

8. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION - RENOVATION OF THE FARMHOUSE LINKING TO CHANGE OF USE OF THE OUTBUILDINGS AND REPLACEMENT OF THE NISSEN HUT TO ENSURE PROTECTION OF THE HERITAGE AND THE FARM'S LONG TERM VIABILITY. REBUILDING OF THE STABLES IN KEEPING MATERIALS AT A STANDARD SIZE TO BETTER SUPPORT THE VIABILITY OF THE LAND. AT WRIGHTS FARM, CLAYHOLES ROAD, KETTLESHULME (NP/CEC/1221/1304 SPW)

APPLICANT: MR MARK HEYES

Summary

1. The proposal is for the works to 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. In addition the existing dwelling on the site is proposed to be a residential annexe ancillary to the proposed new dwelling. For the existing dwelling to lose its rank and role on the site as the dominant farmhouse is harmful to the significance of the listed building. The proposal also includes works to renovate the farmhouse which are mostly positive with a few exceptions and a glazed link between the farm house and the outbuildings (which are proposed to be converted and extended into the new dwelling) which also harms the character, appearance and significance of the listed buildings.
2. There are other issues with the proposal including that the proposed stable will harm the setting of the listed buildings and the current proposed plans raise questions over the accuracy of the drawings and have text which is illegible and lack detail.

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 Kettlethulme 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.
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. 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 and 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. 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.
8. The house is built of natural gritstone with gritstone slate roof, with the walls appearing to have had their render removed recently. There is a lean-to extension adjoining the house with no internal access through to the house which was the old dairy and currently has no roof.

9. Most of a further lean-to extension up to 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.
10. Within the house there are features including a butter churning wheel and the cellar has a vaulted ceiling.
11. There is also a brick built outbuilding with mono pitched roof sited opposite the main outbuildings. 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 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 attractive and contribute positively to the character, appearance and setting of the farm house. Their scale, form and variation in depth and roofline are important characteristics of the group.
13. There is also a Nissen hut adjoining the outbuildings to the west 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 engineering operations which have been reported to our Monitoring and Enforcement team to investigate.
15. At present the applicants are living on site in a caravan whilst works are underway on the house.

Proposal

16. The proposal is an application for listed building consent to repair Wrights farmhouse, the principal listed building, including repointing, render repairs, plaster repairs and other internal repairs, replacement of the windows and RWGs. Works to Wrights farmhouse include a comprehensive scheme of repair to address some of the modern inappropriate materials and the condition of the building. The proposal also includes relocating a cupboard from downstairs to the upstairs landing.
17. The proposal is also for the works to convert the farm outbuildings to create a new dwelling, extend and alter them including demolition of the Nissen hut and replacing this with further extension and to provide a glazed link between the converted outbuildings to the principle listed building. The works to the outbuildings would 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. A replacement stable building is also proposed. This is 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.
19. A new parking area was also proposed off the top of the access track in the field close to Clayholes Lane. The track is proposed to be widened and amended plans omit the parking area replacing it with a bin store.

20. There is a corresponding planning application NP/CEC/0522/0645 which deals with the proposed development including the proposed change of use. The development description of the corresponding planning application has been amended to the following – *‘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 Nissan Hut to form a family home. Replacement of the stables.’*
21. The application is supported by a Heritage Statement (and supplements) and supplementary archaeological statement, 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 aswell as the construction of the glazed link.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. **The proposal by virtue of its design would harm the character, appearance and significance of the heritage assets and their setting, this is because the works required to create the new residential accommodation significantly extend and alter the outbuildings, harming their form and character and would lose the positive contribution these buildings have as part of the group of listed buildings. It would also reduce 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 and 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 the new domestic curtilage to the west of the outbuildings. The proposal would also potentially harm the butter churning wheel by obscuring it from view due to the position of the relocated cupboards and the proposal would also cut through a historic stone flag, part of a fireplace, unnecessarily harming this historic feature. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10 and the NPPF.**
- 2 **Inadequate and inaccurate plans and justifications have been submitted to be able to fully ascertain the impact on the listed buildings and to be able to be certain of the extent and details of the proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3, and Development Management Policies DMC5, DMC7 and the NPPF.**

Key Issues

23. The key issues are:
24. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the buildings and their setting and the impact on the significance of these heritage assets.
25. Are the stables desirable or necessary in the interests of the setting of the listed building?

History

26. 2019 - Informal enforcement enquiry 19/0176 in relation to unauthorised satellite dish, replacement door and windows, and possibly other works.
27. 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 principle listed building and the farmstead.
28. 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

29. Historic England – On the basis of the information available to date, Historic England do not wish to offer any comments. Historic England suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation adviser.
30. Cheshire East Council (Highways) – 14 06 2022 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.
31. Cheshire East Borough Council – The footpath team commented however this is not a Listed Building matter and is therefore only covered in the preceding report for the planning application.
32. Natural England – No response to date.
33. 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.
34. PDNPA – Built Environment – detailed comments are available on the electronic file. The application is supported by a comprehensive Heritage Statement, and additional assessments have been submitted in support of the proposals developed. The Heritage Statement assesses the principle of the proposals, including the glazed link.

Further drawings and details of the proposals are required for the Listed Building application, some are possible to condition. Others around the glazed link that will impact on the significance of the listed building would be required to make a fully informed decision. Some of the information is described within the submission documents, but appropriately scaled drawings would be required to be clear on what is being proposed, some to inform the decision, and some that could be conditioned.

It is important that all works that are on a like for like basis are clearly identified on drawings so it is clear what any consent is for. Some like for like repairs e.g. the rendering

and repointing require LBC (and therefore form part of this application) because the extent will impact on the character and appearance.

35. 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. 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. 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. Additional comments have been received from our conservation officers following receipt of amended plans and supporting information. These set out the following – *I've had a look at the additional information that has been provided following my comments, 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.*
36. 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.*
37. *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.*
38. 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.*
39. Internal Works - *New drawings have been submitted to 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.*
40. *The drawings of the partition and replacement doors are acceptable.*
41. *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.*

42. *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.*
43. *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.*
44. *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.*
45. *For the glazed links, 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.*
46. *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.*
47. *The timber door in the glazed link in front of the means the pantry remains partially obscured and my previous comments regarding this remain.*
48. *The drawing showing the roof insulation is acceptable and therefore not required as a condition.*
49. *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.*
50. *The windows remain as top openers so my previous comments remain.*
51. *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.*
52. *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.*
53. *For the glazed links, 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.

54. 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.

55. Heating proposals

56. 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?

57. Site Plan

58. I also noticed on the site plan that a patio is marked on the site plan 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.

59. 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. 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.

60. Kettleshulme Parish Council – No objections

Representations

61. 7 number of representations have been received. 6 are in support, but only 3 offer the support based on planning grounds, 1 is in objection. These raise the following considerations –

62. Support

- Sympathetic restoration and conversion of outbuildings
- In need of renovation
- Protects listed farm house
- Will maintain a modern viable farm that reflects its historical origins.

63. Objection

- Glass covered walkway would be out of character with the property

Main Policies

64. Relevant Core Strategy policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L2, L3.

65. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12.

National Planning Policy Framework

66. 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.

67. 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.'

68. 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.

69. 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.
70. 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.
71. 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.
72. 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.
73. 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

74. 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.
75. 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.

76. 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.
77. 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.
78. 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.

Development Management Policies

79. DMC3 Siting, design, layout and landscaping-
80. 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.
81. 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
 82. (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
 83. (iv) access, utility services, vehicle parking, siting of services, refuse bins and cycle storage; and
 84. (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
 85. (vii) amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties that the development affects; and
 86. (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
 87. (x) the principles embedded in the design related Supplementary Planning Documents and related technical guides.
88. DMC5 Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.

89. 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.
90. 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.
91. 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.
92. 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.
93. 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.
94. 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.
95. (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.
96. DMC7 Listed Buildings
97. 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
98. (ii) result in the loss of or irremediable change to original features or other features of importance or interest.
99. 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.

100. 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.

101. DMC10 Conversion of a heritage asset

102. 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

103. (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.

104. 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 non designated heritage asset; and
- (ii) 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.

105. 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

106. 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 (DMC10) and development that harmed the significance of a listed building or its setting would not be permitted (DMC7).

107. The Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) the 'Design Guide' and 'Conversion of Historic Buildings' are both relevant.
108. 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
109. **Assessment**
110. The works to create the proposed new dwelling via conversion and extension of the outbuildings including demolition of the Nissen hut.
111. 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 character in their existing form the buildings are worthy of conversion. The site including 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.
112. The outbuildings are protected by the listing of the farm house as 'curtilage listed buildings'. DMC10 amongst other things allows 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.
113. 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. 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.
114. The proposed new dwelling that would be formed would require the alteration and extension of the outbuildings including an extension to replace 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 plan form and frontage would be lost and there would be many large shuttered openings to replace the existing. The package of alterations would change the character of the buildings significantly, and their character, charm and the positive contribution to the character and significance of the heritage asset would be lost. This is corroborated by our Conservation officer's consultation response.

115. In the heritage justification an argument for allowing the extension to the north 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 their 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.
116. The heritage justification for this extension is considered to be tenuous. This is because the absent building 5 was 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 would argue that this has long gone and could be achieved by other more authentic means, simply by 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.
117. Whilst removal of the Nissen hut is positive, its replacement is not. It will essentially double the form of the outbuildings in their proposed unacceptable extended form and will present large openings to the open countryside. At the pre-application stage officers had envisaged the Nissen hut being replaced by something that was truly subordinate to the existing outbuilding, but this proposal is far from that vision.
118. 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 new dwelling is approximately 270m². There is a significant amount of extension and alterations being undertaken and for the reasons described earlier its design is considered to be poor and as a result of this it is insensitive and harmful to character and appearance of the listed buildings.
119. 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 there are no public benefits to weigh against this harm therefore the proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP2, GSP3, and DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10 and the NPPF.
120. Officers are also concerned that the role and dominance of the farm house is diminished by this proposal to an ancillary dwelling and the impact of that on the building's significance. To give some way to measure the dominance of the new dwelling in comparison to the farm house the two floor spaces can be compared. As proposed the

farm house would have approximately 131m² without the glazed link and 154m² with the glazed link. The proposed new dwelling is approximately double the size, at approximately 270m². With the new dwelling being single storey its plan form is much larger than the farm house and the openings proposed are much larger than the house or outbuildings have at present. The new dwelling would be dominant in form, character and function even though it is single storey.

121. During the application process officers have received amended plans to show the extension to the north of the outbuildings as 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.
122. This amendment has not been submitted at the Authority's request and just serves to exacerbate the adverse impact of proposal on the function and rank of the original dwelling as the proposal in either form would diminish 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 and DMC10.
123. 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 detail 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 the hit and miss details ought to be recessed within the opening not used as an external cladding which over sails the opening itself. Officers also advised that a hit and miss detail could improve the scheme, but wouldn't make the development acceptable.
124. The quality of the current set of amended plans is also poor, officers have received drawings in the which text has become illegible, including the elevations and detailed window drawings. And officers 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, there is no scale bar to confirm accuracy. The plans are therefore inadequate and inaccurate, would likely cause difficulties if enforcement officers re necessary, and this inaccuracy is exacerbated when considering this proposal relates to listed buildings.
125. The amended plans still show the converted buildings with top openers, and side opening casements subdivided with glazing bars, these are modern and domestic details, so not appropriate for an agricultural conversion. These should reflect the agricultural nature of the building or as an alternative be a simple glazed unit without subdivision. So these design concerns over windows remain even on the current set of amended plans.
126. The amended plans also now have a note explaining the plant for the ground source heat pump would be located in the pantry. This is the most historic part of the outbuildings and raises the unanswered question of whether this is the most appropriate place to locate the plant. On the face of it, its unlikely to be, and would further erode the character and significance of the building.

Works to Wrights Farmhouse

127. There are many internal and external works proposed to the house and the glazed link between the farmhouse and the proposed accommodation in the outbuildings. These works have been scrutinised in detail by our conservation officers and their comments are set out in full in their consultation response. Prior to their then final comments our conservation officers have proactively provided detailed comments which led to some

further details being submitted however even with those additional details there is still much further details required and new questions arising as explained below, further amended plans have been received but these also require further details, amendments and raise further questions. A pattern which keeps reoccurring with this application.

Glazed Link

128. The principle of the glazed link from the farmhouse to the outbuildings has been explored through site visits and the preparation of a comprehensive Heritage Statement that has been supplemented with additional information. The farmhouse has a modern extension that detracts from the building as it is of poor design and material (being a brick built lean-to), and which is not sympathetic to the principle listed building.
129. Removal of the extension will be an enhancement to the principle listed building, the applicant still requires the space for internal use and desires a link with the outbuildings to be converted. The space is a small stone flag yard, and historic photographs show there has previously been higher walls around the yard, giving a greater sense of enclosure to the small yard.
130. 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.
131. Our conservation officers have advised that the careful design of a glazed link as part of the overall proposals would mitigate some of the negative impact that linking the farmhouse and outbuildings would have to the significance of the principle listed building. More detail including the meeting points of the glazed link, meeting points with the buildings, fixings etc would be required to fully assess the impact, as the fixing method has the potential to damage the historic fabric.
132. More fundamentally officers do not consider that the glazed link proposed is carefully designed enough. Specifically its size/form provides a room by covering the whole courtyard and then links off that to the outbuildings. Officers consider it needs to be more discreet and minimal link rather than the additional room that is proposed.
133. Our conservation officers have explained that in addition to the details shown on the drawings the following would need to be confirmed.
- have simple fixings to the building, using mortar joints where at all possible
 - be clear on its use as a walk through rather than an additional room, reducing the likelihood of domestic “clutter” in the historic yard area and external to the outbuildings
 - retain/repair the yard stone flags as the flooring indicating its historic use
 - be fully reversible
 - retain the external walls to the farmhouse, yard walls and outbuildings i.e. no plaster or other covering including paint, sealant etc to be applied. It is recognised that repointing with a lime mortar is likely to be required
134. A structural report has since 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.

135. The principle of the glazed link as a lightweight structure appears a suitable proposal, but the proposed scheme exacerbates the impact of the alterations and extensions proposed and therefore adds significantly to the harm. Without any public benefits to weigh against this harm the proposal is contrary to the policies of the development plan including Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, L3, and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC10 and the NPPF.

Window replacements

136. The principle of replacing the windows appears acceptable provided the openings themselves are not amended. There are some windows that are modern and others that, whilst not contemporary to the building are sympathetic historic alterations.
137. The proposed replacements have been developed to reflect the earlier style of the building and therefore the replacements proposed appear acceptable. As submitted the drawings show horns on the proposed sash windows, these were not a detail on multi-paned sash windows, but were introduced for strength when larger paned sashes were developed by the Victorians. The horns should be omitted from any proposals, and have been on the latest set of amended plans, which are likely to be acceptable however these plans are blurred and a clear version needs to be reissued (this has been requested but to date has not been received).

Internal Works

138. Internally the works include the reinstatement of the inglenook fireplace within the snug. There is a historic fireplace in existence but the inglenook would be more appropriate to the age of the property, the heritage statement has identified its replacement as causing some harm to the character of the room by removing historic fabric, and suggested this could be mitigated by reusing the cupboards elsewhere in the property. The amended plans provided by the new agent do show where the cupboards would be relocated to, and this will be either side of a fireplace on the first floor landing. However this is shown only on the plans and raises further questions as it appears to obscure the butter churn wheel, and this therefore would result in harm to a historic feature, the proposed location is unlikely to be suitable.
139. Also on the First floor landing a note on the plans proposes additional work to insert a fireplace within the chimney breast and to widen the chimney breast. Officers would need details of the new fireplace this element would be able to be conditioned.
140. A partition is proposed between the cellar stairs and the kitchenette, this is proposed to be mainly glazed with timber frames and a timber door in keeping with the historic examples. The submission included a sketch drawing which gives an idea, and there is no objection in principle, however properly scaled and labelled drawings have been required before an informed decision could be made. Adequate drawings of this have now been provided and are acceptable.
141. Internal repairs to the plasterwork with an appropriate lime plaster is welcomed.
142. An occasional internal door is proposed for replacement to match the other existing doors, based on the sketch drawings there has been no objection in principle, however properly scaled and labelled drawings have been required before an informed decision could be made. This has been provided now and is acceptable.
143. Our conservation officers advised that details of how the extractors and SVPs will access the redundant chimney for ventilation and details on how the ventilation will access the chimney will need to be submitted on a drawing and must limit the loss of historic fabric and impact on any traditional features such as fireplaces. Any venting

through the roof space must use slate vents, modern tower (chimney) SVPs are not appropriate. Such details would need to be conditioned in the event of an approval.

144. On the current set of amended plans there is a note on the plan to describe the route of the SVP and it appears to affect a historic feature as it is described as going through a stone flag in the front of the fireplace. This would not be appropriate as it would damage the historic fireplace and therefore also harm the listed buildings significance.
145. When officers visited the site in May, the applicants discussed the removal of a ceiling in one of the first floor rooms (the proposed bathroom). On scrutinising the plans whilst there was some reference to alterations to open up previously vaulted ceilings on the application forms there has been no reference of this on any of the submitted plans. Full details, shown on the plans and sections to show the proposal in full have been requested and the heritage statement would need to include consideration of its impact on the significance of the heritage asset. The current set of amended plans show where the ceilings would be removed, and this is assessed in a supplementary heritage statement, both of these have been scrutinised by our conservation officers and removing the ceiling in the rooms shown has been accepted.

External Works

146. It is proposed to reinstate the historic door into the dairy, off the yard, this is welcomed. The current doorway will be retained and a glazed panel will be used, a boarded door will be fixed open our conservation officers find this acceptable.
147. The dairy has had the roof removed that was modern corrugated sheet, it is proposed to replace with stone slate to match the rest of the building, this would be an enhancement. Samples of the slate would need to be conditioned.
148. Cast aluminium rain water goods are proposed. However it should be an appropriate traditional material for a listed building such as cast iron. The details and materials would need to be conditioned. To date the applicants have been resistant of using cast iron. However as this is a listed building, it needs to be an authentic traditional material rather than simply giving the impression of a traditional material.
149. Repairs to damaged stonework are to be undertaken, this is welcomed. Significant amounts of repointing and some rendering is proposed for the buildings, this is to be done with a lime mortar which will be an enhancement to the building. The mortar mixes and sample panels should be submitted for approval, this should be conditioned.

The proposed stables

150. There is an existing outbuilding across the yard from the traditional outbuildings. This has red brick front and sides, with 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. Officers note therefore that listed building consent is not required for its demolition. As only buildings that pre date 1948 within the curtilage of a listed building benefit from the same protection as the listed building.
151. 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.

152. 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.
153. 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 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, and 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 design issue.
154. 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. 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. The proposed stables are therefore unacceptable, contrary to the policies of the development plan and the NPPF.

Highways

155. The Highway Authority have raised issues in their consultation response which relate to highway safety. In particular due to the relationship of the proposed new parking spaces 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.
156. 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.
157. 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.

Protected Species

158. 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.

Archaeology

159. 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 –

- a. *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 structure 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.*
- b. *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).*
- c. *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.*
- d. *The recommendation that a programme of archaeological recording will be required on any groundworks associated with the proposed works is reasonable.*

160. Therefore if the scheme officers re approved a planning condition could be used to secure a WSI as suggested by PDNPA Archaeology, to ensure the proposals impact on the buried archaeology of the site is acceptable and in accordance with the policies of the development plan and the NPPF.

Conclusion

161. As demonstrated in this report the proposal would harm the significance of the listed buildings and while positive elements have been acknowledged there are no public benefits of this proposal sufficient to weigh against the harm.

162. The outbuildings (with the exception of the Nissen hut and the stables) benefit from the protection of the listing and 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. The alterations at the top of the access and to the width of the access track and creation

of a bin store, replacement stable, glazed link, negative internal alterations are also considered to have a negative impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Listed Buildings and the National Park. Some of the plans also appear inaccurate and illegible. The proposal is therefore contrary to the policies of the development plan and the NPPF and having considered other material considerations the proposal should be refused.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Planning Officer – Steven Wigglesworth, Planner