

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0434
Valid 19/10/2023

GREAT LOW FARM,
UNNAMED ROAD SECTION
OF A515 FROM BRIERLOW
BAR TO DISTRICT
BOUNDARY, FLAGG,
DERBYSHIRE, SK17 9QE

WORKS TO BRING
FARMHOUSE BACK INTO
RESIDENTIAL USE. CHIMNEY
AND ROOF REPAIRS, NEW
RAINWATER GOODS, NEW
WINDOWS. INTERNAL
REFURBISHMENT WITH
MINOR ALTERATIONS.
REMOVAL OF DERELICT
PORCH AND FORMATION OF
1NO. NEW EXTERNAL
OPENING (LISTED BUILDING
CONSENT - ALTERATION)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact upon Listed Building

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a two storey former farmhouse which is located within the open countryside as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map. The building is a Grade II Listed Building, known as Greatlow Farmhouse. The official Listing identifies the building as:

Farmhouse. Late C18. Roughcast rubble limestone with gritstone dressings, projecting quoins, plain gables, end ashlar ridge stacks, concrete tiled roof. 'L' plan. Two storeys, two bays, with 2-light flush mullioned windows with C20 joinery. Central doorway with heavy lintel and quoined surround, now obscured by C20 pitched roofed porch with glazed door

The site contains a range of buildings creating a courtyard fronting the A515. Various other buildings are located across the site.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for various alterations to the farmhouse. The application describes the works as “*Works to bring farmhouse back into residential use. Chimney and roof repairs, new rainwater goods, new windows. Internal refurbishment with minor alterations. Removal of derelict porch and formation of 1no. new external opening*”.

The proposal has been supplemented by plans and a Heritage Statement. The plans indicate that the proposals relate to:

- Remove derelict porch
- New front door & frame, to agreed design
- New windows, to agreed design, throughout
- 1no. new structural opening, door and frame
- Make good to solid floors, retaining finishes
- Make good to suspended floors & ceilings in materials to match surrounding
- Make good to wall finishes
- Repair roof and chimneys & insulate in ceiling plane
- Refit existing bathroom, new door
- Fit bathroom at first floor
- New internal soil drainage
- New plumbing and electrical installations

The Heritage Statement provides further commentary on the proposed works.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
 S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 EQ6 Design and Place Making
 EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
 Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None relevant

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 07/12/23
 Neighbour consultation period ends: 23/11/23
 Press Advert: 23/11/23

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Conservation Officer

The Conservation Officer has engaged in pre-application discussions with the applicant and provided advice on various occasions.

Advice provided to applicant on 12th October 2023:

I advise that a Conservation Architect needs to get involved at this stage as mentioned previously, to work along with your heritage consultants to devise a project that perhaps is in stages. Currently I cannot begin to permit any works to be undertaken without the foundations of this scheme made very clear. This site as seen is in a very vulnerable and poor state and consequently substantial works and attention are required proportionate to the site's current condition.

Diminutive works and or cosmetics undertaken before major works such as but is not limited to; attention to subsidence, conversion, change of use, landscaping and other items requiring full planning permission is not feasible or logical. For example, there is little point addressing windows, roof material, render or limewash if for example the barn adjoining the farmhouse is impinging its walling and weight into the farmhouse walls.

A survey would be required by a conservation accredited individual or company to ascertain exactly what is going on at the site in order to accurately prescribe the works and an order in which they should be undertaken with the listing status in mind. It may be that the barns and farmhouse required engineered solutions before you consider rendering walling and looking at staircases. I hope you understand that as it stands this project still lacks cohesion.

These works as previously noted require Listed Building Consent and it appears this list on the document includes some too but again is not limited to this.

I have had a discussion in house with my colleagues and again these works require a clear and concise project to be made up for Full Planning, LBC and change of use application where relevant.

Informal advice to Case Officer:

There are a number of issues despite my guidance. This application 0434 has come in now not responding to issues I have raised

This site must be dealt with in appropriate stages; comprehensive planning and listed building application, and cannot have the farmhouse separated from the adjoining barn. As seen on site there are significant issues with the subsidence and the adjoining barn is pressing weight into the farmhouse. The farmhouse is severely derelict and very vulnerable, I am happy to send extensive photographs.

This application shows insufficient investigation, surveys, window schedule, practical conservation, method of harmful interventions (render/pointing etc) or an appropriate response to the current level of deterioration. I cannot understand feasibility to address minor finishes and windows at this stage. The approach to this listed building and curtilage buildings does not appear to have the listing status or long term conservation in mind.

Further informal advice to Case Officer:

At the moment it does not demonstrate an appropriate level of understanding of the existing building and therefore fully justified intervention at this stage..

It is a large site, with a multitude of issues, and a multitude of original surviving features, and it needs to be addressed in stages. In conservation terms this application does not have the longevity and listing status in mind, it does not rectify issues of concern or priority and would certainly not be considered sensitive or an enhancement.

For example, the listed building consent mentions replacing some modern roof tiles *with more modern tiles* – this would be a refusal. I have noted this. I would not encourage the use of yet more modern materials on the (or any) listed building.

Removal of render – there is no investigation into this. It is a harmful process to remove and may be one of the many things left holding the masonry together. There is nothing made clear. How will it be removed? Is it infact there for a reason as often in some cases it is. This is a low priority for intervention when there many structural issues impinging on the leaf of the building. There are insufficient surveys.

Unfortunately the site is nowhere near at a stage where it can be habitable, and minor issues like landscaping/hardscaping, gates and render among other things mentioned on site - are not a priority.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on Listed Building

S.16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires, when considering applications for Listed Building Consent, that special regard be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Local Plan Policy EQ7 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. Particular protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, including listed buildings.

NPPF paragraph 199 states that 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). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Para 200 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

The main consideration in this instance is whether the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The application has been supported by a Heritage Statement, design and access statement, along with plans which demonstrate the works proposed. The Heritage Statement adequately assesses the significance of the Listed Building.

The farmhouse, and adjoining buildings, are in a poor state of repair with the Listed Building being in a vulnerable position. The application has not been supported by any detailed investigation or survey of the state of the building and adjoining structures. More fundamental works may be essential, however the extent of such works are, at present, unclear.

For example, the Conservation Officer has noted that *there are significant issues with the subsidence and the adjoining barn is pressing weight into the farmhouse*. While the submitted HIA identifies that *"All chimney stacks should be inspected by a structural engineer. It is likely that the SE chimney stack will have to be dismantled and rebuilt"* and the *"Structural engineer to advise on any requirement for work to foundations"*.

The proposal to carry out simply cosmetic works to the building, at such a vulnerable stage, are not in the best interest of Listed Building. A staged approach to the redevelopment of the site, informed by appropriate surveys etc, is the correct approach to take. This approach is not a preference but one which would secure the longevity and integrity of the building and wider site.

With regard to the proposals submitted as part of this application, there are also issues with what has been submitted. The scheme includes the replacement of some roof tiles with modern roof tiles. The extent of these works is unclear. Nonetheless, the use of modern roof tiles would not be supported.

There has been no investigation into the removal of render, which could be a harmful process and may be a structural element holding the render together. Further it is suggested that a limewash coat may also be used. However this would not be desirable if pebbledash render is left in some places and not in others. These are two starkly contrasting materials. There is lack of clarity on this point.

The repointing of the chimney using NHL5 is not considered to be appropriate.

The scheme proposes the replacement of windows showing them divided into three. The CO advises that the original windows may have been full single pane casement

with metal or wood with appropriate fixtures and fittings. The window design is unacceptable.

The removal of the porch would need to be done in a manner which does not undermine any existing original fabric. There is no clarity on this point.

Internally, the scheme proposes to make good walls and lath & plaster ceilings using lime plaster. Insufficient detail has been provided to the extent of these works and the specification of what is proposed. Rewiring requires LBNC, the extent of these works is unclear. The proposal includes the re-skimming of plasterboarded ceilings using modern gypsum plaster on plasterboards. These materials are not supported. There is no detail of the means of attachment and what and where this is proposed.

There is insufficient detail or clarity regarding most of the works proposed, both internally and externally. Given the fundamental concerns regarding the process to this property it would be wholly unreasonable to secure any further details by way of condition. In any event the extent of any conditions would be extensive, tantamount a comprehensive LBC application.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed works to the Listed Building are unacceptable and would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The degree of harm would be less than substantial. Although such works may have knock on implications on the building whereby a greater degree of harm may arise.

The proposals would result in enabling development bringing the building back into an appropriate beneficial use. This would be a public benefit of the scheme.

Nonetheless, the works may be superfluous as there are more fundamental issues surrounding the site which are far more important to the integrity of the building than the cosmetic works proposed. In addition, there is distinct lack of clarity on the extent of works proposed, while some of the works themselves are unacceptable. In light of these matters, the works would not deliver sufficient benefits to outweigh the harm identified.

The applicant has engaged with the Council through lengthy pre-application discussions where the Council's position has been made clear. The advice offered in those discussions has not been followed.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The application seeks consent for works to a Listed Building and it is considered that the works would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II heritage asset. Insufficient public benefits would arise to outweigh this harm. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 14/12/2023

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council