

10. FULL APPLICATION: PROPOSED BARN CONVERSION TO CREATE A SINGLE DWELLING INCLUDING THE UPGRADE OF AN EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH ALTERATIONS TO ADJACENT FARM HANDS COTTAGE TO CREATE RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE WITH DEDICATED AMENITY SPACE FOR THE COTTAGE AT HALL FARM HOUSE BED AND BREAKFAST, HALL LANE, LITTON. NP/DDD/0621/0657 JK.

APPLICANT: MR FRAZER SCOTT

Summary

1. The site is a stone barn proposed for conversion into a two-bedroom dwelling located within a former farmstead complex adjacent Hall Lane within Litton village.
2. The alterations to Farm Hands Cottage and its curtilage are acceptable.
3. The principle of converting the original historic barn to a dwelling is acceptable however the application proposes to retain a modern lean-to extension with alterations and rebuilding to form additional accommodation.
4. Officers advised retention of this lean-to harms the character, appearance and setting of the historic barn and the farmstead group and requested its omission. This would enable a more sensitive conversion revealing historic openings, however the applicant has requested determination as submitted.
5. The application is recommended for refusal.

6. Site and Surroundings

7. Hall Farm House lies at the junction of Main Road and Hall Lane in the centre of Litton village. The Hall faces onto Main Street over a small walled frontage. The main amenity space at the rear abuts Hall Lane where there is also a domestic vehicular access.
8. To the south of the house and its formal garden lies the former farmyard which is bounded by a U-shaped range of traditional former farm buildings. The western range of these buildings now forms a part two-storey/part single-storey dwelling known as Farm Hands Cottage behind which are two small walled grass paddocks.
9. The southern barn range lies outside the application area and has already been converted to residential use.
10. The remaining smaller unconverted eastern two storey traditional barn abuts Hall Lane. This eastern barn is the subject of the current application to convert into a dwelling incorporating the much later lean-to extension sited in the corner abutting both the southern barn and the application barn. This lean-to is constructed of mixed stone/concrete block under a corrugated roof and is of no merit.
11. The main access into the farmyard off Hall Lane lies off the north gable of the application barn.
12. All of the property lies within the Litton Conservation Area with the barn being particularly prominent in close views from Hall Lane.
13. There are no designated heritage assets within the application site although clearly the Hall as a late 19th Century farmhouse is a non-designated heritage asset along with its traditional outbuildings which together form an historic farmstead group.

14. The proposed development will, if accepted, create an additional dwelling which would lie within the Nutrient Neutrality SSSI catchment area for the Peak District Dales SAC (PDDSAC) and the River Wye SSSI. Foul water discharges from development are one of the main contributors to nutrient enrichment, as such, any development which will cause an increase in overnight stays within the catchment must calculate a nutrient budget and provide mitigation which will prevent any increase in nutrients entering the River and exacerbating the sites current unfavourable condition.
15. Consequently, a separate Habitats Regulation Assessment report has been produced which officers have determined under delegated powers, concluding that there would be an insignificant impact upon the PDDSAC and thereby enabling determination of this application.

16. Proposal

17. The conversion with alterations of the barn coupled with substantial rebuilding of the lean-to to form a single market dwelling.
18. Amended plans for the conversion have been submitted as well as details of the means of foul sewage disposal being changed. Fouls waters from both the new dwelling and Farm Hands Cottage now being directed to a new packaged sewage treatment plant. This would replace a current septic tank in the yard and would discharge to a new drainage field in the paddock behind Farm Hands Cottage. The application is determined on the basis of these revised plans and associated documents.
19. The plans show the dwelling would have two bedrooms and a main bathroom on the ground floor with the first floor providing open plan living dining and kitchen space. One of the ground floor bedrooms would be within the lean-to extension which would be upgraded and altered with a new front cavity stone wall to replace the existing blockwork. A new roof clad in blue slate would replace the existing corrugated one and match the proposed new slate roof (replacing current Hardrow tiles) on the main barn.
20. A small walled amenity area and a single parking space is shown created between the gable of the barn and the farmyard entrance following the removal of an existing conifer tree of no particular merit. Four other parking spaces are outlined within the yard on the plans.
21. In addition to the works to convert the barn and upgrade the extension the proposal also includes alterations to the rear of Farm Hands Cottage. The amended proposal sees a new doorway in the current dining/study area to give access out onto a proposed new dedicated private amenity space at the rear west side of the cottage formed by walling off a section of the rear paddock.

22. RECOMMENDATION:

23. That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The proposal fails to demonstrate a scheme of conversion to a market dwelling which would conserve and enhance the significance of this non-designated heritage asset and its setting. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies HC1C, DMC10, the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD and the NPPF.**

2. **Insufficient evidence, in the absence of a bat loft or further survey to rule out harm to protected species (bats), contrary to policies L2, DMC11, DMC12 and the NPPF.**

24. Key Issues

- The principle of development.
- The impact of the proposed development, particularly the retention of the lean-to, on the significance of the barn and its setting within the historic farmstead.
- The impact on the street scene and landscape character of the locality.
- Highways and ecological impacts
- Impact upon the Conservation Area.
- Potential impact upon the SAC.

25. Relevant Planning History

26. 1977 – Approval for use of Hall as guest house
27. 1985 – Approval for conversion of barns to dwelling
28. 1996 – Approval for restoration of cottage and conversion of outbuildings for ancillary use. Conditions required the accommodation to remain ancillary to Hall Farm House and not be an independent dwelling and also withdrew permitted development rights. The plans showed the adjacent lean-to on the southern barn being reduced in length to create more space in front of the cottage for an enlarged amenity space.
29. 2007 – Consent granted for independent use of the cottage
30. According to the Heritage Report the lean-to was built sometime between 1922 and the 1950's when it first appears on a photograph. The heritage report considers this indicates that the building had originally been constructed of stone, with a central doorway flanked by two openings although officers are unable to confirm the use of stone due to the poor quality of the image. By 1976, the structure appears to have been rebuilt with concrete blocks, with the central door still present but the flanking windows removed. The western portion of the lean-to was then demolished between 2003 and 2005 according to an aerial image. The eastern wall was re-built and faced in stone more recently by the current owner when the adjacent cottage was created and the lean-to shortened to make way for an amenity space in front of the cottage.

31. Consultations

32. Highway Authority – No objections.
33. DCC noted that despite visibility splays being below recommendations recognise the access is close to the 30 mph zone which coupled with the improvements and noting the existing character of the site concluded that *“it would be difficult to defend a reason for refusal on highway grounds under NPPF 111 (severe) at appeal, ..*
34. Recommends conditions to secure compliance with amended plans, parking provision to be maintained and no gates or barriers at the access.
35. Litton Parish Council – The Parish Council supports this application as it removes an unsightly additional entrance and the renovations are sympathetic to the barn.
36. Natural England – No objections

37. Summarised advice is; if the septic tank discharges to a drainage field, i.e. as shown in Building Regulations Approved Document H2, which also meets the criteria set out within Annex F of NE's letter 'Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites', a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effects can be reached within the HRA.
38. Any mitigation measures used should be secured by condition and detailed within the Appropriate Assessment stage of HRA.
39. It is also important to note that whatever the treatment system, there must be measures in place to ensure it's functioning for the lifetime of the development.
40. PDNPA Ecology - No objections, some impact due to presence of bats and birds, recommends conditions to mitigate re EPSM licence required and update bat survey or additional mitigation (bat loft).
41. Detailed comments (Summarised)
42. A brown long-eared bat Day Roost was recorded in the barn.
43. Given the age of the data an updated survey to assess the current status of the site is required to include a daytime roost assessment (including birds) and at least one emergence survey. Given the current potential of the building to support higher numbers of cavity dwelling bats such as brown long-eared bats, as an alternative to the updated survey, the inclusion of a dedicated bat loft into the development would be welcomed.
44. Given the presence of bat roosts, a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence will need to be secured from Natural England before the works can proceed.
45. As an alternative to a house sparrow terrace (which are not suitable for swifts), advise that at least 2x swift bricks are incorporated into the development. Swift bricks can also accommodate other smaller birds.
46. Any lighting for the scheme should be in accordance with advice given in Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2018) Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK Bats and the Built Environment series.
47. PDNPA Archaeology; Do not support but recognise improvements made to original submitted scheme. Comments as follows (summarised)
48. Significance
The barn forms part of a range of barns that form part of a historic farmstead. The building comprises a north-south aligned projection of a L-shaped range of barns that date to the 19th century, and face on to a former farmyard area. A small modern lean-to is attached to its west elevation, and also attaches to the north elevation of the east-west aligned range.
49. The two-storey section of the main barn is considered to be a heritage asset of local significance. Its significance lies in its:
 - Historic interest – agricultural character, external elevations (stonework, apertures, features etc.) retain a high level of historic interest, legibility of the historic agricultural function of the building. Legibility of phases of stone work and alteration. Size and location of historic apertures evidence historic use and function, surviving traditional shutters, doors and door furniture. Some, but limited interest internally, partial survival of historic flooring, hook fittings, elements of historic roof structure etc.

- Architectural interest - including traditional materials, vernacular form and agricultural character that is evidence of its historic use and function, and a reflection of the development of both farming practices and the local landscape. Architectural features such as ashlar lintel, jambs and cills .
 - Archaeological interest - the main building retains the potential for concealed evidence and information within the surviving historic fabric that holds clues to its historic development and function that could be revealed with specialist study.
50. It is clear that whilst there are some features of interest internally, the barn's main interest lies in its external elevations as this is where most historic interest and legibility lies.
51. The small lean-to is an entirely modern construction, not added until the 20th century. It does not appear on the 1922 OS mapping, but a lean-to is shown on a 1950s aerial photograph. The structure of the lean-to itself was originally built of local stone, but is currently largely of blockwork construction with corrugated roofing, and as the heritage statement makes clear in the mid-20th century the structure was constructed of stone and very little of the original 20th century structure actually survives.
52. As a structure of clear 20th century origin, that is not made of traditional materials, the lean-to is not considered to a heritage asset or have heritage value. Furthermore, in obscuring the features of the main barn it actually detracts from the significance of the heritage asset. I therefore question its suitability for conversion.
53. Comments on the amended scheme
54. *New window in the north gable end of the barn.*
The upper story of the barn was originally a hay loft, as evidenced by the ventilation slits. Other than the ventilation slits this wall was originally sterile of archaeological features. The heritage statement notes that this addition would have an impact of moderate to major significance.
55. *New door on west side farm hand's cottage.*
The west facing wall has an existing door and two small air slits converted to small windows. The current proposals included one window and one new door (Planning Officer notes now reduced to a single door). These will have a significant impact on the appearance of the wall and the building in general. However, this wall faces the fields to the west and is not easily viewed except from the rear of the properties that face on the main road through Litton.
56. *Amenity space for farm hand's cottage.*
This area is characterised by strip fields that run north-south and the proposed amenity space will cut into one of the strips narrowing its line in this area. However, the strip has already been encroached upon by the property to the south and it is proposed that the new amenity space lines up with the already existing encroachment to the south. This will reduce the impact of the proposal but there will still be a low-level impact on the field system around the village.
57. *Roadside elevation.*
This elevation is currently blind at ground floor, a reflection of the historical function of the building and how the building operated as part of the historic farmstead. The proposed two new openings (Planning Officer Note – new openings reduced to one window in latest amended plans) in this elevation that is currently blind at ground floor will change the character of this elevation, and would dilute the agricultural character of the building, which is part of its core significance. It would also affect the legibility of the historic function of

the building, confusing the archaeology of the building, which is harmful to its historic interest, again part of its core significance. This represents a high level of harm to part of the core significance of the building.

58. Rooflights

Welcome the size of the rooflights on the West elevation courtyard roof has been reduced, and their position on the roof lowered. However, 3 is still too many for this small roof and would harm the agricultural character of the building and the solid: void ratio of the roof. (Planning Officer Notes these now reduced to two in number)

59. Lean-to

Still question whether this is worthy of retention in any conversion as a modern structure, and advise that the significance of the historic building would be better revealed by its removal. If it is considered accept to retain and rebuild as part of a conversion scheme then the reduction in size of the window and rooflights would be less harmful to the agricultural character of the building overall the what was previously proposed. A solid roof without rooflights would be preferable. (Planning Officer notes the latest amended plans simplify the openings and omit the rooflights).

60. Window

Planning Officer Note - Latest amended plans remove the previous concern these were still too domestic in character, and now show single recessed glazing to give more of the impression of an agricultural aperture rather than a domestic window with glazing bars etc.

61. From a heritage perspective details such as the number, form and position of rooflights, and window detailing could be controlled by condition. However, the proposed new openings to the eastern elevations are a real sticking point – they result in a large degree of change to a key elevation, of harm to the significance of the heritage asset, and they are contrary to policy.

62. In summary, the proposed conversion still does not work well with the significance of the heritage asset, and would not conserve the significance of the heritage asset. A number of proposed changes will result in a high level of harm. Therefore, from a heritage perspective I cannot support the positive determination of the application with the revisions as proposed as annotated on the amended plans.

63. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

64. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.

65. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2023). 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 particular Paragraph 182 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.

66. Para 201 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.
67. Para 203. Of the NPPF states that 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.
68. Para 205. Of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
69. Para 207. Of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
70. Para 208. Of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
71. Paragraph 209 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.

72. Main Development Plan Policies

73. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

74. Core Strategy

75. 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. With GSP2 - Enhancing the National Park, these policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conservation and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.

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. 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.
79. DS1 - Development Strategy. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Froggatt is a named settlement.
80. 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.
81. Policy CC1 requires development to incorporate sustainable building techniques to mitigate the impacts of climate change. Development must maximise opportunities for carbon reductions by designing development in accordance with the energy hierarchy and incorporating energy and water saving measures.
82. Policies L1 and L3 say that development must conserve or enhance the landscape and cultural heritage of the National Park and other than in exceptional circumstances development that has a harmful impact will not be permitted.
83. We have adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (Detailed Design Guide) for alterations and extensions. Chapter 3 relates to extensions to dwellings and states that there are three main factors to consider, massing, materials, detailing and style. All extensions should harmonise with the parent building, respecting the dominance of the original building. The original character of the property should not be destroyed when providing additional development.
84. Chapter 4 of the SPD deals with other material planning considerations, neighbourliness, outlook and amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property. We have also adopted an SPD on sustainable building and climate change. This is a material consideration when applying policy CC1.
85. 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
86. 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; or
 - II. it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1.

87. Development Management Policies

88. 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.
89. 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.
90. 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.
91. DMC8 Conservation Areas
- A. Applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced. The application should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and the following matters should be taken into account:
- (i) form and layout of the area including views and vistas into and out of it and the shape and character of spaces contributing to the character of the historic environment including important open spaces as identified on the Policies Map;
 - (ii) street patterns, historical or traditional street furniture, traditional surfaces, uses, natural or man-made features, trees and landscapes;
 - (iii) scale, height, form and massing of the development and existing buildings to which it relates;
 - (iv) locally distinctive design details including traditional frontage patterns and vertical or horizontal emphasis;
 - (v) the nature and quality of materials.
- B. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect of their proposals on the character, appearance and significance of the component parts of the Conservation Area and its setting. Where an outline application is submitted the Authority reserves the right to request additional information before determining the application.
- C. Proposals for or involving demolition of existing buildings, walls or other structures which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance or historic interest of the Conservation Area will not be permitted unless there is clear and convincing evidence that: (i) the condition of the building (provided that this is not a result of deliberate neglect) and the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its significance and to the value derived from its continued use, is such that repair is not practical; or
92. (ii) the demolition is to remove an unsightly or otherwise inappropriate modern addition to the building where its removal would better reveal buildings, walls or structures that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance or historic interest of the Conservation Area.
93. D. Where development is acceptable, a record of the current site, building or structure and its context will be required, prior to or during development or demolition.

94. E. Plans for re-use of an area where demolition is proposed must be agreed and a contract for redevelopment signed before the demolition is carried out.
95. F. Felling, lopping or topping of trees in a Conservation Area will not be permitted without prior agreement. This may require their replacement, and provision for their future maintenance.
96. 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.
97. Policies DMT3 and DTM8 require safe access and adequate parking to be provided for development.

98. Adopted supplementary planning documents:

99. 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'.

100. Conversion of Historic Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD):

101. 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:

- a. Principle 1: Understand the building and its setting
- b. Principle 2: Work with the existing form and character
- c. Principle 3: Follow a conservation approach
- d. Principle 4: Create responsive new design
- e. Principle 5: Use appropriate materials and detailing
- f. Principle 6: Conserve and enhance the setting

102. Assessment

103. Principle of Development

104. The proposal is for the conversion of the traditional limestone barn and the later modern lean-to to create a two-bed market dwelling. The barn is located on the edge of the village and within the built-up area of the village.
105. Market housing is only approved on an exceptional basis, as set out in Core strategy policy HC1. HC1C sets out the relevant exception section for this case where, in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2, the conversion can be accepted where it is required either to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings; or achieve conservation or enhancement in a designated settlement listed in DS1. Litton is one such designated settlement.
106. The policies set out above, notably policies HC1 and DMC10, therefore 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.
107. 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 detailed Heritage Statement has been submitted which meets the requirements of policy DMC5. On the basis of this assessment, officers agree that, given its evidential, aesthetic and historical value, the barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. As such the conversion falls within the scope of policy DMC10 which sets out that conversion of a non-designated heritage asset will be permitted subject to detailed criteria being met which seek to protect its significance and the landscape setting.
108. The principle of conversion of the building to a beneficial use is therefore considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy policies DS1, HC1 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 Heritage Statement demonstrates that the main building has sufficient historic and vernacular merit to warrant conversion to an alternative use. Officers agree with this assessment, so the proposal to convert that section would be in accordance with the key policies on this issue.
109. Whilst the principle of the conversion of the main two storey section to a single dwelling is acceptable and accords with Policy HC1, the proposal also includes the lean-to which after enhancement would be used to provide space for the second bedroom and its ensuite.
110. The modern lean-to however is deemed in the Heritage Assessment to have a “*low degree of significance from its connection to the now demolished Old Farm. However, there is very little surviving fabric of the early-mid-20th century structure. Furthermore,*

the lean-to has abutted a number of significant features of the barn and the southern range.”

111. It is clear that the later lean-to is of a limited degree of significance. It was never part of the original barns behind and even as a later addition has been much altered and rebuilt over the years. The lean-to covers some significant openings on the façade of the main barns behind. Some of these were revealed when it was shortened in connection with the formation of Farm Hands Cottage, which enhanced the significance and setting of the heritage asset behind. Complete removal of the lean-to would reveal more of these and would follow the normal approach set out in design guidance and our conversion of buildings policy where such later non-traditional additions of little or no merit be removed as part of the package of measures necessary to enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset. Furthermore, our policies set a high threshold of achieving significant enhancement within policy HC1 and GSP2 to enable an exceptional approval for a market dwelling.
112. The applicant and his agent argue that the inclusion of the lean-to is essential to provide necessary accommodation, the second bedroom, and make the scheme viable.
113. The main issue is therefore whether the conversion is required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of the building and whether the inclusion of the lean-to is a necessary part to secure that.

114. Design and Appearance

115. The Impact of the proposed conversion on the building and its setting

116. 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:
117. "(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)".

118. *Impact on the historic section of the barn*

119. The plans show that the proposal retains and re-uses the building's existing features, principally its form and external appearance. Externally, existing openings are reused for windows and doors with the amended scheme proposing only one new window on the ground floor of the roadside east facing elevation to serve a bedroom, and a new high-level window opening in the otherwise blank north gable end to supplement the kitchen area.
120. Whilst the ground floor opening on the roadside elevation is sited below an existing first floor opening it does erode, to some extent, the present blank ground floor elevation which is a function of this being the rear elevation with the main focus of ground floor openings being into the internal courtyard. It is also noted that this new opening is only necessary because an existing opening on the courtyard side will be covered by the lean-to's retention. The introduction of this new ground floor opening therefore results in a moderate to major impact on significance according to the heritage assessment and is a level of harm to the significance of the building which can be avoided if the lean-to were omitted.
121. Currently the north gable is blank apart from two small high-level ventilation slits. As submitted the plans retained this blank arrangement reflecting the commentary in the Heritage Statement that introducing an opening here represented an impact of moderate

to major significance. Unfortunately, the amended plans now propose a new high-level window in the north facing gable end together with two small heritage style roof lights on the courtyard roof slope to light the open plan living space at first floor level. The roof lights are considered to be well sited and overall would conserve the solid to void ratio of the roof and being sited on the private side of the roof would have no impact outside of the site.

122. A wood burning stove within the living area generates the need for a metal flue in the courtyard side, corner roof slope where it would have least impact.
123. The current Hardrow concrete roof tiles would be replaced by natural blue slates representing a significant enhancement to significance.
124. Overall therefore, whilst it could be viewed that with only two new openings being proposed that the conversion would have a limited impact upon the barns character and appearance, nevertheless the blank nature of the affected elevations means that there would be a heightened impact categorized as a moderate to major adverse impact on significance. This impact could be avoided or significantly reduced with re-planning to deliver a conversion of the historic structure in a more sensitive manner. However, it is recognized that this requires the omission of the lean-to and a slight re-planning of the interior to suit.
125. *The impacts of the inclusion of the lean-to extension*
126. The lean-to is a much later addition to the historic barns and was originally constructed sometime between 1922 and 1950 which is when it first appears on the map. However, it is of no merit having been rebuilt in concrete block under an asbestos roof by 1976. Then more recently it was truncated to move it away from Farms Hands Cottage with the new gable wall being rebuilt and faced with stone.
127. The lean-to is proposed to be mostly rebuilt in stone and receive a new blue slate roof to improve its appearance and provide space for the second bedroom and en-suite. Although tidying this element up and improving its appearance this would essentially be a replacement structure. This would have a permanent adverse impact on significance as a result of concealing important historic openings behind its fabric and preventing their effective use in a more sensitive conversion confined within the historic structure. Weighed in the planning balance this harm is not outweighed by the retention of the very little significance of the lean-to itself. Neither is it outweighed by the loss of the larger bedroom space as there is no evidence to suggest that a similar conversion within the historic shell could not be achieved.
128. Without the lean-to the conversion would need some simple internal re-planning to still achieve two bedrooms on the ground floor. Although this would result in a smaller dwelling (floorspace would equate with our affordable floorspace guidance for a four-person dwelling), it would reveal the covered openings on the west elevation and remove the need for the ground floor roadside new opening thus enhancing the significance of the heritage asset to meet the test in HC1C and better accord with aims of policy DMC10.
129. Omitting the lean-to extension would also better accord with our Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD which sets out at 5.14 That; *'Schemes should work within the shell of the existing building, avoiding additions or extensions.'*
130. And at 2.5 *'Historic buildings should be large enough to accommodate the proposed new use and any associated storage without extensions or new ancillary buildings. Extensions to stand alone buildings or buildings separate from a group will require a strong and convincing justification.'*

131. And at 5.15 that *'Every effort should be made to use existing openings to the full.'*
132. And at 5.18 *'The historic ratio of blank walling to door and window openings – the 'solid-to-void' ratio – should be maintained. The insertion of new openings in otherwise blank elevations, or where there is no physical evidence of previous openings, should be avoided particularly where visible from public vantage points such as footpaths and roads.'*
133. The applicant has been requested to remove the lean-to at various stages within the application life, as well as in pre-application advice where it was suggested that removing the existing *"unsightly lean-to structure to the rear of the property"," would reveal an original door and window opening that have been concealed."* In response the applicant has requested determination as submitted and put forward the following arguments (summarized) in support of its retention;
134. 1. *Historical aerial photos of Hall Farm show that a more permanent lean-to structure, faced in stone with windows and a central doorway has been in place for the best part of 75 years.*
135. 2. *The lean-to has been reduced in length over the years revealing two of the original openings into the adjacent Long Shippon, which have now been infilled, with the third being preserved and incorporated into our proposals for the retained part of the lean-to.*
136. 3. *The lean-to will be faced in limestone walling, with gritstone detailing to a door and window opening, closely replicating what was there originally.*
137. 4. *This in our opinion, tells a story in conservation terms, in the evolution of Hall Farm and represents a significant enhancement to the appearance, character and setting of the complex of buildings there.*
138. 5. *A final point, in terms of the retention of the lean-to, relates to the viability of the conversion, which realistically requires two bedrooms in order to provide a good level accommodation for a small family, which we know there is demand for in the village.*
139. *With regards to the other points raised:*
140. *Ecology – a bat loft is not considered feasible, but our client is happy to install external ready-made / integrated Bat and Swift boxes into the conversion and surrounding buildings*
141. In summary officers conclude that the proposed conversion would generally be of an acceptable design, apart from the inclusion of the modern lean-to extension which would perpetuate the harm to the significance of the original barn and prejudices the more effective use of the concealed openings behind, and to its courtyard setting. Without the removal of that lean-to the development would not achieve the high bar necessary in terms of the conservation and enhancement of the building and its setting, to accord with our housing and conservation policies. Consequently, refusal on these grounds is warranted.

142. Landscape Impacts

143. The barn is part of an historic farmstead on the village edge and now sits within a largely residential setting. There are open grazing field nearby and across the street. The application site is clearly part of the larger building group which is now in residential use. The converted barn would use an existing access and have small garden and parking

space defined by a drystone wall. Given the changes to the building and site would be mostly modest when viewed from the public realm it is not considered that the scheme would change the immediate setting of the building, although it would of course consolidate the current domestication of the wider building group.

144. In this case the curtilage would be very small so its impact would be limited and localised with the main open character of the farmyard being retained. The retention of the lean-to would be viewed from a section of Hall Lane but seen against the other barns in the group and combined with its recladding in traditional materials it would not be a publicly prominent or intrusive addition. It would therefore have only a minimal impact on the setting from outside the site. On balance, the conversion would conserve the local landscape setting and streetscape as well as the Litton Conservation Area.

145. Impact on Residential Amenity

146. The nearest neighbouring property to the barn is Farm Hands Cottage across the courtyard around 13m from the west wall of the historic barn. The conversion has been designed with the ground floor bathroom window and first floor kitchen windows facing the cottage, being obscure glazed to preserve amenity. Two first floor narrow slot window would also face the cottage at around 12.5 -13.2m. These are stated to have 'views obscured' on the plans and are considered due to their size and description to be acceptable in terms of amenity impact.

147. Openings in the lean-to would face north away from the cottage.

148. The small amenity area off the gable would give rise to some impacts but given the already shared use of the courtyard this is not considered to be prejudicial to either dwellings residential amenity.

149. On balance therefore, the dwelling would have no adverse impact on the amenity of any other dwellings. Consequently, the proposal accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

150. Ecological Considerations

151. The application was accompanied by an ecology report and a supplementary bat report which set out that a brown long-eared bat Day Roost has been recorded in the barn. It concluded that in the absence of mitigation, the proposed works would present a significant detrimental impact on the bats occupying this roost. As a result, a Natural England Protected Species Mitigation Licence will be required to carry out the demolition works lawfully.

152. A suggested mitigation and compensation plan was provided to minimise the impact of the development. If the mitigation and compensation/enhancement measures were implemented, the report concludes' *the development is unlikely to have any significant negative impact on bat populations within the local area. In the long term, the development may result in an increase in the value of the site with regard to species diversity and numbers, resulting in an enhancement to local biodiversity.* '

153. The Authority's Ecologist largely agrees but given the age of the data which is over 3 years old, in combination with the fact that the site was initially assessed as having high potential to support a maternity roost and given the mobile nature of bats, an updated survey to assess the current status of the site is required to include a daytime roost assessment (including birds) and at least one emergence survey. Given the current potential of the building to support higher numbers of cavity dwelling bats such as brown long-eared bats, as an alternative to the updated survey, the inclusion of a dedicated bat

loft into the development would be welcomed. The applicant's agent considers a bat loft is not possible and suggested other mitigation (see above) rather than Carry out updated surveys.

154. Consequently, in the absence of a clear understanding of how bats now use the building and will therefore be impacted by the development, without a protected bat loft then harm to a protected species as a result of development cannot be ruled out ad a refusal on this ground alone is warranted.
155. As an alternative to the suggested house sparrow terrace (which are not suitable for swifts), the PDNPA ecologist advised that at least 2x swift bricks are incorporated into the development. Swift bricks can also accommodate other smaller birds
156. The ecologist went on the point out that any lighting for the scheme should be in accordance with advice given in Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2018) Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK Bats and the Built Environment series.
157. Conditions would therefore be recommended to be imposed in any approval to secure compliance with recommendations of the report and provide habitat for swifts and other nesting birds (other than the sparrow terrace boxes referred to in the ecological report) With such conditions the proposal, in respect of birds only, would therefore accord with policy DMC12.

158. Access and Highway Issues

159. There are no access or highway impact concerns given the Highway Authority has responded to the amended plans raising no objections.
160. Within the yard area the plans show one dedicated car parking space for the barn conversion together with one 'general' visitor parking place. Three spaces are reserved for the Hall Farm B and B use. Parking for Farm Hands Cottage is just shown on the plans as one garage space. However currently the cottage also appears to park one vehicle in front of their property. There is adequate space within the yard for the parking and turning of all the vehicles with 2 spaces for the Hall itself within the separate Hall access drive closer to the village beside the Hall.
161. It is considered that the additional traffic associated with the new dwelling can be satisfactorily accommodated within the site with the visibility at the access being appropriate and not prejudicial to highway safety or amenity.
162. The proposal therefore accords with adopted transport policies.

163. Environmental Impacts

164. Nutrient Neutrality

165. The development would result in one new dwelling within the catchment sensitive area of the Peak District Dales SAC and the River Wye SSSI and must therefore demonstrate nutrient neutrality.
166. As submitted the foul sewage was proposed to go to a septic tank in the yard and then via a pump to the public sewer, eventually ending up in the Wye via the local sewage works. This was identified by Natural England (NE) as likely to have potential significant effects on The Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

167. In advising the Authority on the requirements relating to Habitats Regulations Assessment, Natural England advised that where a non-mains drainage system discharges to a drainage field which meets certain criteria it is likely that the amount of phosphorous from the development which would reach the River is insignificant.
168. The applicant has now amended the application such that foul water would now discharge via a packaged treatment plant which will replace the current septic tank and then discharge to a drainage field in the small paddock behind Field Hands Cottage. This new PTP would also pick up foul waters from Field Hands Cottage leading to an overall reduction in effluent into the public sewer system.
169. A separate draft HRA was produced showing how the drainage field met the criteria concluding that any effect would be insignificant. NE have confirmed their agreement to this conclusion and the HRA has been adopted by the Authority paving the way to determination of this application for planning permission.

170. Climate change

171. No details were submitted as to how the conversion would meet the requirements of policy CC1 Climate Change mitigation. However, the applicant's agent states that his client is committed to providing the following:
- (i). A fabric first approach to achieving the best possible U-values and Building Regulations new Part L compliance, or greater – the requirements for which are much more demanding than the previous regulations
 - (ii). Energy efficient heating and hot water provision, with consideration given to the use of an Air Source Heat pump which could be hidden from view / located behind the boundary wall onto Hall Lane
 - (iii). LED light fittings throughout
 - (iv). Water saving sanitaryware, loos, showers etc and fittings throughout.
172. Had the development been acceptable in other respects conditions could have been used to secure these measures.

173. **Conclusion**

174. There are no highway, amenity or wider landscape concerns with the proposals subject to the use of appropriate conditions.
175. Neither are there any concerns about the works to Farm Hands Cottage which are acceptable.
176. Whilst the conversion of the building to a small dwelling is acceptable in principle under policies HC1 and DMC10, the key issue relates to the incorporation, or otherwise, of the modern lean-to into the conversion. Officers consider that an acceptable conversion meeting adopted policy and design requirements for such development could be achieved without the lean-to. However, that is not the applicant's preference and he has requested the application be determined as submitted including the lean-to.
177. Despite an improved appearance, the inclusion of the lean-to would perpetuate the harm it currently causes and leads to unnecessary pressure for further openings resulting in a sub-optimal conversion scheme. The proposal therefore fails to achieve the high standard of design necessary to meet the policy requirement to conserve and enhance

the significance and setting of this non-designated heritage asset through a new market residential use. Refusal is therefore recommended.

178. Furthermore, the applicant's confirmation that a bat loft cannot be included within the scheme means that further surveys would be required to understand the nature of the barns use by bats and thereby provide appropriate alternative mitigation. In the absence of those surveys harm to protected species cannot be ruled out and refusal on this ground is also warranted.

179. Human Rights

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

181. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

182. Nil

183. Report author: John Keeley