



Report to Planning Committee 15 February 2024
 Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development
 Lead Officer: Juliette Wilson, Conservation Officer, Extn 5859

Report Summary			
Application Number	23/01338/LBC		
Proposal	Small open porch and installation of composite doors (Retrospective)		
Location	Foxgloves, Main Street, Edingley		
Applicant	Dr Karen Dening	Agent	N/A
Web Link	23/01338/LBC Small open porch and installation of composite doors (Retrospective) Foxgloves Main Street Edingley NG22 8BE (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)		
Registered	31.7.2023	Target Date	20.11.2023
		Extension of Time	22.2.24
Recommendation	That Listed Building Consent is <u>REFUSED</u> for reason set out in Section 10.0 of this report		

In line with the Council’s Constitution, Councillor Rainbow has requested the application be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration on the grounds that the design, brick and pantiles are in keeping with the barn and it has a practical purpose in protecting the property from flooding. In addition, the Officer’s recommendation differs from that of Edingley Parish Council.

1.0 The Site

The application site comprises a large former agricultural barn, which was approved for conversion into two residential units in 1997. At the time of the application the building was identified as curtilage listed in association with the Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse (LEN 1193536), designated 11th August 1961.

The application site at the date of listing was in the same ownership as Manor Farmhouse

(the principal listed building), was physically related to the principal listed building and had a related function to that principal listed building.

The site is accessed from the Main Street and is situated west of the Grade II* listed Church of St Giles.

Other notable listed buildings within this area of Edingley include:

- Grade II Pair of head stone in church yard of Church of St Giles 5-metres north of the chancel (LEN 1370173), designated 13th May 1986
- Grade II Church Farmhouse (LEN 1045537), designated 13th May 1986

2.0 Relevant Planning History

23/01339/LBC - Installation of EV charging point. Approved 17.11.2023

04/00538/FUL & 04/00539/LBC – Conversion of existing garage to granny annexe. Approved 6.5.2004 & 13.5.2004

97/50542/FUL & 97/50543/LBC – Conversion of Farm building to one dwelling. Approved 7.3.1997

94/50465/FUL & 94/50464/LBC - conversion of farm buildings to two dwellings. Approved 28.7.1994

3.0 The Proposal

Listed building consent is sought for the retention of a brick and pantile, open lean-to porch located on the north-east facing elevation. It measures 1.97m wide by 1.5m deep, 2.4m high to eaves and 3.2m high to the ridge. It also includes the installation of two composite upvc doors in anthracite grey.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of two neighbouring properties have been individually notified by letter, a site notice has also been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press.

A site visit was undertaken 5th October 2023.

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides a presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings and preservation or enhancement of conservation areas.

The Courts have accepted that Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 does not apply to decisions on applications for Listed Building Consents, since in those cases there is no statutory requirement to have regard to the provisions of the development plan. However, Local Planning Authorities are required to be mindful of their duty under the legal framework in determining such matters, i.e. Section 16(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and take into account the following other material considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2023
- Planning Practice Guidance
- Historic England (2016) Making Changes to Heritage Assets: Advice Note 2
- Historic England (2017) Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings: Best Practice Guidelines For Adaptive Reuse
- Newark and Sherwood Conversion of Traditional Rural Buildings Supplementary Planning Document 2013

6.0 Consultations

Edingley Parish Council - support the application.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

As the application concerns a designated heritage asset of a Listed Building, section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') is particularly relevant. Section 16(2) requires the decision maker in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, to *"have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."*

The key issue is:

- Whether the proposal preserves the special architectural and historic interest of the curtilage listed building.

Summary of Significance of Heritage Asset(s)

The building is curtilage listed building in association with Manor Farmhouse (LEN 1193536). Manor Farmhouse dates to the early 18th century and is constructed of redbrick, with concrete pantile roof, brick coped gables with kneelers.

Historically associated with the farmhouse is a large agricultural building range. The building is a 'U' planform with a range of agricultural building types/uses. The building is constructed of redbrick and clay pantile. The building has typical agricultural architectural details such as threshing openings and cartshed openings.

Manor Farmhouse was designated on 11th August 1961 and at the time of designation the farmhouse and agricultural buildings were in the same ownership, physically associated being located together at the end of the lane and in ancillary use to the Farmhouse. The agricultural buildings were converted in the 1990s, a listed building application was submitted and

approved in 1994 and 1997 in which the Council considered it to be curtilage listed. At this time, no additional information has been provided to alter the curtilage listed status of the building.

Heritage impacts

Porch

Historic England's Best Practice Guidelines for Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings sets out that the general principal is carefully designed extensions maybe considered acceptable where they assist in the future '*safeguard of the significance*' of the heritage asset. The building was successfully converted into residential use, which allowed for the safeguarding of the building.

Historic England's Best Practice Guidance suggest that porches can be '*overtly domestic extensions*', which are '*alien in character and can rarely work successfully within the context of the historic farm buildings*'.

Porches are not a typical agricultural feature and its unsympathetic introduction, such as in this case, erodes the agricultural character of the building and therefore its contribution to the special interest of the designated heritage asset.

The building is a large 'U' plan form with a mix of agricultural building types. The location of the porch does not respond positively to the traditional planform and is awkwardly located between different roof forms. In addition, the type of brick used in the construction of the porch is not a good match to this part of the building. The main part of the agricultural building has an orange/red brick, and the porch is constructed with a paler brick with pink tones. The use of different bricks contributes to the extension jarring with the original part.

The application site is set back from the road, however, due to the openness of the site, the porch is visible from the Main Street. The awkward relationship with the traditional agricultural planform and existing roof form is visible from the wider area.

Although the porch is visible, it is considered not to affect the setting of Grade II* listed Church of St Giles, due to mature trees and the location of the porch (you do not experience the church and porch at the same time).

Composite upvc doors

As part of the original conversion all windows and doors were approved as timber. The design of the door was tongue and grove timber boards to the bottom section and glazing to the upper section. Timber is a traditional material, which reflects traditional technology expected for a building of this age and use. The replacement of timber doors with composite upvc versions removes traditional workmanship with detail that cannot be replicated through modern composite materials.

The applicant has raised concerns about the ongoing maintenance of the timber door with it being replaced multiple times over their time as the building owner. Discussions outlined that

part of the problem is from rainwater coming off the roof hitting the door. This could be addressed through a more sensitive approach of installing rainwater goods with a larger capacity that can discharge rainwater efficiently.

Other Matters

Although nothing has been formally submitted with the application, the applicants have raised concerns over flooding. This is following water levels around the property during Storm Babet in October 2023, where water from a nearby stream diverted down the property's drive and up to the dwelling.

Comments have been made, that without the porch the water would have entered the property. The conservation team have previously advised other listed building owners in the district about flood resilience. Although the porch may have prevented water entering the property, less visually invasive options are available, such as removable barriers to the door.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Conclusion

The introduction of an alien and overtly domestic extension results in harm to a listed building that derives significance from a rural agricultural vernacular character. The porch is constructed with brickwork that is not a suitable match to the host property. The introduction of modern composite upvc materials erodes the traditional, historic character of the building.

The problems raised by the applicant in relation to the ongoing maintenance of timber doors and flood resilience can be achieved through solutions that are more sensitive to the building's heritage status and are therefore not considered to represent a clear and convincing justification in this case.

The proposal therefore results in less than substantial harm to the significance of this heritage asset, which, in accordance with paragraph 208 of the NPPF can be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Any benefits arising from the proposal are essentially private gains, and not public/heritage benefits that can be weighed against the harm identified.

It is considered that the proposal does not preserve the special interest of the listed building as required by Section 16 of the Act and therefore should be refused.

10.0 Reason for refusal

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the porch and composite upvc doors would, by virtue of being an unsympathetic addition and introducing an unauthentic fabric into the

heritage asset, result in less than substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the listed building that lacks clear and convincing justification.

The proposal therefore fails to preserve as required by the duty contained within Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in contrary to Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, a material planning consideration. The identified harm is less than substantial for the purposes of the NPPF, but no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the harm identified.

Informatives

The application is clearly contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Working positively and proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Application case file

Committee Plan - 23/01338/LBC

