to the policies of the development plan and the Supplementary Planning Document which deals with residential annexes. Also, it is harmful to the significance of the listed building for the existing dwelling to lose its rank and role on the site as the dominant farmhouse.
2. There are other issues with the proposal including that the proposed stable will harm the setting of the listed buildings, as would the proposed curtilage. The current proposed plans raise ambiguity over the accuracy of the drawings and have text which is illegible. They also lack detail on matters like what impact the pipework for the ground source heat pump would have and where the groundworks for the ground source heat pump would be located. None of these matters can be satisfactorily resolved through conditions

Site and Surroundings

3. Wrights Farm is a grade II Listed farmhouse located in the open countryside on rising ground some 690m to the south east of Kettleishulme village. Access is via an unmade steep drive off Clayholes Lane which lies some 60m to the east. The nearest dwelling is Needham Farm 100m to the south east on Clayholes Lane and Lords Clough Farm 130m to the south. This is a pastoral, gently undulating and open landscape, mostly improved or semi-improved permanent pasture with sheep and cattle grazing and some rough grazing. Settlement tends to consist of isolated gritstone farmsteads with stone slate roofs often dating from the time that the landscape was enclosed from the 18th century Drystone gritstone walls enclose most fields.
4. The farmstead has been sold recently and comprises the farmhouse, a range of traditional but dilapidated outbuildings which are curtilage listed and a modern mono-pitched roof shed/stable building with corrugated roof along with three adjoining fields totalling just under 7 acres. A further Grade II listed traditional stone barn, which lies immediately to the north of the outbuildings was formerly part of the farmstead grouping but was not sold to the current applicants. A new wall erected without planning permission now divides this from the applicant's land holding.
5. A public footpath runs north-south through the farmyard, another runs east-west immediately south of the applicant's landholding with a further footpath running east-west through the applicant's field to the west of the adjacent listed barn.

6. The site carries a Historic Buildings and Scheduled Monuments Record (HBSMR).
7. The house is built of natural gritstone and has a gritstone slate roof, with the walls appearing to have had their render removed recently. The former dairy is attached to the north gable of the house with no internal access through to the house. This was the old dairy and currently has no roof.
8. Most of a further lean-to porch extension over the original front door has been removed which has revealed an external view of the original front door and its attractive stone surrounds. Over the front door at first floor level is an unusual 3 light window with stone mullion.
9. Within the house there are features including the butter churning wheel and a cellar with a vaulted ceiling.
10. Most of the outbuildings are built of stone with a natural gritstone slate roof. They appear to be in a perilous state of repair. Much of the roof is missing and the stonework appears to have deteriorated significantly. The gable end facing the house appears to have no pointing left and has significant cracks potentially indicating structural issues. Much of the rear of another part of this group has fallen away.
11. Within the yard and opposite the main stone outbuildings there is also a brick built outbuilding with mono pitched roof. This is clearly of less significance than the other stone built outbuildings and not covered by the listing due to its apparent age (see our archaeologist's comments on the published file). It is relatively discreet when viewed from Clayholes Road as the level of the land behind the building is higher and therefore from Clayholes Road only the roof can be seen.
12. The range of stone built agricultural outbuildings are (repair issues aside) attractive and contribute positively to the character, appearance and setting of the farm house and the farmstead in general. Their scale, form and variation in depth and roofline are important characteristics of the group.
13. There is also a Nissen hut to the west of the outbuildings which detracts from the character of the group and is not covered by the listing (see our archaeologist's comments). The site is open to view in the landscape from close, medium and long distances.
14. To the west and down the hillside a short distance from the farmstead there are two ponds, the largest of which has undergone recent significant engineering operations. These lie outside the application site area and have been reported to our Monitoring and Enforcement team to investigate separately.
15. At present the applicants are living on site in a caravan whilst works are underway on the existing house.

Proposal

16. The development description is not clear. This is because it does not explicitly state what the existing house would be used for. Officers can use the plans and Design and Access Statement to better understand the proposal and although a single family home is mooted for the entire unit the plans clearly show that there would be in effect two distinct dwellings linked by a glazed link. Using the information about the proposal set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement and also taking into account the applicants aim to keep the site operating as a single family home, mean that in planning terms the proposal must therefore be for a new dwelling with ancillary residential annexe in the existing farmhouse (residential annexes are also known as ancillary dwellings).

17. The proposal includes a change of use to create a new dwelling and for the existing dwelling to become a residential annexe ancillary to the new dwelling. The new dwelling is formed by alteration and extension of the outbuildings to form living accommodation comprising living room, dining kitchen, master bedroom with en-suite and walk in wardrobe, 2 further bedrooms an entrance hall, pantry and bootroom with WC and Shower.
18. The proposal also includes alteration and extension to the farmhouse including removal of the remnants of the dilapidated porch and replacement with a glazed link to the outbuildings (the proposed new living accommodation). Reinstatement of a lime render is also proposed to the North, South and East elevations of the farmhouse.
19. A replacement stable building is also proposed. This would be on the same site as the existing monopitched building but would be wider and taller than the building it replaces and has a dual pitched roof made of corrugated metal with front and side walls in stone.
20. The access track is proposed to be widened to 5.5m, the 1:500 existing site plan is not easily able to be scaled off as there is no scale bar and the stated scale does not work. Based on the plans officers have, the width of the existing access appears to be approximately 4.2m, so the proposal would increase the width of the access track by approximately 1.3m. A new parking area was proposed off the top of the access track in the field close to Clayholes Lane, however the amended plans now omit the parking area replacing it with a bin store.
21. There are internal works also proposed to the house but these are covered by the corresponding application for Listed Building Consent.
22. As submitted the development description read as follows -. 'Renovation of the farmhouse, glass linking to change of use of the outbuildings and replacement of the Nissen hut to ensure protection of the heritage and the farms long term viability. Rebuilding of the stables in keeping materials at a standard size to better support the viability of the land'.
23. The amended description used in the title of this report is a compromise between one officers have suggested in an attempt to establish clarity and what the applicant has been willing to change the description to. This amended development description was agreed with the applicant on 26 September 2022.
24. The application is supported by a Heritage Statement (and supplements) and supplementary archaeological statement, a protected species report, a Design and Access Statement, a surveyor's appraisal of future farm options, a sustainability statement and a Structural Report for the conversion as well as the construction of the glazed link.
25. The applicants have also submitted a collection of comments from 9 properties in support of their proposal. These state there is no problem with the proposal and that it would be an improvement and sympathetic to the locality.

RECOMMENDATION:

26. **That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons -**

- 1. The scale, massing and detailed design of the proposal is unacceptable and does not follow the advice of the SPD Design Guide or Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD. It significantly extends and alters the outbuildings, harming their form and character and would lose the positive contribution these buildings have as part of the group of listed buildings. The proposal is therefore not achieving the conservation or enhancement requirements of GSP2, HC1 or DMC10 to allow for market housing. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of these buildings and their immediate setting and therefore harm the significance of these heritage assets and the valued characteristics of the local landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP2, GSP3, HC1, L1, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 and DMC10 and the NPPF.**
- 2. The proposal by virtue of its scale, massing and detailed design would harm the character, appearance and significance of the heritage assets and their setting, by reducing the rank, role and historic function of the existing dwelling to a residential annexe ancillary to the proposed new dwelling. The glazed link would also fail to enhance the significance of the site and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance and significance of the dwelling and outbuildings. The proposed stables will also detract from the setting of the listed buildings. The proposed alterations at the top of the track and widening of the access would represent an unfortunate and unnecessary domestic intrusion into the landscape as would a new domestic curtilage to the west of the outbuildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10 and the NPPF.**
- 3. Given the scale and nature of the proposed residential annexe (the existing farmhouse) and its relationship and arrangements with/ to the proposed new dwelling it would actually form a separate planning unit with a lawful use as an independent dwelling house. The proposal is therefore contrary to Development Management Policy DMH5 and the Authority's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Annexes'.**
- 4. Inadequate and inaccurate plans have been submitted to be certain of the extent of the proposal or be able to fully ascertain the impact on the listed buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3, and Development Management Policies DMC5, DMC7 and the NPPF.**

Key Issues

27. The key issues are:
28. Design, impact on the character and appearance of the buildings and their setting and also the impact on the significance of these heritage assets.
29. Is the proposal for conversion and extension of the outbuildings to form a new dwelling acceptable?
30. Is the existing dwelling suitable for use as proposed as a residential annexe ancillary to the proposed new dwelling? Does it meet the requirements of DMH5 and the Residential Annexes SPD?
31. Are the stables desirable or necessary in the interests of the setting of the listed building?

History

32. 2019 - Enforcement 19/0176 Informal enforcement enquiry in relation to unauthorised satellite dish, replacement door and windows, and possibly other works.
33. 2020 - Many enquiries in relation to the site as it was for sale. Enquiry 38221 (2020) advised a potential purchaser that a new dwelling to replace the Nissen hut would not be acceptable. The applicants were advised in enquiry 40827 that the then proposed alterations and extensions to the northwest outbuildings would have a considerable detrimental impact on these outbuildings, the principal listed building and the farmstead.
34. 2021 - Enquiry 42473 – Advised that impact on significance is key and careful design advice given in relation to the glazed link and that any replacement for the Nissen hut should be subservient and in matching materials.

Consultations

35. Cheshire East Council - Highways – No objections but concerned that the position of the proposed access track gates in relation to the new car parking spaces may result in vehicles being reversed into Clayholes Road if the gates are closed. The position of the car parking gates would also make access and egress difficult. A revised layout should be provided with the access track gates positioned at least 5.0m further down the track from the nearest car parking space.
36. Cheshire East Council – Rights of Way Team - The property is adjacent to public footpath Kettlethulme No. 9 as recorded on the Definitive Map held at this office (working copy extract enclosed). It appears unlikely that the proposal would affect the public right of way, although the PROW Unit would expect the planning department to add an advice note to any planning consent to ensure that developers are aware of their obligations as follows:
 - No building materials must be stored on the right of way
 - Vehicle movements must be arranged so as not to interfere with the public's use of the way
 - The safety of members of the public using the right of way must be ensured at all times
 - No additional barriers (e.g. gates) are to be placed across the right of way
 - There must be no diminution in the width of the right of way available for use by members of the public
 - No damage or alteration must be caused to the surface of the right of way
 - Wildlife mitigation fencing must not be placed across the right of way

Please note the Definitive Map is a minimum record of public rights of way and consequently does not preclude the possibility that public rights of way exist which have not been recorded, and of which we are not aware. There is also a possibility that higher rights than those recorded may exist over routes shown as public footpaths and bridleways.

37. Natural England – No response to date.
38. PDNPA – Ecology – No objections subject to conditions
Carry out mitigation works to protect bats under licence from Natural England.
Creation of three permanent bat roost features in the fabric of the renovated buildings.
Check the Brick Range / Stables for bat roost potential and nesting birds.
39. PDNPA – Built Environment – detailed comments are available on the electronic file.

40. Essentially there is insufficient information to be able to fully assess the impact of the proposals and some elements particularly the alterations and extensions to the outbuildings are harmful therefore the impact can not be mitigated.
41. The existing outbuildings have a varied roof profile that is part of their character and appearance. The roofline over the proposed pantry and glazed entrance link should be reconsidered to retain the varying rooflines, and therefore the character and appearance. The proposed roofline has a negative impact on the significance of the outbuildings. And a structural survey is also needed to establish the buildings suitability for conversion and identify any strengthening and rebuild that could impact the significance of the outbuildings.
42. The rebuild of an early 20th century part of the outbuildings is based on conjecture. Also the replacement for the Nissen hut needs to be subservient, but instead is large, particularly when considered against the size of the small outbuildings, the roofline is not much lower than the outbuildings and therefore for these reasons it has a negative impact on the outbuildings. Its openings to the west are large and glazed with timber sliding doors, appearing large and dominant to the elevation.
43. Additional comments have been received from our conservation officers following receipt of amended plans and supporting information. These set out the following – Some of the points have been addressed with the plans dated 21/09/22, however some remain unaddressed. This should be read in addition to the previous comments submitted. A number of the new plans for the current proposals are blurred. Clear, in focus versions should be submitted to provide full clarification for the application and decision.
44. Glazed link - Additional information has been provided on the glazed link with structural calculations prepared, however the details required have not been provided. Epoxy Resin has been identified within the structural calculations document, however it has not been defined how this will be used and clearly identified on the drawings required.
45. *An example of the type of drawings and fittings for a glazed link can be found on the proposed details drawings for approved application NP/DDD/1221/1349. These fixings have limited impact on the historic fabric, therefore limiting the impact the link has, they can also be removed with only limited repair required.*
46. Windows - *The drawings have been resubmitted, but are blurred. It appears that they are now with the horns removed, the designs of the windows are therefore acceptable. As above a clear version should be submitted to provide full clarification for the application and decision.*
47. Internal Works - *New drawings have been submitted to show how the re-use of cupboard from the Living Room has been provided. These are to be located either side of the chimney breast on the Landing, this appears to impact on the visibility of the butter churn wheel shown on the proposed first floor plan. If the cupboard does obscure the butter churn wheel then this is a negative harm to a historic feature of the listed building and the cupboard location would be unsuitable. A clear drawing showing the cupboard and its relationship to the butter wheel would be required for an informed decision to be made. The drawing also notes proposed additional work to insert a fireplace within the chimney breast, also to widen the chimney breast to accommodate the new fireplace. This would need drawings of the fireplace to be reinstated, this could be conditioned.*
48. *The drawings of the partition and replacement doors are acceptable.*
49. *The proposal to remove the ceilings in the Bathroom and Bedroom have been assessed by the Heritage Consultants as appropriate to the building, this is acceptable.*

50. *There is only a note on the plan to describe the route of the SVP, and this appears to affect a historic feature i.e. through the stone flag in front of the fireplace. This would not be appropriate as it would damage the historic fireplace. Drawings as requested should be provided and the route should not affect historic features.*
51. External Works -*Historic rainwater goods should be traditional material, and for this property Cast Iron, modern alternatives are not suitable for listed buildings. This is standard policy for the National Park Authority to use the traditional materials for rainwater goods on listed buildings, not materials that give an impression of a traditional material.*
52. Conversion - *A structural survey has been provided that identifies the likelihood of some rebuilding of the length of the rear walls of the outbuildings. The full extent would not be known until works commence. If this fits within the planning policies then the extent and method for rebuild should be conditioned to ensure the historic fabric is retained in-situ as far as possible.*
53. *The timber door in the glazed link in front of the means the pantry remains partially obscured and my previous comments regarding this remain.*
54. *The drawing showing the roof insulation is acceptable and therefore not required as a condition.*
55. *The internal joinery has been confirmed as only the doors and therefore I am not concerned about inappropriate joinery. The floor slab scaled drawings will be required and can be conditioned, the proposed ground floor plan now also notes the use of underfloor heating.*
56. *The windows remain as top openers so my previous comments remain.*
57. Early C20th Rebuild - *The additional information from Jessops considers the contribution the reinstatement of the building would make to the overall farmstead, assessed as an enhancement. This addresses the question on the quality and contribution the building made to the farmstead however having now seen building 5 is shown prior to demolition (plate 1.19) this is questionable as the building would not have made that much of a contribution to the farmstead.*
58. New build on site of nissen hut - *The scale of the building and roofline remains the same so previous comments on the subservience remain. There have been some amendments regarding the open timber doors so the dominance of these with the large openings have been slightly reduced.*
59. Heating proposals
60. *A small note has been made on the proposed ground floor drawing to say that a ground source heat pump is to be used and the plant required is to be located in the pantry, the most historic part of the outbuildings. Plans would be required to show the route of the pipework around the building and into the building, this could be through the historic fabric. Is the pantry then most appropriate part of the building for the plant to be located? Also where is the ground source heat pump to be located?*
61. Site Plan
- On the site plan a patio is marked below the nissen hut rebuild, this appears to encroach into the field. This will domesticate the area, rather than retain the agricultural nature of the farmstead.*

62. PDNPA Archaeology – It is not currently possible to make a recommendation on the impact of the proposal on the buried archaeology. Additional information on the potential for buried archaeology via a map regression and consideration of the proposed works should enable this to be considered. The impact of the proposed development on the upstanding heritage should consider comments from a conservation officer.
63. As a designated heritage asset a balanced planning decision needs to be made that has regard to the significance of the heritage asset and the scale of any harm or loss to its significance (NPPF para.203). It is not currently possible to assess the impact of the development and it should not be approved at this stage. Updated comments were received from the applicant's archaeological consultants in relation to buried archaeology and PDNPA archaeologists have responded explaining that if the scheme were approved then a written scheme of investigation for the buried archaeology would be needed.
64. Kettleshulme Parish Council – No objections

Representations

65. No representations have been received.

Main Policies

66. Relevant Core Strategy policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, HC1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC2.
67. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12, DMH5, DMH11, DMR4.

National Planning Policy Framework

68. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in 2021. 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 development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. 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.
69. 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.'
70. Para 194 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.

71. Para 197 In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
72. Para 199 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.
73. Para 201 Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply: a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
74. Para 202 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.
75. Para 180 When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
- a. if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
 - b. development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Core Strategy

76. 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.

77. Policy GSP2 says that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon, and opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings.
78. 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.
79. 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.
80. L3 deals with heritage assets including Conservation Areas, the setting of listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments and requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of the heritage assets and their settings. Other than in exceptional circumstances development is not permitted that is likely harm the significance of a heritage asset.
81. HC1 deals with new housing and has provision for conversion of listed buildings to open market dwellings as an exception where it is required for the building's conservation or enhancement.

Development management policies

82. DMC3 Siting, design, layout and landscaping-
 - A. 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.
 - B. Particular attention will be paid to:
 - (i) siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing buildings, settlement form and character, including impact on open spaces, landscape features and the wider landscape setting which contribute to the valued character and appearance of the area; and
 - (ii) the degree to which buildings and their design, details, materials and finishes reflect or complement the style and traditions of the locality as well as other valued characteristics of the area such as the character of the historic landscape and varied biodiversity assets; and
 - (iii) the use and maintenance of landscaping to enhance new development, and the degree to which this makes use of local features, colours, and boundary treatments and an appropriate mix of species suited to both the landscape and biodiversity interests of the locality; and
 - (iv) access, utility services, vehicle parking, siting of services, refuse bins and cycle storage; and
 - (v) flood risk, water conservation and sustainable drainage; and
 - (vi) the detailed design of existing buildings, where ancillary buildings, extensions or alterations are proposed; and
 - (vii) amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties that the development affects; and

- (viii) the accessibility or the impact on accessibility of the development; and
- (ix) visual context provided by the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, strategic, local and other specific views including skylines; and
- (x) the principles embedded in the design related Supplementary Planning Documents and related technical guides.

83. DMC5 Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.

A.Planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate: (i) its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.

B.The supporting evidence must be proportionate to the significance of the asset. It may be included as part of a Heritage Statement or Design and Access Statement where relevant.

C.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.

D.Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments will be considered in accordance with policies for designated heritage assets.

E.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.

F.Development of a designated or non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), unless:
(i) for designated heritage assets, clear and convincing justification is provided, to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the:
a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
(ii) for non-designated heritage assets, the development is considered by the Authority to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.

84. DMC7 Listed Buildings

A.Planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate:

- (i) how their significance will be preserved; and
- (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.

B. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building and its setting and any curtilage listed features.

C. Development will not be permitted if it would:

- (i) adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of, or materials used in the Listed Building; or
- (ii) result in the loss of or irrevocable change to original features or other features of importance or interest.

- D. In particular, development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to:
- (i) removal of original walls, stairs, or entrances, or subdivision of large interior spaces;
 - (ii) removal, alteration or unnecessary replacement of structural elements including walls, roof structures, beams and floors;
 - (iii) the unnecessary removal, alteration or replacement of features such as windows, doors, fireplaces and plasterwork;
 - (iv) the loss of curtilage features which complement the character and appearance of the Listed Building (e.g. boundary walls, railings or gates);
 - (v) repairs or alterations involving materials, techniques and detailing inappropriate to a Listed Building;
 - (vi) the replacement of traditional features other than with like for like, authentic or original materials and using appropriate techniques;
 - (vii) extensions to the front of Listed Buildings;
 - (viii) extensions of more than one storey to the rear of listed small houses or terraced properties;
 - (ix) inappropriate impact on the setting of the Listed Building.

Unless justified to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the proposed changes, loss or irreversible damage, and/or addition of new features to the Listed Building and its setting are:

- a) less than substantial in terms of impact on the character and significance of the Listed Building and its setting; and
- b) off-set by the public benefit from making the changes, including enabling optimum viable use, and net enhancement to the Listed Building and its setting.

E. 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.

85. DMC10 Conversion of a heritage asset

A. 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 tranquility, dark skies or other valued characteristics.

B. 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 nondesignated 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.

C. In all cases attention will be paid to the impact of domestication and urbanisation brought about by the use on landscape character and the built environment including:

- (i) the supply of utility and infrastructure services, including electricity, water and waste disposal to support residential use;
- (ii) the provision of safe vehicular access;
- (iii) the provision of adequate amenity space and parking;
- (iv) the introduction of a domestic curtilage;
- (v) the alteration of agricultural land and field walls;
- (vi) any other engineering operation associated with the development

86. DMH5 - Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing dwellings by conversion or new build

87. A. The conversion of an outbuilding close to a dwelling, to ancillary dwelling use will be permitted provided that:

- (i) it would not result in an over-intensive use of the property, an inadequate standard of accommodation or amenity space, or create a planning need for over intensive development of the property at a later date through demand for further outbuildings; and
- (ii) the site can meet the parking and access requirements of the proposed development; and
- (iii) the new accommodation provided would remain within the curtilage of the main house, accessed via the same access route, sharing services and utilities, and remain under the control of the occupier of the main dwelling.

B. Where no buildings are suitable for conversion, a new build ancillary dwelling unit will be permitted provided that it:

- (i) is within the existing building group; and
- (ii) is subsidiary in physical size to the main house; and
- (iii) is of an appropriate design and materials that complement the existing building group; and
- (iv) is able to be located in such a way that any heritage significance of the existing building group is conserved or enhanced by the new building; and
- (v) is able to be located in such a way that the wider landscape setting of the building group is conserved or enhanced by the new building; and
- (vi) does not require new access points and tracks from highway to building or new services and utilities infrastructure; and
- (vii) can be contained within a single planning unit by condition.

C. For proposals under A or B, where it is not possible to secure its ancillary status in perpetuity by planning condition, the ancillary accommodation will be tied to the main dwelling by way of a Section 106 Agreement

88. DMH11 Section 106 Agreements

Section 106 Agreements will be applied to housing developments as follows-

Ancillary accommodation

F. Where planning conditions cannot achieve the desired outcome of tying properties together, the ancillary accommodation, whether achieved by extension, conversion, or new build will be tied to the main property by legal agreement.

G. Variation to the requirements of a Section 106 Agreement may be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the proposed new use of the ancillary accommodation is in accordance with other policies of this Plan relating for example to holiday accommodation use or essential worker use.

H. Removal of a Section 106 Agreement to remove the ancillary status of accommodation will not normally be permitted.

89. In summary the development management policies require a high standard of design (DMC3), they require a heritage assets significance to be identified and conserved or enhanced (DMC5), Conversion to a dwelling to be necessary for the conservation and enhancement of a listed building and development that harmed the significance of a listed building or its setting would not be permitted (DMC7).
90. The Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) the 'Design Guide' and 'Conversion of Historic Buildings' are both relevant.
91. Para 8.3 of the Design Guide states - The building in question should be of sufficient historic or architectural merit to warrant its conversion. Planning permission is needed for a change of use. Factors such as location, size and character of the building and its means of access will all be assessed. The guiding principle behind the design of any conversion should be that the character of the original building and its setting should be respected and retained. This means that in most cases the barn or the mill or the chapel should afterwards look like a converted barn, mill or chapel, and not like a new house or a new block of flats. When converting traditional buildings, new uses should not require the construction of extensions or ancillary buildings
92. Our SPD 'Residential Annexes' is also relevant to this proposal.

Assessment

93. As submitted the proposal was unclear and has caused some significant concerns with the quality of the application. The lack of clarity about the proposal comes from a development description and a design and access statement which did not state clearly what the proposed change of use was to.
94. Officers have to consider a specific proposal and the one which is the best fit to their reported desires for the property is to create a new dwelling in the proposed conversion and extension of the outbuildings and for the listed farmhouse to become a residential annexe ancillary to the new dwelling. So the most relevant policy for the proposed principle of the new dwelling is Core Strategy Policy HC1 and Development Management Policy DMC10 and for the ancillary residential annexe its policy DMH5.
95. An amended development description has been agreed with the applicant, which is not as suggested by the Authority but is instead a compromise. This has required the report to provide further explanation in the proposal section to understand the proposal in planning terms.

The proposed new dwelling via conversion and extension of the outbuildings including demolition of the Nissen hut.

96. The outbuildings which the proposal seeks to convert to a dwelling are of great character and contribute positively to the character and appearance and significance of the listed building and its setting. In their existing form the buildings are worthy of conversion. The outbuildings are also widely open to public view from the local footpaths and highways in both immediate and distant vantage points and are a key aspect of the group of buildings comprising the farmhouse and its attractive outbuildings. The internal floorspace of the buildings which are worthy of conversion is approximately 57m² (which for comparison purposes would equate to a 2 bedroom affordable dwelling under our policies) .

97. The outbuildings are protected by the listing of the farm house as 'curtilage listed buildings'. Therefore HC1C(i) is relevant and does have provision for conversion to a dwelling where in accordance with GSP2, it is required for the building's conservation and enhancement. Policy DMC10 amongst other things, also allows for the conversion provided 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, doorways and major rebuilding) and the building is capable of conversion. DMC10 would only permit conversion to a dwelling where 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.
98. The state of repair of the outbuildings appears perilous. The roof has collapsed in parts and the rear walls have come away in parts. Also the gable end facing the house has cracks and other structural signs of concern. Officers therefore asked the applicant for a conservation led structural survey/report to establish what extent of rebuilding will be required. Essentially this is required to establish if the buildings are capable of conversion and to clearly show on the plans which parts of the historic fabric of the buildings would be retained.
99. This has now been provided and it shows that the rear wall of the outbuildings will need some extent of rebuilding but that extent is not known until works are underway. Our conservation officers have advised that a planning condition would be needed to agree the exact method and extent of rebuilding with the objective being to retain as much historic fabric in-situ as possible. Despite the building's perilous appearance, the structural survey has proven that the buildings can be converted without entirely rebuilding them and a planning condition would also be able to ensure that there is no rebuilding other than shown on plan 22-112-3.
100. The application proposes that the new dwelling would be formed via the alteration and significant extension of the outbuildings following the removal of the Nissen hut. The resultant building would lose the character and attractive appearance of the existing traditional buildings. In particular their existing scale, form and massing and variations in roof line and depth of frontage would be lost and there would be many large shuttered openings to replace the existing. The package of alterations would change the appearance of the buildings significantly, and as a result their character, charm and the positive contribution they make to the character and significance of the heritage asset would be lost. This is corroborated by our Conservation officer's consultation response.
101. In the heritage justification an argument for allowing the extension to the northern end of the range of traditional outbuildings is promoted on the basis of it replacing a previously demolished building. The demolished building is referred to as building 5, and it states no remains of building 5 survive. Whilst the heritage report identifies the proposal to extend the outbuildings on the footprint of building 5 as an enhancement, officers disagree strongly and find the proposed extension to be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the existing outbuildings as set out in the above paragraph.
102. The heritage justification for this extension is considered to be tenuous. This is because the absent building 5 is 20th century (was built between the productions of the 1924 and 1948 OS maps) and has been identified of no heritage value in itself, low quality, with corrugated roof, open front and timber frame and sides. The photograph of the building at appendix 1.19 of the Heritage Statement shows that it detracted from the character appearance and setting of the listed buildings. In the heritage statement some value has been given to its rear (western) wall which was built of stone, because it may have incorporated some historic fabric from a boundary wall which provided enclosure to the yard. The value the heritage statement gives to the proposed extension is that it serves to provide similar enclosure. Officers argue that this has long gone and could be achieved

by other more authentic means, such as by simply reinstating a boundary wall. Officers therefore do not find this justification for the extension compelling and more importantly that it does not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the existing outbuilding that officers have already identified.

103. Whilst removal of the Nissen hut is positive, its replacement is not. It will essentially double the scale of the outbuildings and in addition to their unacceptable extended form will also present large openings to the open countryside. The Nissen hut has come to the end of its useful life and is clearly no longer required for its original agricultural purpose. Our policies do not support the retention of such buildings for non agricultural uses and as a building which detracts from the site and the landscape setting the normal presumption is that they be removed to enhance the site and landscape by returning the site to its former condition. In this case that would open up views of the traditional outbuildings and enhanced their legibility in the role they play in the layout of this historic farmstead, their relationship to the listed house and their setting within the local landscape. Therefore at the pre-application stage officers had envisaged the Nissen hut being removed and if it were to be replaced then this would need to be by something that was truly subordinate to the existing outbuilding. However this proposal is far from that vision.
104. To add some context to the scale of change; the outbuildings of heritage value which are worthy of conversion in terms of their character and appearance are approximately 57m² and the proposed dwelling is approximately 270m². There is a significant amount of extension and alterations being proposed and for the reasons described earlier alongside the objections over the scale, its design is also considered to be poor. As a result of this it is insensitive and harmful to character and appearance of the listed buildings.
105. The pre-application advice has resulted in a design that has shown some sensitivity to retaining historic fabric internally and used glazing to leave the oldest part of the outbuilding legible. Our conservation officers have recognised this, but it is not enough to conserve the valued characteristics of these outbuildings and their significance as part of the group and its relationship to the farmhouse. The proposal is not successful in conserving or enhancing the building due to the aforementioned issues. Therefore the proposal by virtue of its design is found to harm the character appearance and significance of the heritage assets and therefore the proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP2, GSP3, HC1 and DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10.
106. The glazed link, between the house and the outbuildings (proposed for conversion to dwelling) does have a negative impact on the significance of the principal and curtilage listed buildings. This affects the plan form of the buildings and the legibility of the site as a small farmstead, as well as the character and appearance of the farmhouse. It also loses an opportunity to achieve significant enhancement to the appearance and significance of the farmhouse by revealing the original front door and its attractive full surround which highlights its importance and status as the principal entrance into the listed farmhouse. Specifically, the size/form of the link provides a room by covering the whole courtyard and then has a glazed corridor off that to link to the outbuildings. Officers consider any link needs to avoid this harm to the main entrance, be more discreet and minimal rather than forming the additional room as proposed.
107. A structural report has been submitted which provides calculations for the glazed link and explains it will be fixed to the stonework using an epoxy resin. Our Conservation Officers have not been able to support this method, as it has not been defined how it will be used nor is it clearly identified on the drawings.
108. As submitted there was nothing in the application which showed clearly where the extent of the domestic curtilage would be for the proposed dwelling.

109. The extension to the rear of the outbuildings, which replaces the Nissen hut, has openings from the living room and master bedroom from the west elevation which provide access via patio doors out onto the fields to the west. Officers have now received an amended plan which shows the curtilage being extended to the west with a patio area, it does not have any details of the proposed boundary treatments. Despite our advice that it would be harmful to the character, appearance and setting of the listed buildings and the local landscape to extend or provide domestic curtilage west of the buildings, this is now what is clearly proposed in the amended plans, and it would result in the aforementioned harm.
110. During the application process officers have received amended plans to show the extension to the north of the outbuildings forming a bedroom rather than a garage. This includes alterations to its front elevation to the proposed openings and to the rear as a frameless glass lean to extends to its rear.
111. These amendments have not been submitted at the Authority's request and just serve to exacerbate the adverse impact of the proposal would have, in either form, in diminishing the dominance and rank of the original dwelling, demoting its function to an ancillary dwelling. This is considered to be harmful to the listed buildings significance and therefore contrary to LC3, DMC7, DMC10 and HC1.
112. Officers have also received a set of amended plans from the replacement planning agent. These include alterations to the fenestration on the west facing elevation of the new dwelling. The alteration shows a hit and miss timber detailing to openings using oak. This idea came from a meeting with the applicant in September 2022 but their interpretation of this detail is not as officers described. Essentially any hit and miss detail to openings should be recessed within the opening itself and not used as an external cladding which over-sails the opening itself. Whilst officers had advised that a hit and miss detail could improve one detailed design aspect of the scheme, it wouldn't make the development acceptable.
113. The quality of the current set of amended plans is also poor. Officers have received drawings upon which text is illegible, including on the elevations and detailed window drawings. Officers also have no confidence that the plans are to scale as the length of the outbuildings differs between the original submission and the current set by as much as 1.33m. The plans are therefore inadequate and inaccurate, would likely cause difficulties if enforcement were necessary, and this inaccuracy is wholly unacceptable when considering the proposal relates to listed buildings.
114. It is also noted that if it were claimed that the proposed conversion and extension of the outbuildings is for an ancillary dwelling, its size (269m²) is such that it is tantamount to a new independent dwelling and must be treated as such under the relevant housing and design policies (as stated at para 5.5 of the SPD (PDNPA, Residential Annexes SPD, 2021).
115. Considering the above as the proposal would harm the character, appearance and significance of the listed buildings in which it would be created the principle is unacceptable and Contrary to HC1 and DMC10.
116. The proposal to convert the existing dwelling into a residential annexe which is ancillary to the proposed new dwelling
117. The proposed switch in roles would ensure that there would remain a single unrestricted open market dwelling on the site with the existing farmhouse becoming a residential annexe ancillary to the existing dwelling. It could overcome any amenity issues having two dwellings on the site could otherwise have, due to shared parking and amenity spaces and the close relationship of the two buildings. Planning conditions and a legal agreement would be necessary to secure the status of each part, to ensure they are not sold

separately, to retain shared services and phasing to ensure the works to improve the primary listed farmhouse are completed prior to occupation of the new dwelling.

118. Officers have asked for details of the functional dependence the intended occupants would have on the occupants of the parent dwelling. As set out in the Residential Annexes SPD, it is important to establish if the occupation of the annexe would be compatible with a residential annexe, having the necessary dependence on the main dwelling and essentially the two functioning/forming a single C3 dwelling house. The applicants have been sent a link to our SPD which explains in detail what information officers need when considering a residential annexe.
119. So far officers have what is stated in the design and access statement which references accommodation for the applicant's parents for ease of child care and for caring for these parents in the future as they age. It's been explained to the applicants that ease of child care is not considered to be a functional dependence on the main household, and future planning for parents in case they become infirm is not a current dependence. There has since been an email from the applicants but it doesn't add any further detail about functional dependence. So, both of these justifications are not considered to be capable of supporting any lawful occupation of a residential annexe. In all respects it appears the occupants would be an independent household rather than having a functional dependence on the main house.
120. The size of the residential annexe also needs to be considered. The proposed residential annex in this case is to be formed in the original historic farm house and would have on the ground floor, cloakroom, large hall, large snug (lounge), and kitchen with access to cellar and on the first floor a bedroom and a large landing capable of providing a bedroom, and a bathroom. It's a fairly large property albeit with a layout which presents some challenges to utilising the space efficiently. Whilst the applicants describe it as being one bedroomed this is misleading in terms of its actual size. The accommodation it would provide is approximately 131m² without the glazed link and 154m² with the glazed link. To give this some context our local needs housing thresholds for a 5-person house is 97m². The proposal significantly exceeds this figure so in that context it is a relatively large house, exceeding what may normally be considered a residential annexe ancillary to a dwelling.
121. It is also necessary to look at the severability of the proposed residential annexe. The existing dwelling has gardens to the rear and side and use of the farmyard for parking as well as a drive to its side. There was even some additional parking proposed at the top of the drive next to the access onto the highway, but this has since been removed on an amended plan 613/8D. The amended plans also show that the proposed new dwelling has openings out onto the adjoining land to the west, with a patio area in front, so new curtilage areas are being proposed for that new dwelling. It's therefore shown that there would be separate amenity spaces for the new dwelling and the proposed residential annexe. There is the glazed link, but this has been designed to be reversible in the interests of the listed building but also as explained in the design and access statement if the properties were to operate separately. It is not known if the unit would share services and utilities with the main house. Given the other issues raised over size, nature and potential severability it is considered that the existing farmhouse would be operating as an independent dwelling rather than as a residential annexe and could easily be severed from the parent dwelling with only minimal works.
122. An annexe will become a single dwellinghouse where it is self-contained with all the necessary living facilities and has resulted in the creation of a separate planning unit. But, as, for example, with "granny flats" used in connection with the parent dwelling, this would not necessarily amount to a "material change of use". Ancillary accommodation cannot exist without a parent dwelling.

123. In all respects the nature and scale of the proposal would create two separate planning units and while there may be a family connection between the occupants of the residential annexe and the proposed new dwelling officers consider that the dwelling proposed in the existing farmhouse, because of its scale and occupancy of this nature, is not capable of being ancillary. The proposed residential annexe is therefore contrary to the provisions of Development Management Policy DMH5 and our adopted Residential Annexes SPD.
124. A point to bear in mind is that , if the new dwelling and existing farmhouse form and are used as “a building used as a single dwelling house “ planning permission will be required for any future use as two (or more) dwellings as this would comprise a material change in the use of the building and of each part of it which is so used. So, to that extent the Planning Authority can exercise control over the creation of separate dwellings. But, this falls away if what is proposed amounts to two separate planning units/dwellings in the first place.
125. If all other Planning Considerations were acceptable then this would need to be managed by a tightly drawn planning agreement
126. The principle of the new dwelling, for the reasons set out in the previous section, has not been accepted as it would harm the character and significance of the listed buildings, their setting and relationship with the principal listed building. It is therefore material to note that a residential annexe cannot exist without a parent dwelling.
127. The impetus of allowing two open market dwellings to exist on the site has not been proven to be necessary for the conservation and enhancement of the listed buildings. In fact, as proposed, the scheme as a whole has been found to harm the character, appearance, significance and functional role of the heritage assets.
128. Essentially given the scale and nature of the proposed accommodation its relationship to the proposed new dwelling would not be ancillary and would form a separate planning unit as an independent residential dwelling house. The proposal is therefore contrary to Development Management Policy DMH5 and the Authority’s adopted supplementary planning document ‘Residential Annexes’. The development is not required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of a heritage asset and therefore is contrary to DS1, HC1 and Development Management Policy DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
129. The proposed stables
130. There is an existing outbuilding across the yard from the traditional outbuildings. This has red brick front and sides with a part stone flag roof and part corrugated metal. The archaeology report refers to it as ‘Building 7’ a ‘brick range to east of yard’ and explains it was built between the 1948 and 1968 OS maps. Their form means they are relatively discreet. Their shallow (near flat) mono pitched roof is only slightly higher than the land abutting its rear wall. Therefore when viewed from the higher ground on Clayholes Road their low form allows views over to the rest of the site, particularly to the attractive outbuildings behind, without being obstructed by the brick range.
131. The proposal is to replace these brick buildings with a building which is designed as a stable. It would have stone front and sides and the roof would be a corrugated metal sheet coloured green. It would have a dual pitched roof. The building would provide 3 stables and a tack room. The building is similar in length but wider and taller than the building it replaces.
132. The applicants do not suggest they have a need for stables but just try to justify it on the basis that there is already a stable on the site. DMC7 Listed Buildings, explains that planning permission for development that affects the setting of a listed building must

amongst other things clearly demonstrate why the proposed development is desirable or necessary. In this case the stables present an issue as they would be wider, taller and therefore much more obtrusive than the existing buildings which are discreet. Furthermore the use of materials includes a corrugated metal sheet finished in green. Given the high quality environment of this buildings setting, particularly being within the setting of the listed buildings and in front of the existing attractive outbuildings, the issues raised above present a significant scale and design objection.

133. The design would make the building more obtrusive and use materials which in this setting are not acceptable. The proposal is not presented in a way which explains why it is desirable or necessary in the interests of the listed building and its setting. DMR4 also requires that such buildings are constructed to a scale and design which is appropriate to the function of the building. As this is a speculative stable it has no known function for which to justify its size. Just being a replacement is not enough to justify the building which being larger and using inappropriate materials for its roof would not provide an enhancement but instead detract from the character and appearance of the site and the setting of the listed buildings.

134. Heritage

135. It has already been demonstrated in the sections above that the proposal would harm the significance of the listed buildings and there are no public benefits in this proposal to weigh against the harm. More fundamentally the proposal will harm the existing attractive character and appearance of the outbuildings and how they relate to the farmhouse whose dominance in form and proposed function would be diminished harming its significance.

136. In addition, the replacement stable will also harm the setting of the listed buildings. For the reasons stated in the sections above the proposal is contrary to the policies of the development plan and the NPPF insofar as they seek to protect the character, appearance and significance of heritage asset and their setting.

137. Highway Considerations

138. The Highway Authority have raised issues in their consultation response which relate to highway safety. In particular the relationship of the proposed new parking spaces in the submitted plans to the proposed new gate would likely lead to reversing of vehicles onto Clayholes Lane and would make access and egress from the site difficult. They have suggested this could be resolved by a revised layout to move the gate 5m further down the track. In the event of an approval this could be achieved by planning condition so highway safety will not form a reason for refusal.

139. As mentioned earlier in the report the landscape impact of the new parking spaces adjacent the access is considered to be an unnecessary domestic intrusion into the open countryside, and harmful to the setting of the listed building. Similarly, the widening of the access appears to be unnecessary and this will exacerbate the impact on the character and appearance of the area.

140. Amended plan 613/08D has been received which omits the new parking spaces but retains the bin store and the widening of the access. Both of these elements are still considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Listed Building and therefore also reason for refusal.

141. Protected Species

142. Evidence of Bats was found in the house. Our ecologists have scrutinised the submitted ecology reports and recommended that subject to conditions, protected species will not be

harmed. They also consider that some enhancements for bat habitat on the site over what the ecology reports suggests is necessary in relation to compensation for the loss of bat roost potential. They propose that this should be enhanced from just bat boxes to also include bat roost features into the fabric of the renovated buildings. The recommendation is for two roof tile bat roosts in the main house and one in the outbuildings. If the scheme were approved this could be ensured by way of planning conditions, so its absence in the submission is not considered to be reason for refusal. Planning conditions would also need to secure the proposed mitigation. The proposal does include putting up owl and swallow boxes and this is welcomed by our ecologists.

143. A note on the amended plans raises additional ecological issues related to the impact of the Slinkies (coiled piping) for the ground source heat pump being located in the pond. This would need to be fully assessed in terms of its impact on the general aquatic environment of the pond and could potentially impact on great crested newts. This element of the wider development is however not within the application site area or application description and hence not considered to form part of this proposal.
144. Archaeology
145. The submission has been scrutinised by our archaeologists and further information received in addition to the submitted heritage statement as requested in relation to buried archaeology. Our Archaeologists have responded explaining the following and recommending if approved a condition requiring a Written Scheme of investigation would be necessary –
146. *The Supplementary Heritage Impact Assessment: Buried Archaeology has reviewed the potential nature of buried archaeology on the site and identified that the highest potential relates to the earlier history of the farm and buildings and structures that have been lost from earlier periods. The primary structures relate to the former building demolished after 1849 at the east end of the farmhouse, the role and function of this building is unknown. It is not proposed that this area is built on in the current proposals but there could be other structures that were not recorded on maps. Such structures are likely to be of low significance but they could aid in understanding the use and development of the farm.*
147. *In addition, the assessment has identified that there is the potential for waste to have been buried around the farm, prior to modern rubbish collections starting, and this material could provide evidence relating to past consumption of brought in goods (ceramics, glass and metal) on the farm and the consumption of food (animal bones).*
148. *The possible buried remains on the site are likely of local significance but the impact of the proposed works on them will potentially be significant if an earlier structure or midden is impacted.*
149. *The recommendation that a programme of archaeological recording will be required on any groundworks associated with the proposed works is reasonable.*
150. Therefore if the scheme were approved a planning condition could be used to secure a WSI as suggested by PDNPA Archaeology, to ensure the proposal impact on the buried archaeology of the site is acceptable and in accordance with the policies of the development plan and the NPPF.
151. A note on the amended plan states that the Slinkies for the ground source heat pump would be located in the field and the pond. The groundworks for the field would likely need archaeological investigation via a WSI however as no details of the proposal are included in this application it is not considered to form part of this application and would need to be considered via a separate planning application.

152. Energy Saving Measures

153. A ground source heat pump is now described as the means of heating the property, however officers have no details on the plans of where the groundworks for this would be located nor how any historic fabric of the listed building may be affected by the proposal, for example where the pipework would enter the building. The note on the plan states the slinkies for the ground source heat pump would be in the field and the pond. As there are no details of the groundworks for the heat pump these can not form part of this application and given the revised site area its unlikely that such groundworks would fall within the site area. The intention to use a ground source heat pump is positive and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CC1 and our sustainable building and renewable energy SPD. However the groundworks need to be considered properly as well as the impact on the listed buildings. Given the setting it could require Archaeological works and potentially an ecological survey as installing the slinkies in the pond could affect the ecology of the pond by the development itself or potentially from the change in temperatures as the heat is extracted from the pond. These issues need considering via a separate planning application.

154. Conclusion

155. The traditional stone outbuildings benefit from the protection of the listing. They are currently attractive and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the site and the significance of the group of buildings comprising the listed farmhouse and these outbuildings. These heritage assets are widely open to public view from immediate and more distant vantage points. The proposal, by extending and altering the outbuildings would harm the character and appearance of the outbuildings and their setting along with their aesthetic and functional relationship with the farmhouse. The proposal is therefore contrary to the policies of the development plan and the NPPF insofar as they deal with design and heritage assets.

156. The new dwelling that would be formed in the outbuildings is not acceptable in principle, and the proposed residential annexe in scale and nature would not be capable of being ancillary, so is also contrary to the policies of the development plan and our SPD on residential annexes.

157. The alterations to the width of the access track, bin store and replacement stable are also considered to have a negative impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Listed buildings and the landscape of the National Park.

158. The proposal is therefore contrary to the policies of the development plan and the NPPF and in the absence of any other material considerations to warrant a different decision, it is recommended that the proposal be refused for the reasons set out above.

159. Human Rights

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

161. List of Background Papers (not previously published) - Nil

162. Planning Officer – Steven Wigglesworth, Planner, 1st December 2022