

7. FULL PLANNING PERMISSION – RENOVATION OF EXISTING FARMHOUSE AND CONVERSION OF DERELICT FARM BUILDINGS TO PROVIDE A TOTAL OF 6 DOMESTIC PROPERTIES AT STONEY CLOSES FARM, STONEY CLOSE, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/0823/0891, AM)

APPLICANT: MR SWINDELL

Summary

1. The application site comprises an historic farmstead located south of Bakewell.
2. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the range of buildings, including the existing farmhouse, to a total of 6 market dwellings along with associated landscaping and drainage.
3. The proposed development would result in significant harm to the significance of the farmstead and its setting within the landscape. This harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits arising from the development.
4. The application is recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

Site and Surroundings

5. Stoney Closes Farm is an historic farmstead located just beyond the southern edge of Bakewell.
6. The farmstead comprises a traditional limestone farmhouse and a range of agricultural buildings arranged around a yard and backing onto the surrounding open fields. The farmstead is accessed from Stoney Close along a short track.
7. The farmstead is prominent from surrounding vantage points with views from the access to Bakewell Methodist Junior School with the open landscape beyond. The farmstead is also viewed in an elevated position from the footpath to the south east (footpath WD7/10). The group of buildings is also prominent in more distant views from Shutts Lane to from the south west.
8. The junior school is the nearest neighbouring property. The nearest dwellings are along Stoney Close and Yeld Close to the north west.

Proposal

9. Planning permission is sought for the renovation of the farmhouse and conversion of the agricultural buildings to a total of 6 market dwelling houses (including the farmhouse).
10. The farmhouse (unit 1) would be renovated within the existing shell. A conservatory extension is proposed to the rear / side of the building. The existing outbuilding to the rear would be altered and converted to an ancillary office / store. A new detached garage is also proposed adjacent to the existing outbuilding.
11. The single storey barn (unit 2 and 3) would be extended and converted to 2 x 2-bedroom dwellings. A single storey extension is proposed between the single storey barn and the adjacent two storey barn. Internally, new openings would be formed through existing internal walls and new internal walls would be erected to divide spaces. The existing troughs would be removed and the floor levelled. Externally, 'crittall' screens would be installed to the courtyard elevation along with a new full height glazed door. A new door would be installed to the rear elevation and a 'crittall' screen and new door would be installed to the west elevation.

12. The two-storey barn (unit 4) would be extended and converted to a 4-bedroom dwelling. The existing lean-to on the south elevation would be extended across the gable and increased in height. The eaves and ridge of the whole barn would be raised and a new window opening installed in the southern gable in a higher position to facilitate the enlarged lean-to.
13. Internally within the two-storey barn (unit 4) the ground floor would be levelled and existing troughs removed. A new floor would be installed at first floor level. At ground floor new walls would be installed to sub-divide the space to provide for a bedroom, en-suite and staircase to the new first floor. At first floor the space would be sub-divided to form three bedrooms, bathroom and en-suite. Externally, the building would be extended and the roof raised. Two new windows and a roof light would be installed to the courtyard elevation and a door opening would be opened and 'crittall' screen installed in the existing opening. To the rear elevation a new glazed door, window and two roof lights would be installed.
14. The concrete and cement sheet hay barn (unit 5) would be demolished and replaced with a car port to serve units 6 & 7. The car port would be single storey with a shallow mono pitch roof. The car port would be open fronted with vertical larch cladding to the sides and rear under a corrugated grey steel sheet roof.
15. The stone and cement sheet barn (unit 6) would be converted to a 3-bedroom dwelling. Internally the space would be subdivided to create the bedrooms, bathrooms and living space. Externally, new doors and 'crittall' screens would be installed to existing openings and a new door opening installed to the courtyard elevation. The building would be provided with a metal sheet roof.
16. The single storey barn (unit 7) would be partially re-built, converted and extended to a 1-bedroom dwelling. Internally, walls would be demolished and new openings created to facilitate the conversion and a new wall installed to create the bathroom. Externally a single storey extension would be erected to the rear and a new lean-to would be constructed to the south side. The existing openings would be provided with new window and door frames to the courtyard elevation.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

- 1. The development would harm the significance of this historic farmstead and its setting contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10. The harm when weighed in the planning balance would not be outweighed by other public benefits. The application is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

17. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle.
18. Whether the development could deliver affordable housing on site or make a financial contribution to affordable housing.
19. The impact of the development upon the significance of the farmstead and its setting.
20. The impact of the development upon the landscape.
21. The impact of the development upon highway safety.
22. Whether the development is acceptable in all other respects.

Relevant Planning History

23. 2023: NP/DDD/1222/1591: Planning application for renovation of farmhouse and conversion of derelict farm buildings to provide a total of 7 domestic properties. Withdrawn prior to determination.
24. The above application was withdrawn following written advice from the case Officer and a meeting where issues around the design of the scheme, and lack of supporting information on heritage, bats and financial viability were discussed.

Consultations

25. Town Council – Resolved to raise no objection to the renovation of the existing farmhouse. In the light of the 2023 Bakewell Housing Need Survey Report it is felt that, if approved, a proportion of the other units should be affordable or have the Derbyshire Residency Clause associated with them.
26. Highway Authority – Comments are summarised below.

“The application site is located on Stoney Close which is an unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit, which terminates at a cul-de-sac in close proximity to the application site. Bakewell Methodist Juniors School is adjacent to the site, and is also accessed off the cul-de-sac of Stoney Close. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle, however, this Authority would seek improvements to the layout in terms of pedestrian accessibility.

The proposed access road into the site is of an adequate width for the passing of vehicles, however, the proposed planting of tree's along the eastern boundary of the site would obstruct emerging visibility from the main access to the Juniors School into the development, therefore, it is suggested that the proposed trees are removed for a distance of 25m into the site from the school entrance in order to provide adequate levels of visibility from the school vehicular and pedestrian accesses.

Further to the above, it is recommended that a 2m wide footway is provided along the eastern side of the access road which extends to the play area on the opposite side of the road, along with a tactile crossing fronting the play area, to provide a crossing facility for residents of plots 4, 5 and 7 and other users.

Similarly, it is recommended the width of proposed footway from the existing footway on the West / Northwest side of Stoney Close is increased to a minimum of 2m. It would also be beneficial to provide a crossing point in the vicinity of the Juniors School, to provide a formal crossing arrangement for existing residents / school children etc., resulting in betterment to the current situation as there is no formal crossing arrangement nearby the school.

On the basis that the development will remain private, the applicant will need to consult with the relevant refuse collection department to ascertain details of what will be acceptable to them. If it is intended for refuse collection to be undertaken within the site the suitability of the layout for a refuse vehicle to turn in the site in order to enter and exit in a forward gear should be demonstrated by a swept path analysis for a typical refuse collection vehicle. Alternatively, an area of appropriate dimension designated for standing of waste bins on collection days should be demonstrated adjacent to, but not within, the public highway.

Internally, the proposed level of off-street parking provision is sufficient, and there appears to be adequate turning space within the site to enable vehicles to both enter and exit in a forward gear.

Accordingly, before making my formal recommendations I would be obliged if you could ask the applicant to submit revised plans in view of the above comments and in the meantime please hold the application in abeyance until revised plans have been submitted.”

27. Natural England – No objection.

28. PDNPA Policy – Comments are summarised below:

29. On the original submission the following comments were received:

30. It is imperative that a chartered quantity surveyor is employed to determine the costings to ensure that the development costings are accurate. This provides a level of uncertainty that cannot be ignored given the proposal offers no affordable housing on site and questions the viability of the scheme without. There is not enough information to assess the accuracy of the viability appraisal and there are also a number of issues with the assumptions made in the viability appraisal.

31. As submitted, little weight should be given to the viability appraisal. The proposal fails to accord with local plan policies HC1 and DMH6.

32. Following the above comments, a budget estimate for the development prepared by a quantity surveyor was submitted. The viability is discussed further in the following report.

33. PDNPA Conservation Officer – Object to the application. Comments are summarised below:

I would not support the application at this stage as there is insufficient information by which to assess it.

I would also add that the applicant should not view the production of a heritage statement as a tick-box exercise, instead the design proposals should be based on a good understanding of the significance of the buildings. This approach will lead to a much better chance of a successful application. The applicants should be encouraged to read our SPD on conversions, which goes into this in more detail.

In addition to the above, I have some feedback on a couple of things I spotted in the design and access statement.

In the section titled Thermal Upgrading. They state ‘As a conversion of a non-designated heritage asset rather than a listed building or building with[in] a conservation area, there are no exemptions from Building Regulations on thermal performance.’ The document goes on to say that the floors will be fitted with DPMs, concrete floors and PIR insulation, whilst the roofs will also be fitted with PIR insulation.

The above assumption is erroneous. Paragraph 0.14 of Building Regs approved document L Vol 2 (Buildings other than dwellings) states: “The energy efficiency of historic and traditional buildings should be improved only if doing so will not cause long-term deterioration of the building’s fabric or fittings. In particular, this applies to historic and traditional buildings with a vapour permeable construction that both absorbs moisture and readily allow moisture to evaporate. Examples include those built with wattle and daub, cob or stone and constructions using lime render or mortar”

Paragraph 0.16 states “In determining whether full energy efficiency improvements should be made, the building control body should consider the advice of the local authority’s conservation officer.”

In applications for the conversion of traditional buildings, I would expect to see the use of breathable building materials that are compatible with traditional construction.

The use of a radon membrane in a traditional building needs a strong justification, evidenced by in-situ measurements of actual radon levels in the individual buildings. The use of a radon membrane presents risks to the buildings' fabric from the sideways movement of moisture into the walls. The designation of an area as high risk on the government's Radon map is not a sufficient justification for a radon membrane, as radon levels can vary significantly within the 1km grid squares on the map, and even vary between different buildings. Other less harmful methods of radon remediation, such as sumps or positive input ventilation, should be considered before the use of a membrane."

34. The following comments were made on the revised Heritage Statement:

35. *"This document is not sufficient to understand the significance of the buildings, or the impact of the proposed development. If anything, it serves to highlight why the input of a specialist is needed.*

36. *The updated document provides a very basic description and additional photos of each building, but it makes no attempt at identifying the development, phasing, and function of the buildings, and no attempt has been made to describe the significance of the buildings.*

37. *It would be safe to assume that unless the applicant engages with a specialist, we will not receive a satisfactory heritage statement, and we will be unable to make an informed decision on the application. Therefore, the most prudent course of action would be to refuse the application on the grounds of insufficient information."*

38. PDNPA Archaeology – Object to the application and makes the following comment:

"This application triggered an archaeology consultation because the buildings that are the subject of this application form a historic farmstead recorded in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record and PDNPA Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record.

However, the application contains insufficient information to allow an understanding of the nature, level or extent of the significance of these heritage assets.

The 'Heritage Statement' submitted in support of the current application does not meet the requirements of NPPF. It does not describe the significance of the site and buildings as heritage assets, and formal consultation of the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record and PDNPA Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record does not appear to have taken place. Online sources such as the HER website and heritage gateway may have been used, but these only make a small subset of HER information available and full HER search is required. This generates a unique reference code to be included in assessments and reports, which evidence that formal consultation has taken place. The current heritage statement does not quote such a code and appears to be missing information available in the HER relating to the development of the site.

NPPF para.194 requires that any local planning authorities should require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a development, including the contribution made by their setting in a level of detail proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impacts of the development on their significance. It requires that as a minimum the relevant Historic Environment Record will have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

PDNPA's own policies as set out in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies documents also require the submission of appropriate information on significance in support of applications that affect heritage assets.

The NPPF (para.203) also 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 with a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Without the required supporting information the Authority is not able to make balanced planning judgement taking into account the significance of the heritage asset and any impact or harm to the significance of the heritage assets.

Therefore, in the first instance I object to this application on the grounds of insufficient information, and request that appropriate supporting information is provided. The application should not be positively determined without this information.”

39. PDNPA Ecology – No objection subject to conditions:

A European Protected Species Mitigation licence (EPSL) issued by Natural England is required in order to allow works to proceed.

The outline Mitigation Strategy detailed within Section 6 of Bat Emergence Surveys and Outline Mitigation Report by Astute Ecology (July 2023) is approved and should be adhered to (Section 6.1 to 6.7).

In addition to the two Vivara Pro WoodStone Bat Boxes (or similar woodcrete made boxes), 2 bat tubes or other suitable integral bat boxes CP and BLE will be installed on the western and southern elevations (details of which should be submitted to PDNPA for approval).

The residual risk of bat roosts being present during works to Buildings B5 and B6 is to be managed by the procedure as detailed within Appendix 1 of the Ecological Appraisal by CBE Consulting (November 2022).

To mitigate for the residual risk of bats being present during works to B2 and B4 the following Precautionary Working Method Statement undertaken by a licenced bat worker should be adhered to.

As detailed within Section 5 of the EA by CBE Consulting, a method statement to protect birds, reptiles and amphibians should be prepared and submitted to the Authority.

Prior to removal, an inspection of the tree should be undertaken by a qualified ecologist to assess the potential for bats and birds, with results and mitigation recommendations submitted to PDNPA.

Ideally, works would take place outside the bird breeding season which lasts from March to August inclusive. If this approach is not possible, pre-works nest checks should be completed to ensure no active nests are present. If breeding was confirmed, works will be postponed until chicks have fledged the nest.

40. PDNPA Tree Officer: No objection to the removal of the Ash tree subject to 3 replacement trees of standard size to be planted in the proposed area.

41. PDNPA Landscape: Makes the following comment:

“There is no landscape plan provided with the application so it is difficult to determine potential landscape effects. For example, how are parking areas and bin stores screened? While I think, subject to other, policies the development may be acceptable in landscape and visual terms, not enough information is provided for me to make a

considered assessment. A detailed landscape plan is required with the application – to determine if the scheme complies with Policy L1.”

Representations

42. The Authority has received 15 letters of representation to date all in objection to the application. It is noted that some letters refer to a potential housing development on adjacent land. The reasons given relative to the current application are summarised below:
43. Objection:
- a. Concern in regard to accuracy of submitted application.
 - b. The farm should be kept as it is.
 - c. There are too many houses being built in and around Bakewell.
 - d. There is too much traffic around the top of Bakewell especially around the schools and local estates.
 - e. The development would increase traffic in the area and past the school.
 - f. Local roads are not suitable for construction traffic and machinery.
 - g. The development would harm the safety of pedestrians, particularly children going to the school.
 - h. Impacts from construction would harm the amenity of local people.
 - i. The land around the farm is a peaceful place for nature and an amazing place to walk through the fields and would be harmed by the development.
 - j. The development would result in the loss of agricultural land.
 - k. The development does not address local need for affordable housing.
 - l. The development would harm wildlife and natural habitats.
 - m. The development would harm the landscape.
 - n. The fields surrounding the farmhouse may be of archaeological interest.
 - o. Drainage for existing properties is inadequate and additional houses would make this worse.
 - p. There have been livestock on the site until recently.
 - q. Impact of the development upon local services.

Main Policies

44. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC5 and HC1
45. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMC14, DMH7, DMB1, DMT8, DMU1
46. Conversion of Historic Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

National Planning Policy Framework

47. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.
48. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Policies document (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 policies in the development plan and the NPPF.

49. Therefore, full weight should be given to policies in the development plan and the application should be determined in accordance with the Authority's policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
50. Paragraph 182 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.
51. Paragraph 200 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. It notes that 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. It advises that as a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
52. Paragraph 201 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.
53. Paragraph 203 states that in determining applications account should be taken of desirability of sustain and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation can make to sustainable communities and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
54. Paragraph 209 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be considered 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.
55. Paragraph 211 states that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

56. Policy GSP1 requires all development to be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty and that the Sandford Principle be applied and the conservation and enhancement of the National Park will be given priority. Policy GSP2 states that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon. Enhancement proposals must demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.

57. Policy GSP3 states that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings subject to the development proposal paying particular attention to (amongst other things) impact on character and setting, scale, siting, landscaping, building materials, design, form, impact upon amenity, highways and mitigating the impact of climate change.
58. Policy DS1 states that in the countryside conversion or change of use for housing is acceptable in principle.
59. Policies L1, L2 and L3 state that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, biodiversity and cultural heritage assets.
60. Policy CC1 requires all development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources and to achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
61. Policy HC1. C states that, exceptionally, and in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2 new housing will be permitted where it is required in order to achieve conservation and / or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.

Development Management Policies

62. Policy DMC3 sets out detailed criteria for the assessment of siting, design, layout and landscaping.
63. Policy DMC5 provides detailed criteria relevant for proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such applications.
64. Policy DMC7 provides detailed criteria relating to proposals affected listed buildings and states that;
 - a. Planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate:
 - (i) how their significance will be preserved;
 - (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
 - b. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building and its setting and any curtilage listed features.
 - c. Development will not be permitted if it would:
 - (i) adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of, or materials used in the Listed Building; or
 - (ii) result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features or other features of importance or interest.
 - d. In particular, development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to (amongst other things):
 - (i) removal of original walls, stairs, or entrances or subdivision of large interior spaces

- (ii) removal, alteration or unnecessary replacement of structural elements including walls, roof structures, beams and floors.

65. Policies DMC10 sets out detailed criteria for the assessment of proposals to convert heritage assets. Development will be permitted provided that:

- (i) it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision or other alterations to form and mass, inappropriate new window openings or doorways and major rebuilding); and
- (ii) the building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not compromise the significance and character of the building; and
- (iii) the changes brought about by the new use, and any associated infrastructure (such as access and services), conserves or enhances the heritage significance of the asset, its setting (in accordance with policy DMC5), any valued landscape character, and any valued built environment; and
- (iv) the new use of the building or any curtilage created would not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquility, dark skies or other valued characteristics.

66. Policies DMC11 and DMC12 set out detailed criteria to secure safeguarding, recording and enhancement of nature conservation interests and conservation of sites, features and species of importance. Policy DMC14 states that development that represents a risk of pollution (including soil, air, light, water, noise or odor pollution will not be permitted unless adequate control measures are put in place to bring pollution within acceptable limits.

67. Policy DMH7 allows for extensions and alterations to dwellings provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings or dominate the dwelling.

68. Policy DMB1 states that all development within Bakewell shall be contained within the development boundary.

69. Policy DMT8 requires off-street parking to be provided for residential development unless it is demonstrated that on-street parking is appropriate. Parking provision should meet the Authority's adopted standards.

70. Policy DMU1 permits new or upgraded service infrastructure for new development provided that it does not adversely affect the valued characteristics of the area and provided that services are provided before commencement of a new land use.

Assessment

Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle

71. The application site is located outside of the Bakewell development boundary and is therefore in open countryside. Policies DS1 and HC1 allow for the conversion of valued vernacular or listed buildings to market dwellings, in principle, provided that it is demonstrated that the development is required to secure the conservation or enhancement of the building. Policy DMH7 allows for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings.

72. It is accepted that the farmhouse and traditional stone farm buildings together form a historic farmstead. These buildings are not listed or within the designated Bakewell Conservation Area but nevertheless are considered to be non-designated heritage assets by virtue of their architectural, historic and archaeological significance.

73. There are concerns about the level of evidence submitted with the application and whether the stone and cement sheet barn (unit 6) is a building worth of conversion. However, in principle, the conversion of the historic buildings on site to market dwellings would be in accordance with policies DS1 and HC1.
74. The development would deliver more than one additional dwelling and therefore policy HC1 requires the development to address eligible local need for affordable housing unless this is demonstrated to not be financially viable or not needed in the parish or adjoining parishes.
75. The key issues in the determination of this application are therefore firstly, the impact of the proposed development upon the significance of the farmstead, its setting and valued landscape character, having regard to our duty to conserve the special qualities of the National Park and give great weight to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the listed building. And secondly, whether the development can provide affordable housing to meet eligible local need.

The impact of the development upon the significance of the farmstead and its setting within the landscape

76. A revised heritage statement (HS) has been submitted in support of the planning application, however, significant concerns have been raised by the Conservation Officer and the Senior Archaeologist about the HS. In particular that the submitted statement does not meet the requirements of policy DMC5 and the NPPF. In particular the HS does not describe the significance of the site and buildings and formal consultations of historic records has not taken place.
77. The submission of a HS which meets the requirements of policy DMC5 and the NPPF is essential to understand the significance of the buildings and their sensitivity to adaptation and changes to facilitate a new use. In the absence of this it is not possible to understand the significance of the buildings and the impact of the proposed development upon that significance. Officers have raised this issue during the previous planning application (which was withdrawn) and the current application.
78. Notwithstanding the above Officers do have significant concerns about elements of the proposed development and the impact upon the buildings and their setting.
79. Significant extensions are proposed to units 3, 4 and 7 which would affect the form of the buildings and the layout of the range of buildings around the yard. Furthermore, the eaves and ridge height of the two-storey barn (unit 4) would be raised. These extensions would result in harm to the individual buildings and the group.
80. Furthermore, alterations to the buildings are proposed including new window and door openings and the introduction of 'crittall' style windows to the larger openings. In the absence of a suitable HS it is not possible to understand the impact of the alterations but there are concerns about the proposed new openings, particularly to the two-storey barn and the use of 'crittall' style glazing to the large openings which would result in a large amount of glazing to traditionally solid openings and introduce a contemporary industrial rather than agricultural character and appearance.
81. There is also significant concern about the proposal to retain and convert unit 6 and replace unit 5 with a car port. The barn that would become unit 6 is a relatively modern building and despite being faced with stone is not of any architectural or historic significance. The conversion and retention of this building to a dwelling would therefore not be justified under policy HC1 nor required to conserve the farmstead which would be enhanced by the removal of this building.

82. The barns currently front onto the yard and back directly onto the adjacent fields. The proposed development would see the creation of large walled gardens around the barns along with a fenced play area. The creation of these gardens and the use of the land for domestic purposes would severely compromise the setting of the farmstead which would be viewed from nearby vantagepoints and in the wider landscape as being surrounded by gardens along with the planting, lighting and associated domestic activity.
83. The impact of the proposed gardens would be exacerbated by the proposed access. The existing track is a single width 'cart track' which reflects the character of the group. This would need to be upgraded to facilitate any development, however, the application proposes the creation of two access roads one towards the farmhouse and one southward from Stoney Close to provide access to the rear of the site. The access roads would appear as urbanising elements projecting towards the farmstead and fields. The proposed parking would also be around the barns leading to cars being visible around the buildings and wider site.
84. The proposed gardens, access arrangements and parking would seriously erode the setting of the buildings and their historic functional relationship with the adjoining fields.
85. Taken as a whole the development would result in significant harm to the significance of the buildings and their setting contrary to policies GSP3, L1, L3, HC1, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10 and the adopted Conversions Supplementary Planning Document. The harm identified to the historic farmstead as a non-designated heritage asset must be weighed in the planning balance bearing in mind that great weight must be given to the conservation of cultural heritage in the National Park.

Whether the development could deliver affordable housing on site or make a financial contribution to affordable housing

86. The application is supported by a development appraisal and following comments from the Authority's policy team cost estimates for the development have been carried out by a quantity surveyor.
87. The submitted development appraisal and cost estimates show that after build costs there would likely only be a modest profit for any developer considering the existing use value of the premises. The proposed development with provision of no affordable housing would only be marginally viable. There are some concerns about some of the assumptions made within the appraisal, however, it is considered that given the existing use value of the site and development costs that it would not be viable to deliver affordable housing or make a financial contribution for affordable housing off-site.
88. The application has therefore evidenced that affordable housing cannot be delivered as part of the development. The proposal for all the units to be market housing would therefore be justified in principle in accordance with policy HC1. However, this does not override or outweigh concerns about the impact of the development. There is no evidence to indicate that the proposed development is the only means of securing a viable scheme in terms of design or layout.
89. The application and a number of representations refers to a potential future development for affordable housing on the fields north of the farmstead. There is no planning application on the adjoining site and whether or not this were to come forward in the future the current planning application must be considered on its own merits.

The impact of the development upon highway safety

90. The application proposes off-street parking spaces and turning area which is acceptable in principle from a highway safety perspective. The Highway Authority has been consulted and raises several concerns about details including the width of the footpaths, bin storage, the pedestrian crossing and turning for refuse vehicles.
91. There is sufficient space on site for adequate footpath widths, bin storage and turning if the development was acceptable in principle. Provision of revised plans to show these could be secured by planning conditions.
92. Concerns about increased vehicle movements and impacts upon pedestrian safety are noted. Vehicle movements from the development would be limited and while these would pass the school there would be ample space for pedestrians on footways and the additional traffic therefore would not be likely to harm pedestrian safety.
93. It is therefore concluded that the development would not harm highway safety or the amenity of road users.

Whether the development is acceptable in all other respects

94. The application proposes the conversion of a traditional building to a dwelling. In principle, the re-use of such a building for this purpose is a sustainable form of development. The application states that the development would incorporate high levels of thermal insulation, low energy light fittings and a ground source heat pump to minimise energy consumption. The proposed measures are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policy CC1. No details of the proposed heat pump have been submitted and therefore this would need to be secured by planning condition.
95. The application is supported by protected species reports. The buildings were surveyed and found a summer day roost for Common Pipistrelle and Brown Long Eared bats. The report concludes that a mitigation class licence will be required from Natural England and recommends mitigation and compensation measures along with a condition to ensure that the Ash tree to be removed is assessed before removal.
96. The impact of the development upon bats is a material consideration as a protected species. The submitted information is sufficient to understand the potential impact of development upon bats and to be confident that the development will not harm the conservation status of identified species. If the development was considered to be acceptable then the impact upon bats would be justified and meet the derogation tests. If permission were granted planning conditions would be recommended to ensure that the development was carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the report and that details of external lighting were controlled.
97. There is no evidence to suggest that the development would harm any birds or other protected species and the development would not harm any designated sites. There are limited opportunities for biodiversity enhancement given the nature of the proposals and the desire to minimise impact upon the building and its setting, however, the development would incorporate additional bat roosts in wall cavities.
98. A single mature Ash tree would need to be removed to facilitate the development. The tree has early signs of Ash dieback and therefore there is no objection to its removal provided that replacement planting is carried out and this can be secured by planning condition.
99. Foul drainage from the development would be to the main sewer. This is acceptable in principle as the most appropriate means of disposal of foul sewerage. The site is outside of the nutrient neutrality catchment. Surface water would need to be disposed of

appropriately and there is sufficient space around the site to deal with this through infiltration to ground.

100. Given the distance from the barn to nearest neighbouring properties there are no concerns that the development would result in any significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. There is also sufficient distance and separation between each proposed dwelling to ensure privacy and light to occupants.

Conclusion

101. The proposed development and associated works would result in a high degree of harm to the significance of the historic farmstead and its setting within the landscape. The harm identified would be less than substantial.
102. In accordance with policies DMC5 and DMC10 and the NPPF the Authority weigh this harm in the planning balance bearing in mind that great weight must be given to the conservation of cultural heritage in the National Park.
103. The development would result in the delivery of market housing, however, in accordance with policy HC5 and the NPPF this is only acceptable in principle if it is required to achieve the conservation or enhancement of the buildings. However, the development would result in significant harm as outlined above.
104. The development would not result in harm to biodiversity, highway safety or amenity. However, these are neutral factors and do not weigh heavily either in favour or against the proposal. The application would otherwise not result in any significant public benefits which could outweigh the harm identified. There is no evidence to indicate that the proposed design is the only means of converting the buildings.
105. There it is therefore concluded that having had regard to all matters raised that the development would be contrary to the development plan there are no material considerations that indicate that permission should be otherwise granted.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

107. Nil

Report Author: Adam Maxwell – Development and Enforcement Manager