

6. FULL APPLICATION - CONVERSION OF BARN TO DWELLING TO INCLUDE ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS, HOLLOWFORD LANE, CASTLETON, (NP/HPK/0822/1076, JS)

APPLICANT: JESSICA TSANG & FELIX GARSIDE

Summary

1. The application seeks full planning permission for the conversion of a barn to dwelling to include associated access, parking and landscaping works. The barn is well located on the Hollowford Lane at the edge of Castleton and the scheme successfully conserves the heritage significance of the building. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Site and Surroundings

2. Hollowford Barn is located approximately 440m north of the centre of the village of Castleton, on the eastern side of Hollowford Lane, a small lane which runs north from the centre of the village, beyond Millbridge. It leads up to the Hollowford Centre and the local playing fields and also serves farms to the north of the village. It is also leads to a number of popular footpaths on the Mam Tor - Losehill ridge.
3. The barn is located within the south western corner of an open agricultural field. The site is enclosed by a mix of drystone walls, trees and hedging. There is a mature tree adjacent to the building, with a more substantial group of trees on the opposite side of the lane, to the south west of the site. There is an existing gated site access off the road, just to the south of the barn. The existing barn is rectangular in plan and two storeys in height. It has a pitched, slate tiled roof and the main building is of limestone construction. The main elevation faces south towards Castleton. On the west elevation there is a small lean-to extension constructed between the barn and the boundary wall. Internally the barn is subdivided into a ground floor and first floor loft space. The barn is believed to date from the 19th century, with the lean-to extension thought to postdate the 1950s.
4. To the east of the barn are the remains of a former hay “barrack”. This is constructed of four vertical wooden poles that once had a roof structure attached. The structure is in poor state of repair. The roof structure has been lost and the structure is partially held up by sleepers the uprights are tied to. The roof was adjustable via winches that were once attached to each of the uprights and now only survive in part. This was probably constructed between 1919 and 1938.
5. The site is not within Castleton Conservation Area, which lies to the south. The barn is not a listed building. The site lies within the ‘Valley Farmlands with Villages’ landscape character type in the Authority’s Landscape Strategy document.

Proposal

6. The application is for the conversion of a barn to a dwelling, together with the associated access works and landscaping. The original application included the conversion of an adjacent structure for use as a garage but this has now been withdrawn from the application as part of the amended plans submitted following discussion with officers.
7. The Planning Statement explains that the applicants propose to use the adjoining field in connection with their existing agricultural business and to live on site within the converted barn. The overall form and massing of the existing barn will be retained as existing, whilst the lean-to side element would be replaced and re-roofed with natural slate tiles. The barn conversion would comprise living space, shower room and kitchen

on the ground floor, with one bedroom on the first floor.

8. The Statement sets out the main changes to the building as follows:
 - Utilizing the existing main entrance as the new main door, replacing this with a fully glazed timber door with the original barn door pinned back onto the front elevation.
 - Existing threshing hole retained and fitted with a timber framed glazed window.
 - The existing 5 no. ventilation slits glazed to form small apertures of light to the first floor.
 - The timber structure to the old hay barracks is re-instated to form a canopy over a single parking space (now omitted in the amended plans).
 - The materials from the existing barn will be cleaned and re-used including the roof tiles, corbels and coping stones, limestone walls and timber stable door which would be pinned back.
 - Recessed conservation rooflights are proposed within the north west roof slope and the small lean-to roofslope. These, together with one front elevation window within the lean-to element, are the only proposed new openings.
9. New drystone walls are proposed to define the small curtilage and parking area around the barn. A stone pathway is proposed around the barn with a gravel parking and turning area and small area of lawn.
10. The existing access would be closed with an infilling of the drystone wall along the road and a new access slightly further down the road is proposed, to avoid the mature ash tree within the site and to provide a safe access point. One parking spaces would be provided (reduced from two as originally proposed), with an access track created off the new gated access point. The access track would be a track with a grass central verge,
11. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, a Design and Access Statement, a Heritage Statement, a Sustainability Statement, a Protected Species report and a supplementary bat report, and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **3 year commencement**
2. **Development in complete accordance with amended plans, as revised to omit the hay barn parking proposal and second parking space, subject to the following conditions:**
3. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) no improvement or other alteration to the external appearance of the buildings shall be carried out and no extensions, porches, ancillary buildings, satellite antenna, solar or photovoltaic panels, gates, fences, walls or other means of boundary enclosure (other than those specifically approved by this application) shall be erected on the site without an application for planning permission having first been made to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.**
4. **Any new stonework shall be in natural, reclaimed stone matching the existing stonework in terms of colour, texture, facing, coursing and pointing.**

5. **Prior to the installation of any new window or door frames a detailed scheme for the proposed external finish of the window and door frames shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. All door and window frames shall be recessed from the external face of the stonework to match the existing doors and windows. The window and door frames shall thereafter be finished in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the first occupation of the dwelling and the finish shall be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development hereby approved.**
6. **The rooflights shall be conservation model rooflights, fitted flush with the roofslope.**
7. **Any new or replacement rainwater goods shall match the existing in terms of profile, materials, finish and method of fixing.**
8. **All pipework, other than rainwater goods, shall be completely internal within the building.**
9. **Agree details of any external lighting.**
10. **Carry out landscaping scheme prior to occupation (boundary walling) and planting within first planting season following commencement. Provide sample of surfacing materials.**
11. **All new service lines to be underground.**
12. **Provide new access and parking prior to first occupation.**
13. **Historic Building Recording: No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of historic building recording, the equivalent of a Level 3 building survey, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.**
14. **Ecology: All Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement measures to be implemented.**

Key Issues

- The principle of development
- The impact of the proposed development on the barn and its setting
- The impact on the landscape character of the area.
- Highways and other issues

History

12. There is no relevant planning history.

Consultations

13. Highway Authority: No response following referral to Highway Authority.
14. Borough Council: No response.
15. Castleton Parish Council: No response.

16. PDNPA Ecology: *“Following a Preliminary ecology assessment in March 2022, 2x dusk bats surveys were undertaken in August 2022 details of which are presented within Hollowford Barn, Castleton, Supplementary Bat Survey by Dunelm Ecology (September 2022). The building was assessed as having moderate potential to support bat roosts. No bats were observed to emerge during the surveys in August 2022 and no evidence of bats was found during any of the surveys. However, it is noted that although unlikely to support maternity roosts, there is a residual risk of bats being present during works (low numbers)”*

Recommends conditions on any approval.

17. PDNPA Archaeology: Key extracts from response, as follows:
*“Significance: The stone barn is of uncertain date but is probably of early 19th century date or earlier based on cartographic evidence. The original structure is a small rectangular barn with a ground floor used for animals and an upper story used for hay storage. The barn has a door on the south side and a pitching opening on the east, gable, end in the upper story. There are also two ventilation slots on the upper story on the south side, two on the north side and one on the west side. Inside are the remains of animal stalls. A stone built lean to has been built against the ground story with a metal roof. This structure is open on the south side. The barn is listed as an undesignated heritage asset on the HBSMR.
The Hay barn is constructed of four vertical wooden poles that once had a roof structure attached. The roof structure has been lost and the structure is partially held up by sleepers the uprights are tied to. . The roof was adjustable via winches that were once attached to each of the uprights and now only survive in part. This appears to have been constructed between 1919 and 1938. This structure is an undesignated heritage asset listed on the HBSMR. The heritage assessment identifies the stone barn as of medium (regional) heritage significance and the hay barracks as of low or local heritage significance.
The site is located in an area of former medieval fields and the LIDAR data shows the remains of ridge and furrow in the field the features are currently located in. There may thus be medieval finds in the area but they are likely just lost finds and the potential for significant buried medieval archaeology in the area is therefore low. There is no evidence for archaeology in the local area relating to earlier periods so the potential for such deposits is again low. The potential for post medieval remains is probably moderate relating to the surviving barn and hay barrack, however such remains will probably be of low significance.*
18. *The proposed changes to the building will reduce its heritage significance. The two new rooflights will add new openings to the main building and one rooflight on the lean to will add a third. Rooflights were presumably chosen to avoid the need to cut new openings in the stone walls of the structure. All of these rooflights are located to add natural light to rooms that will have windows into them on the proposed development and as such the need for such openings is questioned. The addition of two rooflights on the first story bedroom are significant changes to a room that has a gable end window. In addition the new rooflight in what will be a small kitchen when a new window is proposed is also questioned. The proposals are for the hay barracks to be reconstructed or the uprights made safe and upright as so little remains of the roof that the reconstruction of this is not practical. The landscaping of the site will require the addition of new drystone walls to create a curtilage around the barn following its conversion with car parking for two cars and the installation of an air source heat pump. The new walls will make a significant change to the field in which the barn currently sits, the current walls follow the line of the former ridge and furrow which is observable on LIDAR data and the proposed changes will cut across these ridge and furrow lines.*
19. Recommendations: *The proposed changes to the barn will save what is an otherwise*

declining structure. The impacts of the proposed works will have a significant impact on the inside of the barn where the ground floor will be gutted and a door will be cut through the original west gable wall to join the lean to with the main barn. The external appearance will remain largely the same with one new window and the rooflights being the only new openings. The proposed rooflights are approximately half a metre by three quarters of a metre and three such openings on such a small building will significantly impact on it. Rooflights on any converted agricultural building should be conservation grade and kept to the minimum size and number. The proposed changes to the hay barracks will preserve the skeleton of this structure which will preserve the uprights and some cross beams of this unusual structure. However, based on the plans provided this structure risks being seen as a carport the car parking arrangements should be reviewed to determine if a better arrangement can be identified that does not mean this structure is seen as a carport. The proposed drystone curtilage walls will use the local vernacular style of walling, which is desirable, but will impact on the layout of the current field boundaries. As a non-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)”.

20. Recommends conditions in the event of an approval.

Representations

21. We have received 21 representations, 5 objecting to the application, one raising a question about the intended occupancy of the dwelling (holiday let or permanent dwelling) and 15 supporting it.

22. The objections raise the following points, which are representative of the comments:

- The conversion would urbanise the site, with a larger off road gated tarmac entrance, tarmac tracks across a field, a large new boundary wall and gate containing a gravel courtyard, parking of two cars, chimneys, velux windows, and a much larger gable end wall adjoining the roadside to provide a kitchen.
- Residential development would be beyond the village boundary, which is at the cemetery. It would be development in the open countryside.
- The lane is narrow and well trafficked by walkers and vehicles at all times of the year and will increase with the expansion of facilities at the Hollowford Centre
- This barn is unique not only for its construction but for its location alongside a public footpath/access road instead of in the middle of privately owned land. It can be freely viewed and appreciated without trespassing. Many of these farm buildings have fallen into disrepair and been lost. This is a unique barn building and should be listed and protected as one of the last of its kind, with its future use restricted to animal/ agricultural. Many stone barns have been converted into holiday properties and their use lost only to be replaced, in many cases, by prefabricated steel framed barns. These crofts and small barns used to be affordable units of land but at £240,000 this plot will never be returned to an affordable croft for any local.
- This building is part of the history of farm buildings in this area and should be preserved.
- Moving the entrance down the lane widening it and the subsequent driveway across the field and new boundary walls enclosing two car parking bays just adds to the harm.
- The "Sustainability Statement" tries to make a case to improve the energy efficiency of the barn. Besides the large carbon footprint generated by the suggested measures surely the best way to achieve all these aims is to leave the barn as it was built, an agricultural building in an agricultural field. This will greatly exceed the above aims with no carbon emissions and zero

contribution to climate change.

- Concern that it may become a holiday let, given the high number in this area.

23. Those supporting the application raise the following points, which are representative of the comments:

- The application makes good use of an existing building, retaining its original character and therefore that of the important landscape in which it sits. It is sympathetically modified to respond to the local vernacular, it sits unobtrusively in its surroundings, uses local materials to rebuild and gently modify its footprint.
- The barn will also provide housing for a young couple who wish to live there permanently, therefore addressing the issues of loss of housing for local people to the holiday let industry.
- The use of ground source heat pumps reduces the building's future carbon footprint and the increase in tree planting provides habitat for wild animals.
- This project has been very well designed, thought out and will give his building a future.

Main Policies

24. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, CC1, HC1, L1, L2 and L3.

25. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC12, DMH6, DMT3, DMT8.

National Planning Policy Framework

26. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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 our 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. There is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF and our policies should be given full weight in the determination of this application.

27. Paragraph 176 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.”*

28. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that planning decision should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless there is an essential need for a rural worker, the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its setting, involve the subdivision of an existing dwelling or where the design is of exceptional quality.

29. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed

includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

30. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
31. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Peak District National Park Development Plan

Core Strategy

32. 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.
33. Policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics.
34. Policy L2 states the development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where is likely to have an adverse impact on any site, features or species of biodiversity importance or their setting.
35. Policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
36. Policy HC1 says that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. New housing can be accepted where it would meet eligible local need for affordable housing, provides for key rural workers or is required to achieve conservation and or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.

Development Management Policies

37. Policy DMC3 says that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the

landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place. DMC3 B. sets out various criteria which will be taken into account.

38. Policy DMC5 says that planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
39. Policy DMC5 says that planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate how their significance will be preserved and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
40. Policy DMC10 A. says that the conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:
- i. it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision or other alterations to form and mass, inappropriate new window openings or doorways and major rebuilding); and
 - ii. the building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not compromise the significance and character of the building; and
 - iii. the changes brought about by the new use, and any associated infrastructure (such as access and services), conserves or enhances the heritage significance of the asset, its setting (in accordance with policy DMC5), any valued landscape character, and any valued built environment; and
 - iv. the new use of the building or any curtilage created would not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics.

Policy DMC10 B. says proposals under Core Strategy policy HC1CI will only be permitted where:

- i. the building is a designated heritage asset; or
 - ii. based on the evidence, the National Park Authority has identified the building as a non-designated heritage asset; and
 - iii. it can be demonstrated that conversion to a market dwelling is required in order to achieve the conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.
41. Policies DMT3 and DTM8 require safe access and adequate parking to be provided for development.

Adopted supplementary planning documents:

42. The Authority adopted design guide is relevant, as is the Authority's adopted supplementary planning guidance on climate change and sustainable building. The Design Guide states that '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'.

Conversion of Historic Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD):

43. This SPD was adopted in April 2022. It is intended to be used by those wishing to convert historic buildings. It provides a level of detail that is necessary to interpret national guidance in the context of Peak District National Park's protected landscape. In particular it clarifies DMP policy DMC10 'Conversion of a heritage asset' by focusing on:
- Principle 1: Understand the building and its setting
 - Principle 2: Work with the existing form and character
 - Principle 3: Follow a conservation approach
 - Principle 4: Create responsive new design
 - Principle 5: Use appropriate materials and detailing
 - Principle 6: Conserve and enhance the setting

Assessment

Principle of the Development

44. The proposal is for the conversion of a traditional limestone barn to create a single open market dwelling. The barn is located in open countryside where dwellings are only approved on an exceptional basis, as set out in Core strategy policy HC1. The policies set out above, notably policies HC1 and DMC10, support the principle of the conversion of non-designated heritage assets to alternative uses within policy DS1, provided that the development is required to secure the conservation or enhancement of the buildings and the impact of the conversion on the buildings and their setting is acceptable.
45. The barn is not a listed building so it is not a designated heritage asset. Development Management policy DMC5 requires an assessment of significance to be with an application which relates to a heritage asset. A Planning Statement has been submitted in support of the application, together with a Heritage Statement. The Heritage Assessment is thorough and detailed, providing sufficient detail to meet the requirements of policy DMC5. On the basis of this assessment, officers agree that, given its age and historical and architectural significance, the barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. During the course of this application a request was made to Historic England to list the barn, presumably by a third party, so determination of the application was delayed slightly to allow Historic England to assess it. However, they concluded that the building was not of sufficient interest to be statutorily listed. Nonetheless, the building is considered by officers to be a non-designated heritage asset and, as such, falls within the scope of policy DMC10.
46. Even though it is relatively small and simple building, as noted above, the barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The principle of conversion of the building to a beneficial use is considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy policies DS1 and L3 and DM policies DMC5 and DMC10, provided the scheme does not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the building and its setting. The Planning Statement which accompanies the application concludes that the building has sufficient historic and vernacular merit to warrant conversion to an alternative use. Officers agree with this assessment, so the proposal is in accordance with the key policies on this issue. The principle of the change of use of the site to a single dwelling is acceptable and accords with Policy HC1.
47. The key issue is therefore whether the conversion is required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of the building and the impact of the development on the building and its setting.

Impact of the proposed conversion on the building and its setting

48. DM policy DMC10 says that the conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted where it is demonstrated that the building is a heritage asset and where:

"(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)".

Officers consider that the proposal retains and re-uses the building's existing features, principally its form and external appearance. Externally the scheme uses the building's existing openings for windows and doors. The lean-to on the roadside gable would be rebuilt in stone and slate to provide some additional space in what would be a very small dwelling. This would add to the shell of the original building but the new lean-to would be a sympathetic alteration and addition to the building and would secure the removal of the existing lean-to.

49. The original submission also included the use of the former "hay barracks" to provide a covered car parking area. This is an unusual proposal as it would use a structure that is not a building, but a set of timber posts which supported hay storage. As noted in the Authority's Archaeologist comments, if it has a covered roof, this could have had the appearance of a car port, which would be wholly inappropriate in this setting. Following discussions with officers, this has now been withdrawn from the scheme.
50. It is considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable design which would not harm the original barn and its setting. Therefore, the development would achieve the conservation and enhancement of the building and its setting, in accordance with our housing and conservation policies.

Landscape Impact

51. The site lies within a Limestone Hills and Slopes area of the White Peak as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment. This is a pastoral landscape with a varied undulating topography and some steep slopes. The Castleton Conservation Area Appraisal notes the historic nature of the landscape around the village, with historic field systems and extensive views from surrounding hills, including from Peveril Castle. The application site is part of the wider setting of Castleton, particularly when seen from adjacent footpaths and lanes.
52. In terms of its impact on the landscape setting of the building, the scheme would inevitably change the immediate setting of the building, domesticating it to some extent. The converted building would have a new access off Hollowford Lane and a small curtilage defined by a drystone wall. This would inevitably result in some domestication of the site and its landscape setting. Whilst this is regrettable, it needs to be set against the benefit of retaining a traditional building which occupies a relatively prominent laneside location. Conditions can be used to control some of the manifestations of residential use, such as sheds and greenhouses, but the normal trappings of residential use such as parked cars, a small garden and washing, etc, cannot easily be controlled. In exceptional cases a section 106 agreement has been used to control the land (for example, on a barn conversion at Housley, near Foolow), but in this case the curtilage would be very small so its impact would be limited and localised. On balance, the conversion is considered to be sympathetic, so it would not have a harmful impact on this setting.

Impact on Residential Amenity

53. The nearest neighbouring property to the barn is some distance away to the south. The proposed dwelling would have no impact on the amenity of any other dwellings. Consequently the proposal accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

Ecological Considerations

54. The application was accompanied by an ecology report and a supplementary bat report. The Authority's Ecologist confirms that the surveys have been undertaken in line with the relevant guidelines and that an appropriate impact assessment has been undertaken along with details for appropriate mitigation/compensatory methods. The Ecologist recommends conditions be imposed on any approval to secure compliance with recommendations of the report. The proposal therefore accords with policy DMC12.

Highways Impacts

55. The Highway Authority has not responded, following its initial request to refer the application. However, the proposal is considered to be acceptable from a highway point of view, being a single dwelling and with a new access to improve visibility along the lane. One on-site car parking space is proposed (reduced from two in the original submission).

Environmental Impacts

56. The Planning Statement refers to the requirements of policy CC1 Climate Change mitigation and says that a key sustainability principle is the adaptive reuse of existing structures; this retains the embodied energy of the existing barn whilst futureproofing the use of the structure and ensuring its longevity as a historic asset. The scheme would include internally lining and insulating the building to current Building Regulations standards and the proposal would utilise energy and water efficient fittings and fixtures. In addition, an air source heat pump is proposed. No other specific renewable energy generation measures are proposed, given the nature of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.

Conclusion

57. It is concluded that the proposal is required to conserve the significance of the building which is a non-designated heritage asset by virtue of its architectural and historic character and its importance in its setting. The conversion of the building to a small dwelling is acceptable in principle under policies HC1 and DMC10. The proposal will conserve the landscape character of the locality and its biodiversity and will not harm highway safety or the amenity of any other properties. The proposal therefore accords with adopted policies and the application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

59. Nil

60. Report Author: John Scott