

BINHAM - PF/19/1062 - Proposed conversion of an agricultural barn to a dwelling; Barn South of Westgate Old Farmhouse (prev ref Westgate Barns), Warham Road, Binham, NR21 0DQ for Mr & Mrs Bruce

Minor Development

- Target Date: 11 September 2019

Case Officer: Phillip Rowson

Full Planning Permission

CONSTRAINTS

Countryside

Conservation Area

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PU/15/1249 PUA

Barn at Westgate Farm East, Warham Road, Binham, Norfolk

Prior notification of intention to convert agricultural building to a dwelling (C3)

Approval - Prior Approval Given 15/10/2015

PF/15/1748 PF

2 Westgate Barns, Warham Road, Binham, FAKENHAM, NR21 0DQ

Conversion of single storey agricultural barn to one dwelling - Approved 01/02/2016

PF/18/0921 PF

2 Westgate Barns, Warham Road, Binham, FAKENHAM, NR21 0DQ

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission PF/15/1748 to allow for changes to position of openings, internal walls and corrections to size and position of building -

Approved 12/07/2018

PF/18/1524 PF

Proposed Conversion of agricultural barn to dwelling – Refused 06/06/2019

THE APPLICATION

Seeks permission to convert and extend a traditional single storey “U” shaped building in order to create a three-bedroom dwelling.

Access to the site would be via the existing driveway off the Warham Road.

This application follows a recent refusal of planning permission at the Development Committee in June. The application is varied under this submission by the deletion of a cart shed / store from the proposals. The minutes from that meeting are attached as **Appendix 1** to this report

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the discretion of the Head of Planning to ensure that continuity of member consideration is given following the recent history of referral to Development Committee.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Binham Parish Council - No response at the time of the compilation of this report.

REPRESENTATIONS

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation and Design Officer –

1. *The removal of the previously proposed (attached and then detached) garage from the scheme can only be welcomed on the basis that it;*
 - a) *Would better preserve the character and appearance of the site, and*
 - b) *Would reduce the total amount of new build proposed.*

2. *On the subject of new build, the scheme still provides for the same two extensions to the existing building – a northern projection to house a bath and plant room, and an infill extension within the central yard. In both instances, these would not only alter and complicate the existing footprint and form of what is currently a fairly simple/humble agrarian structure, but they would also not sit at all comfortably alongside the requirements of Policies HO9 and EN4 and LDF Core Strategy; i.e. in terms of buildings having to be suitable for conversion without substantial rebuilding or extension, and that extensions need to have due regard to their context.*

3. *More specifically, the northern extension would present a new gable end immediately on the approach to the building and would thus detract from the existing clean lines of the elevation and the balance provided by its hipped roof. This balance would also be compromised by lengthening the east-facing elevation and thus creating wings of different lengths.*

4. *The infill extension, meanwhile, would affectively square off the building and merge the two enclosing arms wings under a part pitched/part flat roof structure. Whilst admittedly much of this would be hidden from wider public gaze, it would nonetheless introduce an alien domesticity which would be at odds with the host building.*

5. *The submission places a great deal of store on the functional and environmental benefits provided by this infill extension. Breaking these down into the individual subject areas:*
 - a) *It is acknowledged that the additional floor space would offer increased usability over and above that provided by the previously approved scheme. However, this is surely more a matter of convenience rather than an essential part of addressing inherent deficiencies with the building. Indeed, if we refer back to the previously approved layout (below), travel times would not have been excessive with the main rooms placed centrally and enjoying a south-facing aspect (journeys from Bed 2 to Bed 3 would surely be rare).*
 - b) *Again, it is accepted that more compact built forms potentially suffer less heat loss than their more elaborate counterparts. Having discussed this with Building Control, however, there is no overriding reason why similar energy ratings could not be achieved by simply upgrading the shell of the building in its existing form. Therefore, only relatively limited weight can be attached to any perceived sustainability benefits offered by the new build (particularly as no allowance has been made of the environmental impact of the materials used in its construction (in terms of production and transportation)).*

6. *Finally, one of the other central tenets of barn conversions is that they make use of existing openings and avoid new ones in order to protect character. In the proposed elevations, however, it appears that not one of the existing openings is proposed to be reused in its existing form. Instead, they are either to be repositioned or replaced with entirely new openings. I say*

'appears' because the submitted elevations do not actually tally with the proposed floor and roof plans. Hence, it is difficult to be sure exactly what is being proposed. From what can be deduced, however, the clear suggestion is that the proposed layout has driven the external treatment rather than the other way around. As a consequence, the end result seems to err more towards a domestic bungalow rather than a rustic agricultural building (a fact not helped by formalising the brick plinth).

Summarising, C&D have always had a degree of ambivalence around this particular building. On the one hand, it is certainly not a particularly noteworthy structure or one that is blessed with architectural or historic interest. However, it is part of the support cast of buildings within Binham and has stood on site for at least the last 70 years. As a result, a case can definitely still be made for its retention and conversion. However, if it is to be reused, the actual conversion scheme needs to be policy compliant and respectful of its essential character and appearance. As we stand, C&D remain unconvinced that this would be the case with this application.

* Note: Amended plans received 23.8 for consideration with regard to creation of openings ensuring correlation between floor and elevation plans. – consultee comments on amended plans to be received verbally at the meeting.

Environmental Health – Comments awaited at compilation of report.

Previously under 18/1524 on the basis of the same supporting *“raising No objection subject to the inclusion of an advisory note on any permission relating to contaminated land / asbestos.”*

Landscape Officer – Comments awaited at compilation of report.

Previously under 18/1524 on the basis of the same supporting *“Revised plans submitted on 8 April meet with the satisfaction of the Landscape officer in terms of proposed Landscaping and Arboricultural Assessment received on 8 April 2019 and detailed on plan number 518/18/LD01Rev B.”*

County Council (Highway) - Cromer – No objection subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions in relation to parking and turning areas before first occupancy.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

Policy SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS2: Development in the Countryside

Policy HO9: Conversion and re-use of rural buildings as dwellings

Policy EN 4: Design
Policy EN 6: Sustainable Construction & Energy Efficiency
Policy EN 8: Protecting and enhancing the historic environment
Policy CT 5: The transport impact on new development
Policy CT 6: Parking provision

Supplementary Planning guidance:
North Norfolk Design Guide (2008)

Nation Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): 2018:
Section 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 12. Achieving well-designed places
Section 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle of development
2. Design
3. Heritage
4. Amenity
5. Highways

APPRAISAL

This application has been resubmitted to materially address the concerns and reasons for refusal issued in response to application 18/1524. That reason for refusal is as follows:

The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:

*Policy SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk
Policy SS2: Development in the Countryside
HO9: Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings as Dwellings
Policy EN 4: Design
Policy EN 8: Protecting and enhancing the historic environment
Policy CT 5: The transport impact on new development
National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 79 and 193*

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed scheme of conversion, due to the extent of new build, would result in a significant increase in the scale and massing of the host building which would fail to protect or enhance the character and appearance of the building and its setting.

Furthermore, due to its form, bulk and general design the proposed conversion scheme would fail to respect the simple character and utilitarian appearance of the host building.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the above Development Plan policies.

1. Principle of development

Policy SS 1 sets out the spatial strategy for North Norfolk and identifies main and service settlements where development of varying scales can take place. The remainder of the district, including settlements not listed in the policy, are designated as Countryside. This is the lowest tier of the settlement hierarchy and within the designated countryside area development is restricted to particular types of development to support the rural economy, meet affordable housing needs and provide renewable energy.

The types of development acceptable in principle in designated Countryside are listed under policy SS 2; this includes the re-use and adaptation of buildings for appropriate purposes.

Policy HO9 then specifically considers the conversion of buildings in the countryside to residential use. The policy requires that proposals will only be permitted where the building meets the specified criteria including, but not limited to:

- The building is located within an area identified in the Proposals Map for that purpose
- That the building is worthy of retention due to its appearance, historic, architectural or landscape value, and;
- That the building is structurally sound and suitable for conversion to a residential use without substantial rebuilding or extension and the alterations protect or enhance the character of the building and its setting, and;
- The scheme is of an appropriate scale in terms of the number of dwellings proposed for the location.

Since adoption of the Core strategy in September 2008 planning policy and case law has moved forward. It is important that the policy is not slavishly adhered to where more recent development indicate otherwise. This approach requires flexibility when assessing the relevant criteria of policy H09.

Locational Controls:

The publication of revised National Planning Policy Frameworks in 2012 and 2018 have essentially removed location (first bullet point) from the list of national planning policy considerations. Indeed, paragraph 79 of the latest NPPF expressly states that building conversions should be regarded as an acceptable form of development in isolated locations. It follows that if such proposals are acceptable in 'isolated' locations they must be equally acceptable elsewhere. Reflecting this, and similar advice in the 2012 NPPF, the Council has not been imposing locational controls in respect of proposals for building conversions for some time.

Alongside the changes to the NPPF government has also introduced new permitted development allowances providing for the conversion of existing agricultural buildings to dwellings without the need to secure formal planning permission.

The Part Q allowances, the NPPF, and Policy H09 of the Core Strategy are concerned with the conversion and re-use of existing buildings. Those allowances are not spatially restrictive, i.e. do not require compliance with the core strategy Proposals Map.

Please note that the policy requirements should no longer seek that the building is worthy of retention.

Worthy of retention:

These national policy changes and new permitted development allowances influence the relevant weight which should be afforded to consideration of the building as being 'worthy of retention'

The existing building is a typical of agricultural building and although small in scale does include the use of timber boarding and terracotta clay pantiles, it is in a simple C shape layout with crew yard. In essence the building is unexceptional, but is a recognised feature within the local landscape. Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework is again relevant. The provision for made is where 'the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting' (*officer emphasis*). This does not in itself require that the building must be worthy of retention in terms of its architecture, landscape or some other historic or social justification. The position moves to simply requiring that the building must enhance its immediate setting. I will return to a full assessment of the impact of the development on its immediate setting later in this section of the report.

The NPPF is a material consideration, and as such officers consider that the 'worthy of retention' carries very limited weight, in addition, the relaxation of permitted development rights for agricultural buildings allows the conversion of such buildings under part Q, without any need for such buildings to be 'worthy of retention'. Clearly the first criteria of Policy H09 is out of step with the NPPF.

Please note that the policy requirements should no longer seek that the building is worthy of retention.

Structural Integrity

Whether the building is structurally sound and suitable for conversion to a residential use without substantial rebuilding or extension and the alterations protect or enhance the character of the building and its setting remains a material consideration both within Part Q permitted development conversions and in recent case law. The proposals should demonstrate that the building is capable of conversion without substantial rebuilding.

The application is supported by a Visual Structural Appraisal (VSA), prepared by a consulting engineers on 17/11/2015. The report is historic and has some limitations; it is a short textural report supported by photographs it was a visual inspection, and was submitted as an update to a previous report which supported a previous planning permission for the reuse of this building. The engineer concludes that subject to mitigating recommendations that this building is capable of being reused without substantial demolition and rebuilding of the existing structure, officer see no sign of any significant visual deterioration since that time. If minded to grant this may be controlled by suitably worded planning conditions.

Substantial extension:

Prior notification for conversion of the existing building to a dwelling was approved by the Local Planning Authority in October 2015. A fundamental requirement of this process is that the fabric of the building is kept largely intact and was not subject to significant extension or alteration. Having established that principle then a planning application (PF/15/1748) was submitted convert the building into a dwelling, this was approved in February 2016. This permission retained the simple layout form of the barn, with no extensions or outbuildings proposed.

In 2018, a further application was received (PF/18/0921) seeking changes to the 2015 permission including the position of openings, internal walls and corrections to size and position of building. This permission again retained the simple layout form of the barn, with no extensions or

outbuildings proposed. Permission was given in July 2018 and carries a three-year implementation period.

As such there is a valid permission to convert the building which could be otherwise be implemented subject to the discharge of any pre commencement conditions. This approval forms a fall-back consideration in the current case as the applicant's inform officers that this permission was commenced (and is not completed).

The scheme approved in July 2018 was based on the original footprint of the building and creates a floor area of some 150 sq. metres. The conversion achieves a three-bedroom dwelling with lounge, dining room, separate kitchen and three bathrooms.

The current proposals are assessed under planning policy requirements and with consideration against the recent approval (PF/18/0921) as a fall-back position. The current proposals would involve infilling the open courtyard to the southern elevation, a new small extension to the north eastern corner.

The proposals add a floor area of 97.65 sq. metres to the existing building, the existing floor area of the building is circa 150 sq. metres. Officers note that the proposals are reduced by approx. 55 sq. metres, from the recent refusal of planning permission. The proposed cart shed and store were a large standalone building, their removal from the proposals is significant as a means to reduce the built form on site. However, within the context of this modest existing building then even in this reduced form the extensions significantly alter the simple U shape footprint of the building and adds approx. 65% more floor space to the dwelling.

Given the form, layout and scale of extensions then the proposals are considered to remain a substantial extension of the existing building which is not be compliant with this criteria of policy H09.

Appropriate scale in terms of number of dwellings:

In terms of the number of dwellings proposed for the location – a single dwelling is proposed to be formed. As a single dwelling then it is considered to be appropriate in terms of the overall size of the site, the layout of the development, the living conditions that would be provided for the future occupiers including provision of private amenity space. The site is accessed via narrow private lane; the Highway Authority have not raised any concerns in terms of the impact on the local road network. The proposals are considered to comply with this criterion.

With regard to the criteria of policy HO9 above, then it is clear that the proposal are appropriate in terms of the number of dwellings being created; that a visual inspection has been updated and that suitable conditions can be imposed to ensure that the structure of the building can be largely retained during conversion. It is considered locational requirements for conversions such as this will not be pursued; and that it will no longer be materially relevant to consider whether or not the building is in itself worthy of retention. Critically, the conversion cannot be considered as anything other than a substantial extension of the existing building and also proposes an ancillary garage and store. On this basis alone then the proposals cannot be argued to be fully compliant with policy H09.

It is therefore considered as a matter of principle the proposals will comply accord with the requirements of policy SS1 and SS2.

A key criteria of policy HO9 cannot be met, the requirement to convert without substantial extension.

The requirement for the proposed alterations to protect or enhance the character of the building and its setting will be considered within the design and heritage sections of this report. Matters of Sustainable Construction & Energy Efficiency; the transport impact on new development and parking provision will also be considered before the proposals are then balanced against the policies of the local plan when considered a whole.

2. Design

The current building is a simple 'U' shaped form with walls primarily of horizontal timber boarding under a clay pantile roof. The only exception being the two south facing gables which are of a weathered concrete block construction. The building remains clad in timber boarding, with terracotta pantiles being reclaimed for the building or otherwise appropriately sourced.

The scheme proposes significant infilling of the courtyard (9.5m x 8m) to the southern elevation with a partially flat roofed extension, this section incorporates a large glazed lantern light serving the dining / sitting room. The front element of the infill extension has a duo pitched roof clad in terracotta pantiles. The elevations of the infill extension are held back from the existing gables by a return of approximately 1M; this is designed to create the impression of light and shade over the southern elevation so as to appear similar in appearance to that already existing. The infill extension connects the two south facing wings creating a kitchen, snug and hall. It is proposed that the gables to the outer wings would be reconstructed in facing brick (as would the southern wall of the flat roofed extension).

In addition, a small extension (4.5m x 4.7m) is proposed to the rear elevation, this projects out in a northerly direction from the north eastern corner of the building. This extension would contain a bathroom and plant room and would be again be clad facing brick. The ridge and eaves height of the building would be maintained on the northern extension.

The infilling of the open courtyard to the southern elevation would significantly alter the form, character and appearance of the original building. The simple C shape layout is all but lost under these proposals.

The proposals follow previous elevations in terms of the treatment of openings and creation of new openings. It was reported previously that the conversion provided appropriate use of existing openings and treatment of those new and where required existing openings is considered appropriate in the amended form. On this basis then the concerns of the consultees is noted but no objection is raised to this element of the proposals.

Officers recognise that the applicant has previously striven on a number of occasions to meet concerns of officers and the Development Committee. Some significance can be attached to the removal of the cart shed and store element of these proposals. However, it remains a concern that the overall scheme of conversion continues to be reliant on an unacceptable level of infilling to the Courtyard and extension to create a bathroom / Plant room. These elements fail to comply with the strict requirements of policy EN4. Extensions and alterations in conversion proposals will be expected to be suitably designed for the context within which they are set and to ensure that the scale and massing of buildings relate sympathetically to the surrounding area. Furthermore, it should be noted that the North Norfolk Design Guide, in particular Section 7 - Conversions, which suggests that schemes for conversion should avoid any works which otherwise rob the building of its context, original architectural features and interest 9 (in this case layout).

The proposals do not comply with Policy EN4 and the North Norfolk Design Guide (2008).

3. Heritage

The proposals are set in the open landscape to the south of the ribbon development along the Warham Road the building is seen against the backdrop of the conservation area to the north from the surrounding countryside. The building and majority of the application site are not within the Binham Conservation Area, the northern part of the garden and driveway is within the designated area. There are limited, glimpsed views of the building when looking south from the access, and from some vantage points along Warham Road. The building and proposals will also be viewed via the proposed access from Warham Road.

Development Committee is required by Sections 66 (1) and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act 1990) to have special regard to the “desirability of preserving” the character and appearance of conservation areas. This means that the desirability of preserving the setting of and character and appearance of conservation areas is not merely a material consideration to which appropriate planning weight can be attached, but it is a legal obligation to have ‘special regard’ or pay ‘special attention’ to these matters. When a local authority finds that a proposed development would harm these matters, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight as a matter of law. There is effectively a statutory presumption against planning permission being granted where such harm arises. That presumption can be waived only in exceptional circumstances where other material considerations, including the public benefits of a proposal, demonstrably outweigh the harm created on the heritage asset.

Development Committee should also take into account the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which specifically addresses the need for conserving and enhancing the historic environment, in particular paragraph 193, which states:

‘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)...’

Paragraph 196 goes on to state: *‘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’.*

Considerable weight must therefore be given to the preservation of heritage assets including their setting.

In considering development proposals affecting heritage assets, Core Strategy Policy EN 8 sets out that *‘the character and appearance of conservation areas will be preserved and where possible enhanced’*. However, this element of Core Strategy Policy EN 8 is now out of step with the guidance set out in the NPPF which is more permissive towards allowing development affecting heritage assets but only where there are clear and convincing public benefits in favour, and in accordance with the statutory requirements set out above.

The NPPF defines setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which it is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, and may affect the ability to appreciate the significance or may be neutral. Significance is defined as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.

The proposals have been significantly amended since refusal of planning permission. A new build cart shed / store has been removed from the Northern site boundary, i.e. that section of the site immediately adjacent to the conservation area. Previously the proposals were considered not result in substantial harm to the conservation area, or its significance as a heritage asset. These changes also help to assimilate the proposals in the wider landscape. Despite these changes the alterations to the building retain a significant extension and new build element. It is those aspects that may present harm to the heritage asset, i.e. the setting of the conservation area. The proposals fail to respect the simple character and utilitarian appearance of the host building, the harm that arises is mitigated by limited views from Warham Road and the rising landform that offsets views to the site from the public footpath to the South of the application site. The landscape planting and design changes do help to mitigate that impact further but the harm created by the significant extensions cannot be lost entirely. The harm created is assessed as laying at the lower end of the spectrum but will have some impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area.

Having measured this less than substantive harm, I turn to the wider benefits that can be delivered from the proposals, re-use and adoption of the building, a new home as a conversion, inclusion of a sustainable geothermal energy project, an elderly local couple will be able to live within the village and function effectively as an extended family with their grandchildren.

I am persuaded that the less than substantial harm that arises to the character and appearance of the wider Binham Conservation Area carries a limited weight, and that this very limited weight can now be outweighed by those material benefits listed above, when considered in combination.

As such the proposals are compliant with the provisions of Local Plan Policy EN8, Sections 66 (1) and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act 1990); and Paragraphs 103 & 196 of the NPPF.

4. Amenity

Due to its location being set some 50 metres from the Warham Road it is not considered that the scheme as proposed would give rise to any amenity issues in respect of the neighbouring properties in terms of potential overlooking or loss of light.

5. Highways

Subject to suitable conditions being imposed then The Highway Authority has indicated that the scheme does not raise any issues in terms of highway safety.

6. Sustainable energy provisions

The applicant proposes to utilise a sustainable geothermal energy heating system, and has specifically designed the layout of the conversion to maximise solar gain within the building. The infilling of the crew yard is considered by the applicant to reduce potential heat loss by reducing the length of external perimeter walls. The layout ensures room are readily accessed from a central living area. Further additions may be secured by the use of planning conditions to ensure that low water volume fittings are added, are high levels of insulation are provided. In this way provisions can be made which will satisfy local plan policy EN6, and our drive to low carbon future.

7. Fall-back

When examining the fall-back position then I see a previous extant permission (PF/18/0921) which adheres closely to the existing template of the building and required no extension to facilitate a three bedroomed dwelling.

The applicants have suggested that environmental, sustainability, amenity considerations are of material weight in this matter:

- Solar gain, providing main living accommodation to south facing elevations,
- Provision of a ground source heating supply (extension to north east corner houses plant),
- Meeting the families housing requirements by living as an extended family within the same village
- Overcoming a compromised internal arrangement / circulation space within the approved scheme

It is reasonable to agree that at least some of these elements may offer a proportionality may mitigate some increase in floor space and change in layout. However, the significant increase in floor space and layout to encompass all of these elements is considered excessive and cannot be considered to establish a more desirable fall-back position than the approved scheme. It is entirely conceivable that the existing building may be redesigned to accommodate a more effective internal arrangement / use of circulation space; modest alterations may be made to relocate living space / accommodate solar gain. Similarly, geothermal / other sustainable energy sources or sustainable resolutions may be delivered without requiring the wholesale change proposed.

8. Conclusion

On the basis of the above assessment then the proposals result in a development which cannot comply with local plan policy requirements under HO9 & ENV4. The mitigation offered is genuine and is materially helpful to the consideration of planning balance, but when taken within the context of the wider local plan cannot suitably mitigate the harm created by the significant extension and alterations proposed. In such circumstances then the implementation of the previously approved planning application PF/18/0921 is assessed as being preferable as a fall back consideration.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:

Policy SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS2: Development in the Countryside

Policy HO9: Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings as Dwellings

Policy EN 4: Design

Policy EN 8: Protecting and enhancing the historic environment

Policy CT 5: The transport impact on new development

National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraphs 79 and 193

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed conversion scheme, due to the extent of new build, would result in a significant increase in the scale and massing of host building which would which fail to protect or enhance the character and appearance of the building and its setting.

Furthermore, due to its form, bulk, general design, the proposed conversion scheme would fail to respect the simple character and utilitarian appearance of the host building.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the above Development Plan policies.