

Application No:	17/02329/FUL
Proposal:	Householder application for re-modelling of Dairy Shed and addition of a garage
Location:	Church Farm, Main Street, Norwell, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6JN
Applicant:	Mr P McCartin
Registered:	4 January 2018
	Target Date: 1 March 2018
	Extension of time agreed until: 9 March 2018

This application is presented to the Planning Committee at the request of the Ward Member following the concerns raised by Norwell Parish Council.

The Site

Church Farm is an 18th century former farmhouse, group listed with the attached Church Farm Cottage. The site is a long rectangular plot with 2 detached outbuildings, a garden store close to the dwelling and a former milking parlour in the NE corner of the site. The dwelling fronts on to the public highway with an access to the rear via a private driveway to the east, which also serves a modern housing development known as Church Court. The adjoining Church Farm Cottage is located to the west with fields to the north of the site.

Relevant Planning History

17/02330/LBC - Re-modelling of Dairy Shed and addition of a garage (pending consideration)

13/00546/LBC - Demolition of 1970's porch to rear elevation and repairs throughout; new porch canopy, relocate and re-erection of boundary fence & new entrance gate. Internal and external alterations to include new windows, conversion of attached outbuildings and internal re-configuration (permitted 28.06.2013)

11/00728/LBC - Demolition of rear porch, installation of traditional horizontal sash window, repairs to brickwork, installation of 2 no. conservation rooflights to rear roof slope and various internal alterations (permitted 05.07.2011)

10/00903/LBC - General overall restoration and repair to all structural parts of the buildings including windows and doors, the removal of four tiled surround fireplaces and insertion of 2 conservation rooflights to the rear elevation (permitted 27.09.2010)

03/00702/LBC & 03/00703/FUL - Proposed three dwellings, barn conversion to form a dwelling, conversion of cart shed to a garage. Demolition of existing buildings (permitted 23.06.2003)

The Proposal

The proposal seeks consent for alterations to the existing milking parlour to create a garden room and along with an extension to this building to create a garage and office.

The extension will measure 10.8m in length, 6.5m in width and 4.8m in ridge height. It is proposed that the garage will be constructed of brick and slate with timber doors and windows.

The garage would be connected to the milking parlour by a glazed link measuring 1.5m in length, 3.4m in width and 2.6m in height and will be constructed with a flat roof and aluminium-framed glazing.

To the southern elevation of the proposed garage, a mower store and log store are proposed, measuring 3.3m in length, 4.2m in width and will have a mono-pitched roof with a ridge height of 2.9m. This addition will be constructed of brick and pantiles.

The alterations to the milking parlour include the partial removal of the existing frontage between the bays and infilling with black-stained timber cladding, retile the roof using existing roof tiles where possible and reclaimed tiles, reinstatement of timber posts between bays, a new glazed opening in the northern and western elevations and the installation of a log burner. The installation of 2no. rooflights in the western roofslope are also proposed.

The application has been amended during the course of the application to address concerns raised by the internal Conservation Officer. This report and recommendation therefore relates to amended plans received on 12th February 2018.

Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 6 neighbouring properties were individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been posted close to the site and an advert placed in the local press.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood District Council Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2011)

Core Policy 9: Sustainable Design

Core Policy 14: Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD

Policy DM5: Design

Policy DM6: Householder Development

Policy DM9: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Conversion of Traditional Rural Buildings SPD 2014

Consultations

Norwell Parish Council – *object to the proposals on the following grounds:*

1. *The alterations to the existing buildings are so significant as to amount to the creation of a new separate development on the site*

2. *The new garage will have a significant visual impact and is out of character with the surrounding area.*

NSDC Environmental Health Officer – No comments received to date

NSDC Conservation Officer – No objection following amended plans (detailed comments included within the appraisal)

In addition to the above, **a letter has been received from a third party raising objection** to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The design will dominate the western end of Church Court which would result in the loss of the open aspect currently enjoyed
- Issues of safety for Church Court when vehicles enter/leave the garage
- Garage would result in the loss of driveway currently used by all properties that share it
- the introduction of the garage would restrict parking availability along the drive
- Issues relating to land ownership along the private drive leading to Church Court.

Comments of the Business Manager

Principle of Development

Policy DM6 accepts householder development subject to an assessment of numerous factors including that the proposal respects the character of the dwelling and surrounding area, as well as protects the amenity of neighbouring residents.

As the site lies within the Conservation Area for Norwell, and the works relate to a Grade II Listed Building, any proposed development must comply with the principles of Policy DM9 and Core Policy 14. Criteria within these policies require proposals to take into account the distinctive character and setting of the Conservation Area and preserve the appearance of important historical buildings.

Impact on the Character of the Area

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Policy 9 and Policy DM6 of the DPD require new development to achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is of an appropriate form and scale to its context, complementing the existing built and landscape environments. Additionally, Policy DM9 of the DPD and Core Policy 14 of the Core Strategy require applications to at a minimum preserve the character and appearance of conversation areas.

Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') require the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any architectural features that they possess. In this context, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm, and is a matter of paramount concern in the planning process.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF, for example, advises that the significance of designated heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alterations or development within their setting. Such harm or loss to significance requires clear and convincing justification.

The setting of heritage assets is defined in the Glossary of the NPPF which advises that setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. Paragraph 13 of the Conservation section within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

Section 72 of the Act, requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. Furthermore Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance.

Turning first to the proposed alterations to the milking parlour, these have been accepted in principle but have been altered to reflect suggestions made by the internal Conservation Officer. For reference, the initial comments received from the Conservation Officer are detailed below,

I welcome the reinstatement of the three bay layout of this building, the historic form of which can still be read in the surviving pad stones. While noting this will radically alter the building's current appearance, I feel it will be a more traditional restoration of this elevation, revealing what was once a cart shed.

I do however have objections about some of the other proposed glazed elements. I note the existing north and rear elevations are blank, which is typical for a cart shed where the openings are usually on one side only. It is unfortunate here that the proposed conversion requires these naturally large openings to be blocked but I am sympathetic to the fact they look otherwise look out onto a shared driveway. In accepting that there will need to be some new openings to bring this building forward for re-use, on balance, I have no objection to the proposed central bay of glazing on the garden facing elevation.

However, I do object to the proposed treatment of the gable of this historic farm building, which sees a fully glazed treatment right into the ridge and verge, creating an appearance and character quite unlike the simple rural outbuilding it is. While I am sympathetic to their desire to maximise views of the countryside beyond, this could be achieved by a much more modest opening, which when installed would not look out of character on a former agricultural building. As such I would suggest a cart shed style opening, either of a segmental brick arch or a sturdy timber lintel, with a simple glazed treatment.

The north-facing gable has been amended to reduce the level of glazing introduced on this elevation and following this, the Conservation officer has raised no objection to the scheme. I would concur with this conclusion, although I would consider it appropriate to condition materials and joinery details to ensure the alterations are appropriate for the historic status of the building and surrounding area.

With regards to the proposed extension to form a garage, I am mindful that the extension is fairly significant in footprint, however it is my view that the site can accommodate this size of structure without resulting in the overdevelopment of the plot. Further to this, the ridge height of the extension will remain subservient to the milking parlour, reducing the overall dominance of the structure within the site and the surrounding area. I am mindful that the garage will be visible from the public realm when stood at the entrance to Church Court, and it will perhaps be more visible owing to the slight increase in land levels up to the proposed location for the garage.

However, owing to the subservient scale and appropriate design of the proposal, I take the view that the garage is unlikely to be overly prominent and therefore will not have an adverse impact upon the Conservation Area. I also note that an existing modern outbuilding (of which I cannot find any planning history for) is proposed to be removed which will be a benefit for the site as it does not reference the historic building and will reduce clutter within the site.

An objection was received during the public consultation exercise regarding the loss of open views currently afforded to Church Court. Having visited the site, I note that these neighbouring properties currently have a largely undisturbed view across to Fauna Follies to the west of Church Farm Cottage, however I would not agree that this is a particularly 'open' view given that there are built structures within close proximity. As such, I am of the view that the introduction of additional built form is not likely to have an adverse impact upon these views or character of the area.

In terms of the impact upon the listed building, the internal Conservation Officer has provided the following comments on the garage,

I have no objection to the principle of creating a new garage structure. I note this is located between the house and former dairy outbuilding, so reads as part of the domestic curtilage of the site and avoids any sprawl into the countryside. While it is to be placed on currently open garden land, it is a very traditional arrangement to see long thin ranges of outbuildings leading out behind traditional cottages and farmhouses. The new garage is read within the built form of the village and at this scale and position is not, in my opinion, an overly intense use of the site or out of character.

I have no objection to the proposed design of this new garage, which is like a simple outbuilding in form and character, with materials that accord with the host building and wider area. While I note it has a wider gable than the milking parlour, I note that the eaves and ridge are set below those of the milking parlour and the roof pitch is comparable. I also note it has been arranged gable end onto the plot, which is a traditional arrangement for outbuildings and mirrors the milking parlour. Overall the form is appropriate and does not dominate the main house or historic outbuilding. While side hung outward opening garage doors are my preference aesthetically, if these create visibility or safety issues then I would accept an up and over garage door but this should have the appearance of a simple plank door when shut. I have no objection to the small lean-to element to this new build garage, which is a fairly traditional style add-on for small stores.

In addition to the above, the Conservation Officer also assessed the small glazed link extension connecting the garage to the milking parlour. Following concerns raised by the Conservation Officer, this has been amended to reduce the overall scale to reduce the visual impact; the amendments are now supported by Conservation and I would concur with their assessment.

Aside from the above, I note the Parish Council's concerns with regards to the development amounting to a separate development within the site, which I assume means the likelihood of a new dwelling within the site. The application submitted shows accommodation incidental to the host dwelling and the LPA must take the applicant's proposal in good faith and on face value that this is their intention. I note that the resultant footprint of the two buildings could amount to the size of an independent dwelling, however this is not what the applicant has applied for and in any event, it is likely that the LPA would raise concerns with regards to heritage, parking and amenity should any independent building be proposed in the future. Furthermore, as stated above, the extension is considered subservient to the host building. It is therefore considered that the Parish's concerns would not substantiate a reason for refusal in this instance.

On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal is not likely to have an adverse impact upon the Norwell Conservation Area nor the integrity of the Listed Building in terms of design in accordance with Policies CP9 and CP14 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM6 and DM9 of the DPD and Section 12 of the NPPF. I would however recommend that conditions relating to materials and joinery details are conditioned should Members be minded to approve the application.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM6 of the ADMDPD states planning permission will be granted for householder development provided it would not adversely affect the amenities of the adjoining premises, in terms of loss of privacy, light or over-bearing impacts.

The existing milking parlour and proposed garage will be located away immediate boundaries with neighbouring properties, separated from the nearest neighbouring property (1 Church Court) by approximately 8m. I consider this distance to be sufficient to limit any loss of light or overbearing impacts. Furthermore, only one window is proposed to the eastern elevation overlooking the driveway; this will serving the office store and will provide no more overlooking than the windows currently installed in the milking parlour (which are proposed to be removed as part of the development). As this room will not be primary living accommodation, I am of the view that the neighbour's privacy is unlikely to be adversely affected.

The letter of objection received during the public consultation period refers to 'amenity space' for parking afforded to users of the driveway. This is a land ownership issue and therefore out of the control of the LPA; the garage will open up on to the shared driveway but once the doors are closed, there would be no encroachment of development on to this shared access. It is noted that the local resident feels there would be a loss of parking spaces along the driveway but looking at the properties served by the driveway, they all appear to have parking available within their respective curtilages and therefore this additional parking could be considered to be a benefit for these properties, rather than formal parking spaces.

On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal is unlikely to have any undue impact upon neighbour amenity in accordance with Policy DM6 of the DPD.

Impact upon Highway Safety

Policy DM5 is explicit in stating that provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development whilst Spatial Policy 7 encourages proposals which place an emphasis on non-car modes as a means of access to services and facilities.

As noted above, I am mindful of comments received regarding parking arrangements for Church Court and have concluded that the proposal is not considered to affect the formal parking allocated to the properties served by this access to the east of the site.

Issues regarding highway safety have also been raised and I have consulted the Highway Authority on this issue, although at the time of writing this report, they have not responded. However, the Highway Authority have recently issued standing advice guidance for the LPA and taking lead from this guidance, development that would not result in a new or alteration to an existing vehicular access on to a street, encroach into the public highway or compromise local parking standards is unlikely to raise a highway objection. The proposal would not result in a change in access or encroachment on to Main Street and there would be sufficient turning area available within the

shared driveway in accordance with the standing advice. Additionally, the proposal is an addition to an existing dwelling and therefore I would not expect there to be any significant increase in vehicular activity along the driveway associated with Church Farm, particularly as they already use this driveway for parking and for access to additional land also within the applicant's ownership to the rear of the site.

On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal will not have an adverse impact upon highway safety.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

The application seeks to make alterations to the existing milking parlour within the curtilage of the Grade II Listed Church Farm, along with the extension of this milking parlour to create a garage, office, mower store and log store.

Having assessed the proposal, it is concluded that whilst the addition to the milking parlour is substantial, it will remain a subservient addition to the milking parlour and the host dwelling, with no adverse impact to the listed building or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in part due to the traditional design and materials proposed. These materials, along with joinery details and repair works, should be conditioned to enable the LPA control over the final appearance of the development, should Members be minded to approve the application.

In terms of amenity and highway safety, concerns have been raised during the public consultation period, however in assessing the application it is concluded that there is sufficient distance between the milking parlour/garage to ensure there are no adverse impacts upon neighbour amenity, whilst it is considered that highway safety will not be compromised; comments regarding parking have been noted, however the issues raised would appear to be civil matters relating to the use of the shared driveway of which the LPA have no control over.

It is therefore recommended to Members that, subject to conditions, the application accords with local and national planning policy and should therefore be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

That full planning permission is granted, subject to the following conditions,

Conditions

01

The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

02

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following plan references;

- Location Plan – PL01 Rev.A
- Proposed Garage – PL03 Rev.A

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority through the approval of a non-material amendment to the permission.

Reason: So as to define this permission.

03

No development shall be commenced until precise details and samples of the materials identified below have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

- Facing materials
- Roofing tiles
- Cladding

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

04

No development shall be commenced until such time as a brick sample panel showing brick bond, mortar and pointing technique has been provided on site for inspection and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development thereafter shall be carried out only in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

05

Mortar for the purposes of re-pointing shall be carried out using hydraulic lime or lime putty. The sand mix, colour, texture and pointing finish shall match as closely as possible the historic pointing found elsewhere on the building.

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

06

No development shall be commenced in respect of the features identified below, until details of the design, specification, fixing and finish in the form of drawings and sections at a scale of not less than 1:10 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

- External windows including roof windows, doors and their immediate surroundings, including details of glazing and glazing bars.
- Treatment of window and door heads and cills
- Verges and eaves
- Rainwater goods
- Coping
- Extractor vents
- Flues
- Meter boxes
- Airbricks
- Soil and vent pipes

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historical appearance of the building.

07

Should any repointing be required to the milking parlour, no development shall be commenced in respect of the repointing until details of the extent of the re-pointing of the building, along with details of the mortar to be used, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The raking out of loose mortar for the purpose of re-pointing shall be carried out by tools held in the hand and not by power-driven tools. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

08

No development shall be commenced until a methodology, including a full schedule of works, for undertaking repair works for the milking parlour has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning application.

Reason: To safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

Notes to Applicant

01

This application has been the subject of pre-application discussions and has been approved in accordance with that advice. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 (as amended).

02

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development hereby approved as the gross internal area of new build is less 100 square metres.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Nicolla Ellis on ext 5833.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Matt Lamb

Business Manager – Growth & Regeneration

Committee Plan - 17/02329/FUL

