

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2021/0024
Valid 04/02/2021

SHAW MARSH FARM
UNNAMED ROAD FROM
EAVES KNOLL ROAD TO
SHAW MARSH FARM
NEW MILLS

DEMOLITION OF PART OF
EXISTING ATTACHED SINGLE
STORY OUTBUILDING IN
POOR CONDITION IN ORDER
TO BUILD A NEW
DOWNSTAIRS BEDROOM AND
LIVING AREA EXTENDING TO
THE
SIDE AND REAR OF THE
FARMHOUSE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Green Belt
- Conservation and Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to Shaw Marsh Farmhouse, a residential dwelling that forms part of the cluster of buildings that make up the farmstead. The existing dwelling is traditional in character constructed of a natural stone with slate tiled roof. The principal elevation faces southwards, on to a public footpath that runs around an adjacent field to the west, offering clear views of the western elevation.

The western elevation is characterised by a single storey annex that has a long cat-slide roof that runs parallel with the main farmhouse, with a second single storey annex attached to it. Based on a site visit and a review of the planning history associated with the site, there is no evidence to suggest that these aspects did not form part of the original building. The plans cite that the annex nearest to the house is partially demolished.

The site lies in a relatively isolated location, north of New Mills Golf Course, west of and accessed via a single farm track from Eaves Knoll Road, and is situated outside of the built-up area boundary, in the open countryside, and in the Green Belt. The site also lies within the Brookbottom Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission to demolish the existing outbuilding said to be in poor condition, which stands closest to the main farmhouse on the western elevation, replacing it with a single storey extension, constructed of a matching stone, with lean-to roof that forms a continuation of the existing cat-slide roof. The plans show the extension to span a width of 4m and a maximum height of 3.7m.

Following comments from officers regarding the scale and design of fenestration on the western side elevation, revised Elevation Plans have been submitted which show the provision of two equally proportioned windows with headers and sills.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S6 Central Sub-area Strategy
- EQ3 Rural Development
- EQ4 Green Belt Development
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Revised National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Promoting Sustainable Transport	Chapter 9
Achieving Well Designed Places	Chapter 12
Protecting Green Belt Land	Chapter 13
Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment	Chapter 15
Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	Chapter 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 15th March 2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 1st March 2021
Press Advert: 11th March 2021

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

No comments received

HPBC Conservation Officer

Happy to delegate assessment to Officers

DCC Archaeology

Thank you for sending on the photographs of this building complex, and apologies for the delay in response to you.

On the basis of this additional information, in conjunction with the information in the brief heritage impact assessment submitted, I would not object to the demolition of the outbuilding in question. I would recommend however that this be photographically recorded in advance of any works to the building (Historic England level 1 recording) and that its demolition be archaeologically monitored.

Early OS maps of this site show a building in the location of the structure that is proposed for demolition. There is a possibility that it may pre-date the farmhouse, or be built on the foundations of an earlier structure therefore. Archaeological monitoring of demolition will ensure that any evidence of this which is exposed in the course of works can be recorded.

The following conditions should be attached to any grant of planning permission for this scheme:

Archaeological recording and monitoring

- a) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment

3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation"

- b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a)."
- c) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured."

Historic Building Recording

No development, including demolition, shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for historic building recording has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, until all on-site elements of the approved scheme have been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority, and until the provision to be made for analysis, reporting, publication and dissemination of the results and archive deposition has been secured.

The Written Scheme of Investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme and provision for post-investigation analysis and reporting
3. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
4. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation"

- b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation for historic building recording approved under condition (a)."
- c) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation for historic building recording approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured."

The above recommendations are in line with the requirements of para 199 of NPPF which requires developers to make provision for the recording of heritage assets which are to be impacted by their proposals.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection.

AES Waste

No objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks extensions to an existing dwellinghouse that lies outside of the built-up area boundary, in the open countryside and the Green Belt, and within the Brookbottom Conservation Area.

Local Plan (LP) Policy EQ3 supports the extensions to existing dwellings in the open countryside provided they are subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

LP Policy EQ4 requires development proposals in the Green Belt to be assessed and determined in line with national Green Belt policy contained under Chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 goes on to state that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out the exceptions whereby new buildings are not regarded as inappropriate development, and are therefore acceptable in principle subject to all other material considerations. One such exception is:

“the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building”

The site lies within the Brookbottom Conservation Area and as such the application is subject to LP Policy EQ7 and relevant policies contained under Chapter 16 of the NPPF that relate to heritage conservation, underpinned by Section 72 of the Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

LP Policy EQ7 has regard to the Built and Historic Environment. It states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their

significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF contains the relevant national policies regarding the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Where a proposal will lead to substantial harm or total loss of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits.

Having regard to the above policy context, the principle of development can only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal complies with the relevant local plan policies and restrictive national planning policies relating to the Green Belt and Heritage Conservation, in addition to satisfying all other relevant material considerations.

Green Belt

Extensions and alterations to a building located within the Green Belt are supported by local and national planning policies where it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original building.

The original building is defined within the NPPF as the building as it stood on 1st July 1948 or if built after that date the building as it stood in its original form. The building in question is a traditional stone farmhouse with associated brick outbuildings. There is no planning history associated with the site and based on a site visit there is no evidence to suggest that the building has been subject to any previous extensions or alterations. It is therefore deemed that the building as it stands today comprises the original building for the purposes of the NPPF.

There is no definition either within the Local Plan or indeed with the NPPF, as to what constitutes A 'disproportionate addition'. As such each individual application will be assessed on its own individual merits having regard to specific characteristics of the site.

A useful starting point for assessing whether an additions to a building is disproportionate is to establish the footprint and volume of the existing building and calculate the respective increase resulting in the proposed development as a percentage. In many circumstances, an extension or alteration that results in a percentage increase of between 30-40% in footprint and volume is considered to be acceptable, subject to specific characteristics of the site, the building and the extension or alteration proposed.

Given the modest nature of the proposal within the context of a much larger building, the assessment of whether the proposed extension is disproportionate or not, relates solely to the existing outbuilding (labelled as 'derelict outbuilding' on the Existing Plans) and proposed replacement extension shown on the Proposed Plans.

The extent of demolition relates to a single storey outbuilding with an area of 2.0m x 5.0 (10sqm), reaching a height of 3.6m, with an overall volume calculated to be

approximately 24m³. The proposed extension has a relatively consistent height spanning a depth of 4.1m and a width of 8.6m (35.26m²) calculated to have an approximate volume of 88m³.

When read within the context of the original building, the overall increase in floor area and volume is considered to be negligible. The single storey nature and strong relationship with the existing roof form strengthens the judgement that the proposed replacement extension is not disproportionate comparable to the original building.

In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposed extension constitutes an acceptable form of Green Belt development and complies with LP Policy EQ4 and relevant restrictive policies under Chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Conservation and Design

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ3 refers to rural development proposals which lie outside of the defined built-up area boundaries and seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness. The policy supports extensions and alterations to existing dwellings provided they are subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, in terms of scale, height, density, and layout.

LP Policy EQ7 has regard to the Built and Historic Environment. It states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and more recently adopted Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further useful design guidance for extensions and alterations to dwellings, particularly more traditional buildings in the open countryside. All extensions should harmonise with the parent building and respect the dominance of the original building, being subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF contains the relevant national policies regarding the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Where a proposal will lead to substantial harm or total loss of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits.

The Conservation Officer has not commented on the proposed development and has advised Officers to make an informed professional judgement having regard to policy.

The western elevation is highly prominent from the nearby PROW and therefore any extensions or alterations to this traditional building should be treated sensitively. The photo below shows the existing context.



Above: View to western elevation from nearby Public Right of Way

The proposed plans show that the replacement extension would create an additional bedroom and lounge area. The replacement extension is considered to respect the dominance of the parent building and responds well to its existing form by incorporating a slate tiled roof that forms a continuation with the existing roof. The use of matching stone and slate tiled roof will complement the traditional appearance of the farmhouse and is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the building and wider conservation area when viewed from the PROW.

The plans as submitted shows the side elevation facing the PROW to have two large windows that have little in common with the fenestration in the existing house with regards to scale, appearance of choice of material (UVPC).

Following dialogue with Officers, revised Elevations (dated May 2021) have been submitted which show the provision of two smaller well proportioned windows with two panes, flanked by header and sills. The applicant has agreed in principle to a different material to UVPC, and to a condition requiring specific details and specifications of the window and joinery details to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development.

Following comments from DCC Archeology and suggested conditions that include a Written Scheme of Investigation, the applicant has also agreed to these required pre-commencement conditions, and in doing so, mitigates any potential adverse harm to heritage assets.

In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposed extension constitutes a high quality design that responds well to the existing building and preserves the immediate and wider character of the rural area, and the conservation area, in accordance with LP Policies S1, EQ3, EQ6 and EQ7, relevant Supplementary Design Guidance, and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings to protect the amenity of the area. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD requires new extensions and alterations to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties having regard to the relationship between existing and proposed development, the positioning of windows and any changes in land levels.

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The isolated nature of the application site means that there would not be any adverse harm to any neighbouring residential property as a result of the proposed extension.

The side elevation in its revised form is shown to contain two smaller windows which overlook the field and PROW running through it. It is considered that there would be no adverse harm regarding any loss of privacy or overlooking, given that views of this window from the PROW would be brief owing to users walking through the field.

As such, it is considered that the proposed replacement extension would not result in any adverse harm to public or residential amenity, in line with LP Policy EQ6, the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be

satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network and that sufficient off-street parking provision is shown in accordance with Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 108 states that in assessing applications for development, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

The extension would result in an additional bedroom being created. The Highways Authority have raised no objection to the application. Owing to the large amount of off-street parking provision to the south-east of the property nearest to the farm access, it is considered that there would be no adverse harm to highway safety as a result of the additional bedroom, in accordance with LP Policy CF6 and paragraph 108 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Further to submission of revised plans that shows amendments to the proposed fenestration, the application has been found to preserve the character and appearance of the building, the overall conservation area, and wider rural landscape character, being of a high quality design that responds positively to the existing building and surrounding landscape.

Owing to the isolated nature of the site and large amount of hard standing associated with the farmstead, there are no issues with regards to amenity or highway safety.

Therefore the application is found to comply with restrictive policies relating to heritage conservation, and all other local development plan policies, and thus constitutes a sustainable form of development.

Subject to appropriate conditions, which includes pre-commencement conditions agreed by the applicant, the application is recommended for approval in line with Local Plan Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Approve with Conditions**

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 1st June 2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council