

8. FULL PLANNING APPLICATION – PROPOSED CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF HISTORIC BARN FOR ANCILLARY DOMESTIC USE AT WHEAT HAY FARM, SHATTON LANE, SHATTON (NP/HPK/0924/1004, WE)

APPLICANT: JOHN BRYAN

Summary

1. This application seeks planning permission for the conversion of a gritstone barn to form an ancillary gym/studio. It also seeks permission for the removal of the timber stable which adjoins the barn to the east and the construction of a new extension to the barn connected through a glazed-link.
2. This application has been supported by a Heritage Statement which confirms that the barn is dated from the early 19th century and possess a medium heritage significance. It is therefore recognised as being a non-designated heritage asset.
3. The conversion of the barn for uses ancillary to Wheat Hay Farm is acceptable in principle. However, the proposed extension, with associated glazed link, would have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the traditional building and the wider setting of Wheat Hay Farm.
4. The application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. The application site is located in the settlement of Shatton on the north side of Shatton Lane where there is a group of older, traditional buildings. Wheat Hay Farm comprises a range of mostly traditional buildings grouped around the old farmhouse. The buildings adjoining the farmhouse have previously been converted to residential uses.
6. Immediately to the south of the main farmhouse directing fronting onto Shatton Lane there is a small walled courtyard featuring a 19th century cowshed with an adjoining timber stable block and a detached timber stable block.

Proposal

7. This application seeks planning permission for the conversion and extension of the 19th century barn into an incidental use to Wheat Hay Farm comprising of a bedroom / gym, W.C. and studio. The conversion itself would be contained within the shell of the existing structure and utilise the existing openings with the exception of turning one of the rear windows into a doorway.
8. The existing adjoining stable would be demolished. An extension is proposed in this location constructed from natural stone set under a natural stone slate roof. The front elevation of the outbuilding would be largely solid, featuring one full-height glazed doorway. On the rear, the building features a large 4-panelled glazed section set beneath a zinc canopy. The extension would be connected to the barn with a glazed link.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason;

1. **The proposed extension would harm the character, appearance and significance of the existing barn, a non-designated heritage asset and harm the setting of Wheat Hay Farm contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3**

and L3, Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

- Principle of development;
- Design and impact on heritage assets;
- Other matters.

History

9. May 2005 – (NP/HPK/1104/1216) Conversion of barn and tack room to holiday home – Granted conditionally
10. October 2006 – (NP/HPK/0706/0628) Conversion of barn and stables to holiday house – Refused

Consultations

11. Highway Authority – No response to date
12. High Peak Borough Council – No response to date
13. Brough and Shatton Parish Council – No response to date
14. Natural England – No objection

Representations

15. Five letters of support have been received. They raised the following matters:
 - The proposed development would restore the historic barn and preserve its character and heritage;
 - The proposed extension would be a significant improvement on the dilapidated stables which would preserve the quiet, rural nature of the area;
 - The proposed outbuilding would not increase the footprint or massing of the built-form and would therefore conserve the barn's proportions and overall feel of the area;
 - The proposed ancillary use would not intensify the use of the site;
 - The development would enhance the village as a whole.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

16. 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.
17. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF 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.

18. 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.

Relevant Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

19. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. L2 – *Sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance*. Development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting.
23. L3 – Cultural heritage assets. Seeks to ensure all development conserves and where appropriate enhances the significance of any heritage assets.
24. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

Development Management Policies

25. DMC3 – *Design*. Siting, Design, layout and landscaping. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
26. DMC5 – *Development affecting a heritage asset*. Planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate: (i) its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
27. Policy DMC10 – *Conversion of a heritage asset*. Conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that it:
- 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.

It goes on to state that attention will be paid to the impact of domestication and urbanisation brought about by use on the landscape character and built environment.

28. Policy DMH8 – *New outbuildings and alterations and extensions to existing outbuildings in the curtilage of dwelling houses*. New and extensions to existing outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves or enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and/or the landscape, including Listed Building status and setting, Conservation Area character, important open space, valued landscape character.

29. Policy DMC11 – *Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interest*. Proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss by demonstrating that in the below order of priority the following matters have been taken into consideration:

- i) enhancement proportionate to the development;
- ii) adverse effects have been avoided;
- iii) the ‘do nothing’ option and alternative sites that cause less harm;
- iv) appropriate mitigation; and
- v) in rare cases, as a last resort, compensation measures to offset loss.

30. Policy DMC12 - Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance:

- A) For Internationally designated or candidate sites, or European Protected Species, the exceptional circumstances where development may be permitted are those where it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect such sites or species can be fully met.
- B) For sites, features or species of national importance, exceptional circumstances are those where development is essential:
 - i) for the management of those sites, features or species; or
 - ii) for the conservation and enhancement of the National Park’s valued characteristics; or
 - iii) where the benefits of the development at a site clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.

Assessment

Principle of development

31. The gritstone barn is dated from the early 19th century. The submitted Heritage Statement advises that the barn possesses a medium heritage significance, owing from its

architectural interest as an example of a vernacular cowhouse. Accordingly, the barn possesses sufficient historical interest to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.

32. Policies DS1 and DMC10 allow for conversion of heritage assets to ancillary domestic use in principle. The following section of this report will assess whether the proposed conversion and extension complies with the detailed criteria set out in policy DMC10 and detailed guidance in the Conversions Supplementary Planning Guidance.
33. Accordingly, the pertinent consideration in the determination of this application will be whether the proposed conversion and extension, conserves or enhances the significance of the barn and wider farmstead.

Design and impact on heritage assets

34. As noted, the proposed conversion of the 19th century barn would be contained within the shell of the existing building. The plans show that the windows would be replaced with like for like units, which include a mix of hit and miss boarded windows, hopper and casements. The exception would be the western window on the rear elevation of the building which would be altered to a doorway. In addition to this, the application proposes two rooflights on the rear north facing roof slope.
35. Policy DMC10 requires conversions to comply with four main criteria. Working through these sequentially, it is acknowledged that the existing barn is capable of accommodating the new use in principle without changes which adversely affect its character. The proposed enlargement of the rear window would not be inappropriately domestic in appearance, and it would enable the barn to still be read as a traditionally and vernacular building amongst the built-form of Wheat Hay Farm.
36. While a Structural Survey has not been provided, the evidence submitted with the application suggests that the barn is solidly built and capable of conversion. If this application were to be recommended for approval, a condition would be recommended to prohibit re-building of the barn as this would result in the unjustified total loss of the heritage asset.
37. The barn is located on an existing courtyard and is in close proximity to the main built-form of Wheat Hay Farm. The application does not propose any changes to the curtilage of the barn. Accordingly, the changes brought about by the new use of the building would not have a harmful impact on the heritage significance of the barn, nor the valued landscape character and valued built-form.
38. The proposed conversion in isolation would not be intrusive in the landscape, nor have an impact on the tranquillity, dark skies or any other valued characteristic.
39. Accordingly, the proposed conversion of the barn is acceptable. It would conserve the historical significance of the barn and its setting, and would find a viable use for the building. Therefore, this aspect of the proposed development is in compliance with policies L3, DMC5, DMC10 and the guidance contained within the Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD.
40. Notwithstanding the above, this application also proposes the removal of the adjoining timber stables and the erection of an extension in the form of a stone building connected to the barn and accessed through a glazed link.
41. The existing timber stables are a detracting feature of the site by virtue of its condition, materials. Therefore, there is no objection to the demolition of the stables which would enhance the setting of the barn and wider farmstead.

42. The proposed extension would be single-storey and therefore subservient to the main structure. It would feature a narrow gable and low eaves with simple detailing. It would be finished in traditional building materials, including stone walls and natural stone roof. The footprint of the extension would be comparable to the existing stables and with the exception of the glazed link be higher to eaves and ridge compared to the stables.
43. The extension would be wider than the main barn and pushed away by the glazed link. Therefore, while the extension would be subordinate in height it would not be in width. However, the footprint would be comparable to the existing stables. Therefore, on balance the massing and form of the extension is acceptable in general terms.
44. Notwithstanding the above, there is significant concern with the detailed design of the proposed extension.
45. Officers acknowledge that the principle of connecting a larger extension to a building through a glazed link can be successful way enabling larger extensions to be constructed. In essence allowing the extension to be read as an outbuilding linked to the main building. However, in this case, the proposed link would be visible from the street-scene and would measure 3m in length. At this scale, the link would be interpreted as a feature itself, as opposed to a small linking structure. The fully glazed feature would be visually strident when compared to the adjacent solid, vernacular barn. Officers consider that this element would appear incongruous in the historic environment at Wheat Hay Farm.
46. In addition to the glazed link, Officers also have concerns with the proposed detailing on the rear elevation. In the centre of the rear elevation, the submitted drawings show a 4-panelled bifold door set within a zinc canopy. It is acknowledged that this feature would be on the rear facing elevation, and therefore not visible from the street-scene; however, it would still be a discordant feature in the historic grouping of Wheat Hay Farm by virtue of its form and material.
47. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not conserve or enhance the character, appearance or significance of the barn or the setting of Wheat Hay Farm. It is therefore in conflict with relevant policies.

Other matters

48. This application has been supported by a Protected Species Survey which assessed the barns potential for bats and birds. During the survey, no bats were observed emerging from or entering the building. It found evidence of bats using the wider site and therefore recommended appropriate artificial lighting. With respect to hibernating bats, is recommended that no pointing work is carried out between November and May as a precautionary measure. It also suggested habitat enhancement measures through the provision of roosting facilities across the site.
49. The report concluded that no specific bird surveys were necessary, but recommended the conversion take place outside of bird nesting season.
50. Subject to conditions to secure the mitigation and enhancement measures, the proposed development is acceptable with regard to protected species. It is therefore compliant with policies L2, DMC11 and DMC12.
51. The proposed development is exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

52. The closest neighbour would be Nether Shatton House approximately 20m to the south across Shatton Lane. Due to the separation distance and the scale of development, it would not have a harmful impact on residential amenity.
53. This application has been submitted with a Sustainability Statement. It states that the development would be constructed using high efficiency fixtures and insulation, and would also use breathable materials in the barn. This is considered commensurate to the proposed development, particularly when the mitigation of climate change needs to be balanced against the impact on a heritage asset. It is therefore compliant with CC1.

Conclusion

54. This application proposes the conversion of a 19th century barn into an incidental studio and gym. The proposed scheme of conversion of the barn itself is acceptable and would conserve the significance and setting of the barn; however, the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on the significance of the barn and wider setting.
55. The proposed glazed link, bifold doors and zinc canopy would be incongruous features next to the vernacular and utilitarian barn.
56. The proposed extension would therefore have a harmful impact on the character, appearance and historic significance of the 19th century barn and farmstead. The proposed development is therefore in conflict with policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10.
57. The proposed conversion of the barn to ancillary domestic use is acceptable in principle. However, the barn is in good repair and therefore there is no overriding public benefit in finding a viable use for the building. The removal of the existing stables would enhance the setting of the buildings and contributes to the justification for an extension of this scale. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the design could not be amended to avoid the harm identified above. Therefore, there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage asset. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the NPPF.

Human Rights

1. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
2. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
3. Nil

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Senior Planner