

11. FULL APPLICATION – CONVERSION AND CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BARN AND YARD INTO RESIDENTIAL USE (C3) AT STANLEY LODGE, GREAT HUCKLOW (NP/DDD/0822/1079/WE)

APPLICANT: MR & MRS BURROWS

Summary

1. This application seeks consent to convert and change the use of an outbuilding at Stanley Lodge Farm to create an ancillary dwelling on site.
2. This application is a variation of a previous application (NP/DDD/0521/0531) which sought consent for the conversion of the outbuilding, in addition to the demolition and rebuilding of a blockwork lean-to on the barn which would form part of the living accommodation. Following feedback from the Cultural Heritage team, that scheme was amended to remove the lean-to element. It was subsequently granted planning permission.
3. Whilst the detailed design of the rear lean-to extension has been amended from the scheme originally proposed in NP/DDD/0521/0531, it is considered that its inclusion within the scheme would not conserve or enhance the non-designated heritage asset. The inclusion of the lean-to extension would detract from the significance of the heritage asset, and be contrary to the conservation principles the conversion of the outbuilding was originally approved on. This application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

4. Stanley Lodge Farm is a retired working farm, situated to the south of Great Hucklow and is approximately 1.7 miles to the north of Wardlow. The barn is two storeys, and forms an L-shape around a yard area, with stable door openings and three windows on the ground floor on the elevations facing the yard, (front elevations), with three openings on the first floor. On the rear elevation there are two windows and a blocked-up door. To the western side there is a modern steel framed storage building with concrete block walls under a lean-to concrete tiled roof.
5. The main barn is a traditional form, previously used as a milking parlour and hay storage, but with openings that have been altered over the years. The main farm house is attached to the east of the barn and there is hardstanding for parking within the site, all of which is included in the application site. The farm is approximately 3.5ha. There is a riding arena to the front of the barn and a large modern barn to the west.
6. The land slopes gently upwards to the north, and as a result the site is visible from public roads to the south albeit from a large distance. The nearest neighbouring property is sited approximately 0.4km to the north. The existing buildings are not listed and the site is not within a conservation area.
7. The barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The attached lean-to is of no merit being a modern concrete and steel addition.

Proposal

8. This application is seeking consent to change the use and conversion with extension of the barn from storage (sui generis) to form a four-bed market dwelling (C3). The supporting planning and design and access statements refer to the new dwelling as being an ancillary dwelling to the farmhouse which would be occupied by the applicant's father.

9. The conversion would be accommodated within the existing shell of the traditional building and a rebuilt lean-to. The proposed development would result in four additional openings within the walls of the original structure and four rooflights. It seeks consent for the removal of the existing timber framed windows and doors, and proposes to replace them with timber windows and doors to match Stanley Lodge farmhouse. It also seeks consent to replace the concrete Hardow roof tiles with natural blue slate to match Stanley Lodge farmhouse.
10. The existing 20th century blockwork lean-to located on the western elevation of the barn, would be replaced with a largely rubble limestone lean-to to match the stonework of the barn. The lean-to would feature a full-height timber window on the main southern gable elevation of the lean-to. Its roof would be finished in natural blue slates, with the exception of a section in the middle of the lean-to where the roof would be fully glazed, with Glazed wall section below featuring 5-panelled bi-fold doors with painted timber frames.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed conversion including the lean-to extension on the western elevation of the barn would harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset by introducing a modern extension to the traditional barn which would erode the original form and character of the outbuilding. It would therefore detract from the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and would not therefore meet the required conservation and/or enhancement test within housing policy HC1C which enables the conversion of suitable ‘valued vernacular’ buildings to form new dwellings. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, HC1C, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMH8, the NPPF and the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD.**
2. **By virtue of the proposed development’s scale, it is considered that the proposal would not constitute an ancillary dwellinghouse. In the absence of a clear and robust justification for its size, it would not be subordinate to Stanley Lodge Farmhouse and would instead constitute a separate planning unit. It is therefore contrary to policy DMH5 and the Residential Annexes Supplementary Planning Document.**

Key Issues

1. Principle of development
2. Impact on heritage assets
3. Whether proposed development would be ancillary to Stanley Lodge
4. Impact on valued characteristics of the landscape

History

11. 7th May 2010 – Construction of a ménage for own private use (schooling of horses and horse turnout area) on land currently used as slurry pit – Granted conditional consent.
12. 29th January 2021 – Demolition of existing garage outbuilding and replace with 5-stall stable block and tack room – Granted conditional consent

13. 7th May 2022 – Conversion and change of use of existing barn and yard into dwelling ancillary to Stanley Lodge – Granted conditional consent

Consultations

14. Derbyshire County Council Highways - No highway authority comments to make on the basis the conversion forms private, domestic, ancillary living accommodation for the existing dwelling.
15. Great Hucklow Parish Council – Supportive of the application due to complying with policy DMH6. Supportive of re-using vacant agricultural buildings where it maintains the character of the National Park.
16. Natural England – No objections
17. PDNPA Archaeology – The lean-to is an entirely modern structure (portal framed, 20th century) is of no heritage value, and actually detracts from the significance of the building. The inclusion and conversion of this modern structure is contrary to the PDNPA Design Guide and Policy DMC10. Its removal would enhance and better reveal the significance of the barn as a heritage asset, and could be considered a heritage benefit of the scheme in the planning balance. Its removal and replacement with a different modern structure would not secure these benefits. As such, the heritage advice remains that the scheme should be revised so that the conversion is achieved within the historic shell of the traditional farm buildings and the detracting modern structure is removed.

Representations

18. No representations were received during the course of the application.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

19. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The latest revised NPPF was published on 20 July 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 Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019) 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 more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
20. Paragraph 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.

21. Para 203 of the NPPF states: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Main Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

22. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
23. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
24. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Taddington is a named settlement.
25. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.
26. L3 – *Cultural heritage assets of historic significance*. Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting.
27. HC1: *New housing*
This states that - Provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. Housing land will not be allocated in the development plan. Exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted where: (*only section relevant to this case shown*)
- C. In accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2: I. it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings;
28. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

Development Management Policies

29. Policy DMC1 states that any development outside of named settlements which have the potential for wide scale landscape impacts must provide a landscape assessment with reference to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan.
30. Policy DMC3 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place. Particular attention will be paid to siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing buildings, settlement form and character, and 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.

31. Policy DMC5 states that 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.

The supporting evidence must be proportionate to the significance of the asset.

32. Policy DMC10 states that conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:

- i) It can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character;
- ii) The building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not comprise the significance and character of the building; and
- iii) The changes brought about by the new use, and any associated infrastructure, conserves or enhances the heritage significance of the asset, its setting, any valued landscape character, and any valued built environment; and
- iv) The new use of the building or any curtilage created would not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics.

33. Policy DMH5 states that the conversion of an outbuilding close to a dwelling to ancillary dwelling use will be permitted provided:

- 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 route, sharing services and utilities, and remain under the control of the occupier of the main dwelling.

34. Policy DMH8 outlines that alterations and extensions to existing outbuildings will be permitted provided changes to the mass, form, and appearance of the building conserves or enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and/or the landscape, including Listed Building status and setting, Conservation Area character, important open space, valued landscape character.

Supplementary Planning Documents

35. The Peak District Conversion of Historic Buildings (SPG) offers guidance for converting historic buildings. The guidance aims to ensure that the new use respects the original character, appearance and setting of the building.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of development

36. Policy DMC10 permits the conversion of non-listed buildings to dwellinghouses in accordance with policy HC1 in principle, where they have been demonstrated to be non-

designated heritage assets. Policy DMH5 also allows for the conversion of outbuildings into ancillary residential accommodation.

37. Whilst this application is not supported by a Heritage Statement, the Authority is mindful that a previous application, NP/DDD/0521/0531, was supported by a Heritage Statement which confirms that the barns at Stanley Lodge are non-designated heritage assets. Accordingly, the principle of converting the barn into ancillary residential accommodation is acceptable.
38. This planning application differs from the previously approved planning application at Stanley Lodge (NP/DDD/0521/0531) by proposing a lean-to extension off the western elevation of the barn. A similar extension was proposed as part of the previous application; however, this was subsequently removed following Officer concerns with the impact of the extension on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
39. Notwithstanding the above, policy DMH8 permits the alteration and extension of outbuildings in the curtilage of dwellings in principle, subject to the alteration and extension conserving or enhancing the valued characteristics of the built environment.
40. Accordingly, the proposed conversion of the non-designated heritage asset is acceptable in principle. The previous extant planning permission at Stanley Lodge for the conversion of the structure is a significant material consideration in the determination of this application. As such, the pertinent consideration for this application is whether the lean-to extension off the rear elevation of the barn conserves or enhances the significance of the non-designated heritage asset; however, it is noted that whilst this application is similar to NP/DDD/0521/0531, this application has been submitted as a Full Planning Application, so it is also appropriate to consider the principle of the whole development in the determination of this application.

Impact on heritage assets

41. Policy DMC10 permits the conversion of heritage assets subject to several criteria. Policy DMH5 further outlines that the conversion of existing outbuildings in the curtilage of dwellings into ancillary dwellinghouse is acceptable subject to criteria. It is noted that in the Design and Access Statement, it is the applicant's intention for the outbuilding to be occupied by family members, and for the dwelling to remain ancillary to Stanley Lodge Farm. Policy DMC5 provides the overarching position on development affecting heritage assets, stating that development should only be approved if it conserves or enhances the setting or significance of the asset, and provides a reasoned justification for why the development is desired or necessary.
42. At present, the barn is currently used as a sui generis store. The associated land holding is relatively small in nature, operating on 3.5 hectares of land. The property benefits from a set of modern stables and a horse-riding arena. The outbuildings subject to this application are two gabled barns formed in an L-shape. It is understood that the barns would have been originally used as a milk-parlour, with the upper floors used for hay-storage. They are constructed from coursed limestone and currently feature concrete Hardrow roof tiles. The majority of the barn openings are orientated to face onto the semi-enclosed yard. The openings currently comprise of a combination of dark stained timber and painted timber with single glazed panes, gritstone lintels and sills. The barn's orientation, form, and relationship with Stanley Lodge Farmhouse are all considered to be features of value which contribute to their significance.
43. The majority of the conversion would utilise the existing form of the structure. The existing roof tiles would be removed and replaced with natural blue-slate tile. This would match the material palette of Stanley Lodge, and is seen as an improvement on the current

Hardrow tiles which are non-traditional and contrast with the limestone finish of the outbuilding. This element is acceptable.

44. The conversion would broadly mainly utilise existing openings on the barn. The current stained or painted timber frames (both window and doors) would be removed and replaced with timber frames in recessive heritage colours. At present, there are various styles of frames across the structure, with no original units surviving. It is considered that the simplified style proposed is broadly acceptable and will present a more utilitarian and agricultural style and character. It is considered that the proposed replacement window and door frames are acceptable subject to precise agreement of the details including an appropriate lintel for the new opening on the rear, and would conserve the agricultural character of the barn.
45. As previously stated the application proposes an additional window opening on the northern elevation of the barn. The Conversion of Historic Building (SPD) states that new openings *should only be inserted into walls where necessary*. It is considered that the new window is necessary to facilitate the conversion by enabling the room to be used as another bedroom. As such, it is considered that the new opening is acceptable, particularly as it generally reflects the style and size of other openings across the barn, and does not weaken the barn's agricultural style. This alteration is considered acceptable on balance provided it is fitted with a stone lintel.
46. This application seeks consent for a black vitreous enamel stove flue pipe on the western roofslope of the barn. Due to the tall height of the flue, it would only be slightly visible above the roof-pitch when viewed from inside the semi-enclosed yard of Stanley Lodge. It would however be much more visible from the west and the south. In these views its prominence could be significantly reduced to an acceptable level if it were cranked over internally within the upper floor of the barn before emerging through the roof which would present a shorter visible section. This would then have a minimal impact on the appearance of the barn, and be considered acceptable and hence can be covered by a condition if the development were to be approved. Similarly, the proposed rooflights would be conservation models with a central glazing bar fitted flush in the roofslope. The majority of the rooflights would be directed onto the rear roofslope of the barn, minimising their impact. Additionally, the UPVC rainwater goods would be replaced with cast iron goods. These elements are considered acceptable.
47. In addition to the above alterations, which broadly comply with the approved plans of NP/DDD/0521/0531, this application also seeks consent for an extension of the western elevation of the barn. At present, there is a 20th century blockwork lean-to which extends approximately 5m from the western elevation of the barn. The current lean-to has a very shallow 18-degree roof-pitch when compared to the 37.5 degree pitched roof of the barn itself. The lean-to is considered to be a significant detracting feature by virtue of its material, scale, and form. Amended plans showing its removal was considered an essential enhancement and therefore a pre-requisite before the positive determination of application NP/DDD/0521/0531.
48. This application seeks to remove the existing lean-to, and replace it with a modern extension matching the scale and form of the existing. It would extend 5m from the western elevation of the barn and span the whole elevation (17m). As such, it would introduce a further ~85sqm of floorspace into the conversion.
49. The replacement lean-to extension would be largely constructed from rubble limestone to match the existing barn finish. Its roof would be blue slates to match the roof of the main barn. On the rear elevation, the extension would feature 2 full length glazed openings with timber frames, and a single window in timber frames. These would broadly match the existing openings of the barn in terms of scale, design and materials.

50. The middle 4.75m section of the extension would not be finished in limestone and blue slate. Instead it would feature 5 timber bi-fold doors in recessive heritage colours. The roof for this section would be glazed panels set in frames.
51. The rationale for this design stems from historic plans of Stanley Lodge. The accompanying covering letter features a historic OS map of Stanley Lodge from 1898 which shows that the barn historically had 2 small lean-tos off its western elevation. This application states that the development would remove the detracting element of the blockwork lean-to and construct a modern limestone extension which would “reinstate” the historic form of the barn.
52. Accordingly, the design features a central glass element so that the northern and southern “solid” sections of the extension reflect the historic lean-tos, with the glass central section representing the gap between the historic lean-tos.
53. Notwithstanding the limited evidence of some historic lean-tos, it is considered that the modern lean-to is a detracting influence on the non-designated heritage asset’s significance. This point has not been disputed by the applicant. The applicant states that the proposed replacement extension provides an enhancement to the barn and its wider setting.
54. It is considered that the removal of the lean-to would best reveal the significance of the barn. Its removal would present the non-designated heritage asset’s original form, enhancing the wider setting of Stanley Lodge by presenting the original relationship between the barn and farmhouse, prior to the later alterations.
55. The form of the proposed lean-to is considered to be inappropriate. It would be extremely shallow when compared to the roof-pitch of the main barn, and would be wider than the gable of the barn. This is considered to constitute poor design as it would not respect the host barn’s form, massing or scale. It would therefore erode its character and appearance, detracting from its significance. It would be contrary to policies DMC3 and DMC5.
56. Whilst the limestone finish of the lean-to would be considered acceptable in isolation, it is considered that the glass central section would be at odds with the wider character of Stanley Lodge. The rationale behind the glass section is understood and acknowledged; however, it is considered to be somewhat contrived in nature. It would erode the solid character of the barn and wider farmstead, and harm its significance and setting. Whilst it is acknowledged that the western elevation is screened from wider long-distance views, it is considered that the impact on the significance of the barn itself is harmful and contrary to policies DMC5.
57. It is also noted that the information provided does not give an indication on the material or form of the historic lean-to extensions. The 1898 OS plan only shows the area occupied by the extension. It is of an unknown form and material palette, and has since been completely removed and replaced by a 20th century blockwork extension. Accordingly, it is considered that the existence of historic alterations is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this planning application.
58. As such, the pertinent consideration is whether the proposed extension is acceptable with regard to impact on heritage assets and in design terms. As noted, the current extension is considered to be a detracting influence on the historic form of the barn and farmstead. Policy L3 states that development should seek to “reveal” the significance of heritage assets. It is considered that the removal of the lean-to would reveal the significance of the barn by showing its original form. The provision of a modern extension

in the same scale as the existing would not assist in revealing the significance of the barn.

59. It is considered that the form of the barn, in addition to its relationship with Stanley Lodge farmhouse, is a feature of value. Policy DMC5 states that development affecting heritage assets should seek to conserve or enhance features of value. The addition of a modern extension would erode the form of barn by introducing a non-traditional element which does not respect the massing, form, or material palette of the host barn.
60. Policy DMH8 states that alterations and extensions to existing outbuildings will be permitted provided that the changes to the form, mass and appearance of the host building conserves or enhances the immediate curtilage with regard to the built environment of the locality. Whilst policy permits extensions in principle, it is considered that the construction of a modern lean-to extension would not conserve or enhance the host building by virtue of the proposed extension's form and mass, which is considered inappropriate.
61. To conclude, it is considered that the conversion of the barn is appropriate in policy and guidance terms. It would utilise the existing openings of the barn with the exception of one opening, and would feature several enhancements as a result of the conversion such as more traditional window and door frames, blue-slate roof tiles, and higher quality rainwater goods. This part of the application complies with the guidance contained within the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD.
62. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed extension to the barn is considered inappropriate. It would erode the significance of the barn by introducing a modern element to the asset which erodes the historic form and massing of the barn. The design of the extension would introduce contrasting design principles through the glazed central element of the extension.
63. It is contrary to the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD which states that extensions to stand alone building will require a strong and convincing justification. This application has been supported by a covering letter which outlines that the extension would "reinstate" the historic form the barn. It is considered that the application has failed to demonstrate that the extension would do this by failing to provide robust information on the exact detailing of the lean-to shown in the 1898 OS plan. Accordingly, it has been determined as a modern extension to the heritage asset.
64. For the reasons above, it is considered that the development is contrary to policies DMC3, DMC5, DMH8 and L3. The modern extension would erode the significance of the heritage asset by introducing an inappropriately design, scaled and detailed element to the historic barn and would not therefore secure the necessary conservation and enhancement required to meet housing policy HC1. It is considered that its features of value will not be conserved or enhanced as a result of development, and there has been no justification to why the proposed development is desirable or necessary in conservation terms.
65. The development is therefore considered contrary to local policy and the guidance pertained in the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD.

Whether proposed development would be ancillary to Stanley Lodge

66. Policy DMH5 states that the conversion of an outbuilding close to a dwelling into ancillary dwelling use will be permitted provided 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 on site. The site should be able to meet

the parking and access requirements of the proposed development, and 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 house.

67. In addition to demonstrating compliance with policy DMH5, it is necessary for the application to demonstrate that the accommodation would genuinely be ancillary to the host dwelling. Chapter 5 of the Residential Annex SPD outlines several criteria to demonstrate that accommodation would be ancillary. Pertinent to this application are the following requirements:
- Be subordinate in scale to the main dwelling in the case of new development;
 - Contain a level and scale of accommodation that can be justified for its intended occupants;
 - Have a functional connection/degree of dependence with the main dwellinghouse;
 - Conserve and enhance the heritage significance of the building group.
68. It is noted that the development broadly complies with the three requirements of policy DMH5. It would not result in an over-intensive use of the property, or contribute towards an inadequate standard of accommodation or amenity space. Whilst the site would feature a substantial level of development, including agricultural store, traditional barn including modern extension, farmhouse with modern lean-to extension, and stable block, it is considered that this would not constitute an over-development. Furthermore, it is considered that the site can accommodate sufficient parking and access provision, and the site would share the access, service and utilities of the host dwelling.
69. Notwithstanding its compliance with the policy stipulations of policy DMH5, it is considered that the conversion, inclusive of the proposed lean-to, would not constitute ancillary accommodation. The proposed development would result in a large dwelling with 4-bedrooms, living room, another sitting room area, kitchen diner, utility room, boot room, and 2 bathrooms and a WC. This is considered to be a sizeable element that may rival the dominance of the farmhouse at Stanley Lodge when viewed as a collective farmstead.
70. The application has only made passing remarks to the intended use of the accommodation, stating in the Design and Access Statement that the applicants intend to live in the conversion as their lifetime home with their father occupying the main house.
71. For the previous application on site (0521/0531), it was considered that as the conversion conserved the non-designated heritage asset through appropriate design, and would ensure its future through a viable use, its conversion into a three-bedroom property was acceptable and compliant with policy DMH5 and associated design guidance. Conversely, this application seeks a sizeable extension to the barn, and as such it is appropriate to consider the justification for the size, including who will live in the property and why there will be a functional connection or degree of dependence on the main dwellinghouse.
72. The application has not provided any justification for the proposed size of the development. There is no further justification to outline the requirement for an additional ~85sqm of liveable floorspace, and no information on how the proposed dwellinghouse will retain a degree of dependence on the main dwelling.
73. It is noted that the application also seeks consent for the change of use of the semi-enclosed yard into residential curtilage. This would essentially lead to the ancillary dwelling benefitting from its own curtilage separate to that of Stanley Lodge Farmhouse. Similarly, the site has sufficient space for Stanley Lodge farmhouse and the barn to have

separate parking areas, although this is not explicitly outlined in the application package. As a result, it is important to consider the severability of the proposed ancillary annex.

74. 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.
75. In all respects the nature and scale of the proposal *could* create two separate planning units and while there may be a family connection between the occupants of the proposed accommodation and farmhouse, the scale of accommodation, coupled with the separate amenity space and parking, would be tantamount to a new dwelling on site by virtue of its size and services.
76. The proposed development would result in an ancillary dwellinghouse which would not be subordinate to the existing farmhouse, and would instead result in a separate planning unit as an independent residential dwelling house with no clear dependence on the host dwelling. The application has not provided clear and concise evidence to demonstrate the justification for the development (in particular its increase in size), and it is considered that the development would be harmful to the setting of Stanley Lodge farmstead. It is therefore considered contrary to policy DMH5 and the associated Residential Annexes SPD.

Impact on the valued characteristics of the landscape

77. Policy L1 requires development to conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the landscape.
78. The proposed development would broadly be contained within the existing form of the barn. It would not result in variations to the domestic curtilage of the property, apart from the change of use of the yard into amenity space. As this would not involve any material changes to the already paved yard, it is considered that it would have a negligible impact on the landscape.
79. It is acknowledged that the inclusion of the extension would be somewhat detracting due to the barn losing its legibility on the landscape; however, it is also acknowledged that there is an existing lean-to which matches the form of the proposed. As such, its impact on the landscape can only be given limited weight in the planning balance.

Human Rights

80. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
81. List of Background Papers (not previously published): Conversion of Historic Buildings (SPG), Residential Annexes SPD
82. Nil
83. Report author and job title:
84. William Eyre – Planner