

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

7 April 2022

Application No:	SMD/2022/0017	
Location	The Barn, Ringe Hay Farm, Basford	
Proposal	Single-storey side extension	
Applicant	Mr D Marks	
Agent	Ken Wainman Associates Ltd	
Parish/ward	Cheddleton	Date registered: 13 th January 2022
If you have a question about this report please contact: Chris Johnston email: Christopher.johnston@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

This application has been called to committee at the request of Councillor Worthington so that the decision made is consistent with other planning decisions at the site.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site is in the countryside about 1km to the north-east of Cheddleton and 1km to the north of Basford Green. It comprises one of two adjoining two-storey semi-detached dwellings within a converted traditional stone barn that forms part of Ringe Hay farm, a complex of farm buildings reached by a long farm track connected to Basford Green Road, a country lane to the east. There are other converted dwellings and a farmhouse at Ringe Hay Farm which lie to the east across a yard. The land to the west is open fields which slope downwards towards Cheddleton. The dwelling and attached dwelling were formerly holiday lets but have become unrestricted dwellings following a planning permissions to remove the occupancy restriction in 2018. The site is not in the Green Belt or within any other particular land designations.

3. THE APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 This is a householder planning application for a single-storey side extension to provide an additional kitchen at the dwelling. It would have matching stone facing materials and a matching Staffs Blue tiled roof with side-facing gable, the rear roof slope of which would follow the roof slope of the existing rear lean-to section. The

front wall would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling. The internal dimensions of the kitchen would be 5.5 x 3.6 metres.

3.2 A previous application for the single-storey side extension was refused at Planning Applications Committee on 9th September 2021 (SMD/2021/0436). The only notable difference with the previous scheme was the finishing materials of stock brick instead of the now proposed matching stone. The form, shape, height and siting remain the same with only a change in the finishing materials. The previous application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed side extension, by virtue of its form and design including fenestration

design, would be harmful to the historic character and appearance of this rural vernacular building and, as a building which contributes to the character and appearance and evidential understanding of a historic farmstead as identified by the Staffordshire Historic Farmstead Survey (2009) and recorded in the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record, the proposal is found harmful to a non-designated heritage asset as defined by the NPPF. The stated reasons for the development are not found to be justifiable given that the requirements of the applicant could be accommodated by other works that do not involve extensions to the building and therefore do not balance out the harm identified. The scheme is therefore found on balance contrary to policies SS10, H1, DC1 and DC2 of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 and the government planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 203 and contrary to and not supported by the Council's adopted Supplementary Design Guidance and Design Document.

2. No heritage assessment has been provided with the application contrary to Policy DC2(3) of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 and the NPPF paragraph 194.

3. The proposed design of the extension fails to conserve the character of the existing

converted farm building and creates in its place a more obviously domestic residential dwelling which would also be harmfully prominent on the primary elevation of the building and would therefore also lead to a more intrusive appearance at odds with the wider setting of the historic farmstead and its surroundings, contrary to policies SS10, H1, DC1, DC2 and DC3 of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 and contrary to the NPPF.

3.3 The extension is required to provide a larger kitchen for the applicant due to medical reasons following a road accident in 2011 which left him with permanent injuries.

3.4 The previous application included significant details of the particular needs of the applicant as justification for the enlarged space and this is outlined in the Committee Report for the previous application. This new application includes an updated Planning Statement giving further justification of need and also a physiotherapist home visit report dated 3.1.22.

3.5 The new application also includes a Heritage Impact Assessment report, which did not accompany the previous application.

3.6 An internal layout drawing of the existing house is also provided.

3.7 An amended drawing was received on 11.3.22 which shows the existing dining room converted into a utility room to accompany the adjacent proposed kitchen extension.

3.8 Details of the application scheme including accompanying reports can be viewed at:

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=157445>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

SMD/2021/0436: Previous application for the single-storey side extension. Refused on 10.9.21.

SMD/2021/0321: Single-storey rear extension at “The Dairy” (the neighbouring attached dwelling). Refused on 30th July 2021. Appeal allowed.

SMD/2019/0033: Certificate of Lawfulness application for proposed dwellings (relating to “The Barn” and “The Dairy”). Approved.

SMD/2018/0374: Removal of conditions 8 and 9 relating to SMD/2005/0864 [05/00439/FUL] at Ringe Hay Farm. Approved. This removed the conditions which restricted the converted building to holiday let use only so that the building could be used as two unrestricted dwellings.

05/00439/FUL – Conversion of redundant agricultural building to 2 holiday cottages – Approved.

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted Sept 2020)

5.1 The Development Plan comprises the Local Plan Development Document (adopted September 2020).

5.2 The following Local Plan policies are relevant to the application:

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 The Historic Environment
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting

- H1 New Housing

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Revised (2019)

5.3 The following sections of the NPPF (2019) are particularly relevant to this application:

- 2: Achieving sustainable development
- 4: Decision making
- 12: Achieving well-designed places
- 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

5.4 Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

6. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbour letters	Expiry date for comments: 09/02/2022
Site Notice Posted	19/01/2022 (expiry date 09/02/2022)
Press Notice	N/A

Public response to consultation

6.1 No letters have been received.

Parish Council

6.2 No objection.

Local Highways Authority (Staffordshire County Council)

6.3 No objection.

SMDC Conservation Officer

6.4 The comments from the officer in response to the previous application were as follows:

“The barn was converted into two holiday cottages in 2005. The barn is a good example of a Moorland’s cow shed with hay store on the first floor, with cart store under a cat-slide roof at the rear. It is of simple form with openings reflecting the historic function of the building. The farmstead is identified in the Historic Environment Record as an isolated, dispersed farmstead with its outbuildings laid out along a routeway (referred to as a 'driftway' plan). The farmstead had been established by at least the early 19th century and appears to survive relatively unaltered. The Moorlands is recognised as having a significant collection of early

farmsteads, dating to the 19th century, which are largely unaltered. I would regard this farmstead as being a non-designated heritage asset.

Although now converted it remains a good example of its type. Its simple form and retention of original openings are an important part of its significance.

The application proposes the addition of a single storey extension on the gable end sitting in front of the cart entry. Two rooflights are proposed in the extension facing the garden elevation, and a further two rooflights in the main building to serve the dining room.

The application should be assessed against the Council's Design Guidance, specific guidance on Converting Rural Buildings, and the Staffordshire Moorlands Farmstead Assessment Framework. The conversion guidance states that 'Conversions should be within the shell of the building. Extensions will be discouraged; where essential they should be small and unobtrusive and reflect the proportions of the main building' (page 3.4). The guiding principle is that the character of the original building should be retained and conserved for the future, and the building should still look like a barn when converted – and not like a house. Any alterations should respect the buildings scale, proportions and special features should be retained and any alterations made within the constraints imposed by the building. If an extension is needed then the resultant change to the building's character is likely to be significant.

Firstly we have no floorplan to show the existing layout of the building to be able to assess the current arrangement and why there is a need for the extension. The principle of an extension is therefore contentious given the overriding policy guidance which aims to limit conversions to be within the existing shell of the building.

Secondly, the location of the extension, its appearance and proportion are harmful to form and character – its proportions are low and squat, it masks the distinctive cart entry, and it disrupts the simple form of the building. It has a very domestic appearance which harms agricultural character.

Rooflights are rarely found on barns and should be avoided where possible. The dining room already is served by a window.

If the principle of the extension is acceptable then this is the wrong location and design. Harmful to a non-designated heritage asset."

7. OFFICER COMMENT AND PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 The main issues relate to:

- The Impact on the character and appearance of a traditional rural building considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and therefore the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7.2 The application is a resubmission of a previous application for a single-storey side extension required for the medical needs of the applicant and the only change is the finishing materials but the new application includes further information in support of the proposal.

7.3 The application was refused because the form and design, including fenestration design, was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and the overall historic farmstead, considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The Committee Report for the previous application gives more in-depth assessment of the level of harm and can be viewed at:

<https://democracy.highpeak.gov.uk/documents/s24928/ITEM%2012%20SMD%202021%200436%20the%20barn%20ringe%20hay%20farm.pdf>

Although the now proposed matching stone materials would harmonise better with the building than the previously proposed brick, this does not overcome the harm to the building and farmstead caused by the overall form and design of the extension. The new scheme is therefore considered to continue to lead to harm to those non-designated assets and therefore under the planning policies should again be refused permission.

7.4 The dwelling is one of two adjoining dwellings formed via a barn conversion. Before the previous application was refused, a proposed single-storey at the adjacent barn dwelling was refused also due to the harm to the character and appearance of the building but has since been allowed on appeal (ref: SMD/2021/0321). The agent for the new application stated in an email the following:

“The inspector in coming to his decision states that the building is not a heritage asset which is relevant to this present application because the applicant’s first application was refused essentially on the grounds that the building was a historic asset. The inspector’s conclusion makes a major difference when considering this present application. Also relevant is the Inspectors conclusion that the appeal extension was necessary for health reasons.”

7.5 Whilst the Officers do not dispute the above, it must be pointed out that the extension allowed on appeal was in the form of a rear lean-to which matches the form and projection of the existing rear lean-to at the application dwelling. It is therefore considered to be a different form of extension which is also not visible when approaching the building via the access road through the farmstead due to its rear siting. Officers also consider the appeal extension, whilst still harming the building, would be more in keeping with the current form of the building, whereas the new proposal for this site would result in an extension which projects out from the side of the building and was described by the Conservation Officer at the time as follows:

“the location of the extension, its appearance and proportion are harmful to form and character – its proportions are low and squat, it masks the distinctive cart entry, and it disrupts the simple form of the building. It has a very domestic appearance which harms agricultural character.”

7.6 It is considered that the extensions, as with all proposals, would need to be judged on their own individual merits and that the appeal decision for the very different form of extension to the neighbouring dwelling does not have any bearing on the level of harm caused by this new proposal.

7.7 The updated Planning Statement states “...a Historical Impact Assessment (HIA) undertaken by the applicant’s agent reveals that extensive rebuilding works were carried out on both The Barn and The Dairy in 1999 and 2000 significantly diluting and harming the historic authenticity of the entire building. The authenticity of the cart door opening is also questioned in the HIA.

As a result of the extensive rebuilding and renovation works in 1999 and 2000 (see The Historical Impact Assessment) it is highly questionable as to whether the building containing the Dairy and the Barn is still a historic asset.

The works carried out in 1999 and 2000 were so extensive that most of the original architectural features of the building containing the Barn and the Dairy were removed.

The Historical Impact Assessment provides details on the work carried out. Large areas of the walls were rebuilt and re-pointed with sand and cement mortar, the roof removed and re-laid, the roof timbers and structure replaced, windows and doors rebuilt, and new lintels installed. Most of the external construction of the building is modern and not historic. There are no photographs or drawings of the buildings before 1999. Therefore, it is not possible to know what was there before the extensive renovation works took place. The cart door opening is in a wall that was extensively rebuilt in 1999 and 2000 and it is impossible to determine whether it was an original or a new feature. What is clear is that the present opening was rebuilt/built in the renovation works.”

7.8 There is clearly some conflict regarding the historic quality of the heritage asset between the applicant’s HIA and the opinion of the Council’s former Conservation Officer at the time of the previous application who commented as follows: “*The barn is a good example of a Moorland’s cow shed with hay store on the first floor, with cart store under a cat-slide roof at the rear. It is of simple form with openings reflecting the historic function of the building. The farmstead is identified in the Historic Environment Record as an isolated, dispersed farmstead with its outbuildings laid out along a routeway (referred to as a ‘driftway’ plan). The farmstead had been established by at least the early 19th century and appears to survive relatively unaltered. The Moorlands is recognised as having a significant collection of early farmsteads, dating to the 19th century, which are largely unaltered. I would regard this farmstead as being a non-designated heritage asset.*

Although now converted it remains a good example of its type. Its simple form and retention of original openings are an important part of its significance.”

7.9 Irrespective of this, the previous application was refused as its form and design were considered to harm the character and appearance of the building and the wider historic farmstead. This harm has not changed with this new scheme which differs only in that the finishing materials have changed. The application should therefore

be refused for the same reasons as previous, with the exception of Reason for Refusal no.2 regarding the lack of a submitted Heritage Assessment, which with this new application, has now been included.

7.10 As stated above, the applicant is putting forward special circumstances in support of the application based on a medical need for more space and a larger kitchen, as with the previous application. The new application includes additional details regarding the health matters and the need for the extension. The Council again therefore needs to decide if these circumstances would outweigh the harm to the historic character and appearance of the building. Members are reminded that the applicant requires the extension in order to provide a larger kitchen as the current kitchen, due to its size has become difficult for the applicant to use following a severe injury caused as a result of a car accident in 2011 which is described in more detail in the documentation accompanying the application. The applicant explains that greater light provision is also needed in order for him to use the kitchen for its intended purpose. This is the reason for the inclusion of large windows and rooflights.

7.11 The additional information includes a Physiotherapist Home Visit Report dated 3.1.22 which states the applicant needs more light and an indoor utility room, as the kitchen layout is “not ideal” and that his condition is likely to deteriorate. However, there is nothing in the report which states that the applicant’s health condition has deteriorated since the previous application. It is also worth mentioning that the applicant must have bought the house some time after it was converted under a 2018 planning permission, some seven years after the accident that led to his health condition (in 2011). The information provided also states that up till 2015, the applicant needed a wheelchair but may need one again at some stage in the future.

7.12 Currently the applicant has to walk to a separate outbuilding to use facilities such as a washing machine and tumble dryer and Officers accept this is a significant inconvenience given his health condition. However, the new plans include the conversion of the dining room into a utility room which is easily of sufficient size to accommodate the common white goods often accommodated in a utility space and with the current kitchen still in use, the converted space together with the current space would appear large enough. The current kitchen which the applicant has been using since he purchased the dwelling a few years ago can still remain in place whilst the dining room is being converted into an enlarged kitchen or new indoor utility room.

7.13 In the Jan 2022 updated planning statement, part 5 page 4 states internal walls would need to be removed to convert the dining room and he would have to move out which due to his condition he is unable to. Officers accept the difficulties of moving the applicant into temporary accommodation given his particular health condition. However, the Officers also consider that no internal walls removal or any other form of room reconfiguration would be required in order to convert the dining room into an enlarged kitchen or utility room which would be linked to the existing kitchen via an existing space of sufficient width around the wet room, so he could still use the existing ground floor facilities he needs and therefore not need to move out during building works, particularly as the dining room would be sealed-off as required during building works.

7.14 Overall, whilst Officers sympathise with the applicant's situation and understand the need for a larger space that is also well lit by natural light, it does not appear from the new information submitted that the applicant's health condition has deteriorated since the previous application was refused and that no new evidence has come to light to suggest that an extension to the building is essentially required in order to provide him with the space he needs given there still appears to be potential to provide this under the current configuration of the ground floor part of the house via the conversion of the dining room of sufficient size without the need for any wall removal or temporary removal of current essential facilities (e.g. kitchen and wet room) that would force him to seek temporary alternative accommodation elsewhere.

7.15 Therefore, the case officer does not consider there are any special circumstances put forward which would outweigh the harm caused to the historic character and appearance of the building and farmstead by this particular proposed extension or override the reasons for the refusal of the previous extension application. The case officer also considers that allowed appeal at the adjoining dwelling for an extension does not have any bearing on the assessment of this particular case as the adjacent proposed extension is completely different to the one proposed for this particular site and which is considered to have a far less harmful impact. As stated above, each application has to be judged on its own individual merits.

Planning Balance & Conclusions

7.16 The amended scheme for a proposed extension would still harm the character and appearance of the traditional stone barn dwelling and farmstead considered to be non-designated heritage assets. Furthermore, the justification of need for the extension, including the new information put forward under this new application, is not considered to be sufficient enough to outweigh the level of harm to the building by extending it and is contrary to the Council's design guidance which resists the further extension of such buildings. The revised scheme therefore remains to be contrary to policies DC1 and DC2 of the Local Plan as well as the Council's design guidance (as listed above in the Policy section of the report) and also Section 16 of the government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

8. RECOMMENDATION

A That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed side extension, by virtue of its form and design including fenestration design, would be harmful to the historic character and appearance of this rural vernacular building and, as a building which contributes to the character and appearance and evidential understanding of a historic farmstead as identified by the Staffordshire Historic Farmstead Survey (2009) and recorded in the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record, the proposal is found harmful to a non-designated heritage asset as defined by the

NPPF. The stated reasons for the development are not found to be justifiable given that the requirements of the applicant could be accommodated by other works that do not involve extensions to the building and therefore do not balance out the harm identified. The scheme is therefore found on balance contrary to policies SS10, H1, DC1 and DC2 of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 and the government planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 203 and contrary to and not supported by the Council's adopted Supplementary Design Guidance and Design Document.

2. The proposed design of the extension fails to conserve the character of the existing converted farm building and creates in its place a more obviously domestic residential dwelling which would also be harmfully prominent on the primary elevation of the building and would therefore also lead to a more intrusive appearance at odds with the wider setting of the historic farmstead and its surroundings, contrary to policies SS10, H1, DC1, DC2 and DC3 of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 and contrary to the NPPF.

Informative

1. It is considered that the proposals are unsustainable and do not conform with the provisions of the NPPF. It is considered that the applicant is unable to overcome such concerns and thus no amendments to the application were requested.





