

APPLICATION NUMBER		23/00337/LBALT	
SITE ADDRESS:		Biggin Old Hall, Biggin, Ashbourne	
DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT		Proposed extension with solar roof tiles, ground source heat pumps and water supply boreholes, replacement porch, refurbishment of outbuilding and internal and external alterations and repair works	
CASE OFFICER	Sarah Arbon	APPLICANT	S and H Waterhouse
PARISH/TOWN	Biggin By Hulland	AGENT	J Probert - Oakenstone
WARD MEMBER(S)	Cllr Murphy	DETERMINATION TARGET	30th May 2023 (EOT 16 th June 2023)
REASON FOR DETERMINATION BY COMMITTEE	Called in by Ward Member	REASON FOR SITE VISIT (IF APPLICABLE)	For Members to appreciate the site and context.

MATERIAL PLANNING ISSUES
– Impact on the character, appearance and significance of the heritage asset

RECOMMENDATION
Refusal

1.0 THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The site is located to the east of Hulland Ward with Millington Green and Biggin located to the north west. It is accessed directly from the A517 just west of Cross o'th'hands via a road also serving Toad Holes Farm with the application at the end of the access road to the north west. The linear barn to the north west of the farmhouse has recently been converted. Biggin Footpath 19 runs adjacent to the north western boundary and goes east to the rear of the barn then heads north east.
- 1.2 Biggin Old Hall, Hulland Ward is a Grade II listed building (listed 1983). The property comprises of the Hall itself, a detached linear stone barn and two detached brick outbuildings. The barn and outbuildings are all curtilage-listed to the Hall and benefit from the Grade II listing. The Hall dates from the early 18th century.



2.0 DETAILS OF THE APPLICATION

- 2.1 The application includes a number of proposed works:-

Repairs / refurbishment -

External Walls- repairs and strengthening.
Re-open previously bricked-up openings.
Collapsed area of first floor.
Ground floor slabs
Upper floors.
Upper staircase.
Internal wall finishes.
Access to built-in wardrobes
Doors and Internal Woodwork.

New / replacement -

New roof over existing retained timberwork.
Rooflight over stairs.
Extension- single storey to west gable with solar PV tiled roof.
Porch to east side entrance.
Doors and Windows.
Replace C20th fixtures, fittings and fireplaces.
Kitchen.
Ground floor Utility/WC.
First floor bathrooms.
Internal drainage.

Services- power, water, heating.

External site works -

Landscaping and land drainage.

External foul and surface water drainage replaced.

Refurbish out-building to west of house (previous stable) as store & water treatment plant room.

Adapt outbuilding to east of house as suitable for bat-roost.

Ground source heating supply bore-holes and associated pipework.

Drinking water supply bore-hole and associated pipework.

3.0 PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

- 3.1. 1. National Planning Policy Framework (2021) - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
2. National Planning Practice Guide (2014)
3. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 16
4. Historic England Advice Note 2 - Making Changes to Heritage Assets (2016)

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

20/01126/LBALT	Structural repairs and rebuilding works to detached barn	PERC	21/01/2021
20/01327/FUL	Conversion of barn to ancillary accommodation with partial rebuild and refurbishment works	PERC	14/05/2021
20/01328/LBALT	Rebuild and refurbishment works to barn in relation to conversion to ancillary accommodation/ holiday let	WDN	15/03/2021
21/00353/LBALT	Rebuild and refurbishment works to barn in association with conversion to ancillary accommodation	PERC	17/05/2021
21/00353/DCOND	Discharge of condition 2 of application 21/00353/LBALT - Rebuild and refurbishment works to barn in association with conversion to ancillary accommodation	DISFUL	24/08/2021
21/01265/FUL	Extensions and alterations	Refused	31/01/22
21/01264/LBALT	Proposed link extension to stable building, refurbishment of stable building, erection of a replacement porch and external and internal alterations to farmhouse	Refused	31/01/22
22/00980/FUL	Erection of single storey side extension, alterations and refurbishment to existing dwelling	Refused	17/10/22
22/00981/FUL	Proposed single storey side extension, replacement porch, refurbishment of	Refused	17/10/22

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Biggin Parish Council

- 5.1 Biggin Old Hall is a grade two listed building of great architectural merit forming part of the historic hamlet of Biggin Parish, having a similar Georgian style and age to other original farmsteads in the parish. However on visiting the property last year it was clear that this farmhouse has had alterations over the years as most older properties do and has been quite neglected, often due to farming families growing old in the property and not able to maintain the property. The property is clearly in need of restoring urgently and is no way safe to live in and it believe this has now been recognised that the house is inhabitable. The weight of the roof has caused the walls to bow most likely due to replacement from an original thatched roof of the time to a tiled one.

As this property is grade two listed the conservation officers response to previous applications and concerns of the proposed applications is appreciated and the difficulties are noted, however the applicants have taken on a very challenging and costly restoration project in purchasing the Hall and farm and deserve the support and help to proceed immediately to restore the building before it collapses. It is clear from works already undertaken on the barn the quality of restoration and care already put into this property and with support and guidance the same would be done to the hall. The layout on the ground floor would benefit from the extra room proposed and it is believed the applicants are willing to create this in the least harmful way and welcome guidance. Other listed properties in the local area have been allowed to add extra garden rooms in sympathetic ways creating a better space for modern day living.

Further proposals to include eco sustainable systems are now proposed to this restoration and modifications to previous planning applications to seek approval to this vulnerable historic property. These applications together restore and bring today's living standards to life preserving this property for generations to come.

The Biggin Parish meeting and residents support applications within the parish where the applicants want to retain our historic farms and buildings for future generations to enjoy and to support them in their respect and love for protecting the countryside. These buildings sit well into the landscape causing no harm to its character, only enhancing as they have for centuries and will continue to do so.

On conclusion as chair of the Biggin parish meeting on behalf of the residents support is requested to be given by planning in support of these applications being approved. Finally, the Biggin parish meeting, on behalf of residents, wishes to exercise its right to have the application heard by a full planning commission unless the DDDC are minded to approve the application as previously asked using delegated powers.

Conservation Officer

- 5.2 The scheme for a new 'overlay' roof is an acceptable alteration. However, it is considered that the proposed (permanent) removal of the purlins and the introduction of the large, associated, rooflight would have a negative and harmful impact on the fabric, character, appearance and significance of the historic stairwell. The proposed extension off the western gable end of the property, in its presence, scale, and mass etc., is considered to seriously compromise and distort the identified and recognised architectural and historic significance/interest of the building. It is considered that the proposal to dismantle and rebuild the porch is generally acceptable and that all replacement windows should be of painted timber and of traditional construction and detailing on a one to one basis. The

additional conservation of outbuildings and associated engineering works below ground are deemed acceptable subject to conditions.

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

6.1 Six letters of support have been received and are summarised below:-

- a) It would be lovely to see Old Hall Farm restored to its former warmth and glory and providing a family home for generations to come.
- b) I am pleased to read of the proposal's 'green' credentials and think it is crucial that proposals of this nature are encouraged and prioritised by the council.
- c) The property has significant history and should be preserved but it also needs to move with the times in terms of modern living and energy efficiency.
- d) I believe these plans offer a good balance between maintaining the heritage of the property whilst providing an energy efficient home.
- e) The proposed extension is not visible from their property 'Toads Holes Farm' so will in no way impact on them.
- f) The plans look like they are going to keep the historic nature of the building and pay great respect to the surrounding environment.
- g) The aim of the proposal is making it habitable by raising head clearance in some rooms.
- h) The property is clearly at risk of becoming beyond repair and the applicants should be applauded for undertaking such a project involving significant financial commitment to guarantee the future of Biggin Old Hall.
- i) Careful consideration has been taken to address environmental and ecological issues and I hope the applicants are granted permission to enable them to preserve the property as soon as possible.

7.0 OFFICER APPRAISAL

The following material planning issues are relevant to this application:

– *Impact on the character, appearance and significance of the heritage asset*

- 7.1 It should be noted that the two previous Listed Building applications have been refused that were to be attached to the rear section of the dwelling and linked to the existing outbuilding and both included the rooflight and removal of historic purlins.. Each part of the proposal is now assessed in turn.
- 7.2 The repair and strengthening of external walls includes the installation of structural strengthening (helical bars), repairs to stonework/brickwork & re-pointing. The proposed helical bars (6mm diameter s/s rods) are to be set into the (raked out) horizontal mortar joints (every third course) and then pointed up. The areas on the elevations proposed for the bars are depicted on the engineer's drawings. This is considered to be acceptable. 'Cemtie' s/s rods (10mm diameter x 800mm long) are proposed at the corners of the building to '*pin quoins to brickwork*'. It is unclear if the installation of these rods involves drilling a hole in the face of the stone quoins. If this is the case then, whilst it is acknowledged that the holes can be made good with lime mortar, a large number of the original stone quoins would have to be drilled. This is considered to be an invasive and potentially harmful intervention. In this regard, it should be explored as to whether such restraints can be installed internally. Repairs (or replacement) of decayed stonework and brickwork, subject to being undertaken on a strictly like-for-like basis (in terms of stone type/colour/grain/origin and brickwork type, size and texture etc.) such works are acceptable (subject to conditions on approval of samples). With regard to re-pointing this should only be undertaken to areas where necessary and should be subject to approval (via a condition) of the proposed lime mortar mix and a sample panel of re-pointing.

- 7.3 There is architectural/archaeological evidence for a (now blocked) internal doorway between G.01 & G.03. Based on this evidence it's re-opening is an acceptable alteration, however, a condition relating to the proposed new timber door/doorframe would be required. There is architectural/archaeological evidence for a blocked window opening in the northern wall of room G.02. This is square in shape and was formed (at an unknown date) above the chamfered plinth and below the brick string course. (It may have been blocked up when this corner was infilled in the 19th century with a lean-to outbuilding). A proposal to unblock this historic window opening and insert an appropriate design and pattern of window frame would be deemed acceptable (subject to constructional detailing/glazing etc. via condition).
- 7.4 The floor structure to room F.02 has sunk affecting the headroom at the western end of room G.02 (below). In the recent past the end of the original spine beam has been propped with a timber post against the western wall. It is proposed to '*raise & strengthen*' this floor. This would involve the removal of the existing concrete/limeash to room F.02 to expose the floor structure. The proposed methodology for the raising of the beam etc. and its strengthening (new steel 'shoe') are depicted on submitted drawings. The modern supporting post would then be removed. Whilst this work is relatively invasive, it retains the historic fabric and it is considered that the proposed work is an acceptable alteration to this part of the internal structure.
- 7.5 The ground floor slabs are coated in bitumen. Trial pits have been undertaken to assess their make-up. Both rooms G.01 & G.02 have historic quarry tiles. It is proposed to lift all of the ground floor slabs (and salvage the tiles for re-use). It is then intended to replace the floors with proprietary (insulating) screed and introduce underfloor heating. The proposals are considered to be acceptable, however, it is assumed that the existing flooring under the main timber staircase would *not* be lifted etc. as this would, potentially, affect and detrimentally disturb the historic joinery, structure and construction of the lower part of the staircase and its associated walls/partitioning. A condition in this regard should be imposed on any approval.
- 7.6 The upper floors are mainly limeash, some of which is original. It is proposed to repair the existing limeash floors (by a specialist contractor, based on an analysis of the existing limeash matrix/mix). This is considered to be acceptable, however, a condition (on any approval) should be imposed requiring floor plans identifying the areas of the existing limeash flooring which is to be repaired and the proposed methodology on a room-by-room basis.
- 7.7 The proposed works to this historic timber upper staircase are as follows – the timberwork is to be repaired (from below) which will require the removal of the current 'ceiling' (and its re-installment), blocks & wedges are to be used to stabilise it using traditional carpentry techniques, the condition of the treads (under previous over-boarding) are to be assessed and the over-boarding removed if possible. This is considered to be acceptable, however, a condition (on any approval) should be imposed requiring a detailed schedule of works/methodology and specification (with annotated drawings – plans and sections) for the proposed staircase repair works.
- 7.8 The current lime plaster to all of the internal walls (solid walls & partitions) is in a varying state of condition. On the ground floor, in certain areas, a cement render/plaster has been used. Partition walls are to be repaired on a like-for-like basis using lime plaster. The inside face of all external walls are to be re-covered in an insulation/breathable system suitable for historic walls. Based on this proposal it appears that all of the existing wall plaster (to external walls) is to be removed back to the brickwork substrate. This is an extensive and potentially invasive proposal, however, where the wall plaster has/is failing its removal and replacement is considered acceptable. However, there should be a presumption in favour of retaining any, sound, existing/historic wall plaster throughout the building's interior. This should be required as a condition on any approval.

7.9 Between rooms F.01 & F.02 (utilising the thickness of the central stack) there appears to have been two small rooms (the larger of which, to F.01, originally had an open window, now blocked). The proposal is to form new doors to access these small rooms to act a wardrobes/dressing room etc. This is considered to be acceptable, however, a condition (on any approval) should be imposed requiring full constructional details of the new doors/architraves etc. (It is not proposed to un-block the window to F.03). The property contains a number of different historic doors. It is proposed to assess the condition of *each* door/doorframe etc. and carry out repairs as necessary. A condition (on any approval) should be imposed requiring a detailed schedule/specification of repair works on a 'door-by-door' basis. If any doors require replacement (for justifiable reasons) then a condition (on any approval) should be imposed requiring details of the new doors/architraves etc.

New roof

7.10 The roof is recognised as being of important historic significance and the '*most notable of all the surviving structural elements*' (Heritage Impact Assessment). A key aim of the proposed works therefore is to preserve this roof as far as possible, as existing. The structure is largely intact and the majority of the roof timbers survive from the original time of construction. Some of the timbers have been identified as having had a previous use, most probably from an earlier building on the same site. The structural engineer has assessed the condition of the roof structure in detail and this is discussed in their submitted report. They conclude that "*we, therefore, consider that the roof timberwork is in poor condition and in its present condition and configuration, structurally inadequate to support the existing roof over the long term*". Furthermore, they state that "*strengthening this structure to ensure that it can support a new roof covering and remain serviceable over the long term will, in our opinion, require considerable intervention*". The engineer discusses various methods to strengthen the existing roof but concludes that these are "*likely to have a significant and adverse impact on the visual aesthetics of the existing structure*".

7.11 The proposal, therefore, that the engineer has put forward, is that the issues with the historic roof structure could be solved by taking advantage of the space provided by the high copings on the gables (east and west). An entirely new roof structure could be built *over* the existing within this space, relieving the existing timber roof structure of the need to provide support. This would involve the installation of new ridge beams (steel) above the existing roof and new rafters would span from this ridge to the existing eaves level. The details are depicted on the engineer's proposed roof plan and proposed roof sections.

7.12 Whilst the benefits and reasoning behind the proposal, as outlined above, are understood there appears to have been no assessment/consideration of the reason for the high copings to the gable end walls. If the existing roof structure is relatively original and in-tact in its location and the brick and stone gable copings have not been raised or altered at any later date then it must be assumed that the two are part of the original design and conception for the property – i.e. a building with high gable copings, in relation to its roof ridge line. However, the current roof covering is Staffordshire Blue clay tiles, and it is therefore probable, based on the architectural/archaeological evidence (subject to further investigation/analysis etc.) that when originally built the Hall most likely have had a thatched roof, with the roof angle being nearly 50 degrees. This is likely to account for the (current) high copings.

7.13 The primary consideration, therefore, is whether this potential, architectural, idiosyncrasy is of such significance (in possibly conveying a historic change in roofing material) that it should remain as it currently is. It is opined that whilst the potential evidence is of interest to the history of the property the idiosyncrasy could now be taken advantage of to install a new 'overlay' roof structure over the historic roof structure (in order to preserve and safeguard and negate extensive interventions into the important historic roof structure and its detailing

etc.). As designed and depicted on the submitted drawings/details the new ridge would sit immediately above the existing ridge and the eaves line and position would not be altered or extended. Based on this proposal, it is considered that the scheme for a new 'overlay' roof is an acceptable alteration (to safeguard the important historic roof structure) and is also a proposal that is reversible should the historic roof structure ever be the subject of study and/or repair. (It is noted that further investigation is required relating to the central brick stack and its capacity to accommodate/accept the new steel ridge beam ends – a condition should be imposed in this regard relating to finalised details and structural assessment).

Rooflight

- 7.14 The upper flight of the main staircase follows a similar line of the pitched roof over this part of the building. The roof structure to this part of the building is historic and important and there are two historic roof purlins (identified as 'P1' and 'P2'). The proposal is to remove the sections or lengths of these two purlins over the stairwell and install a large rooflight within the roof slope over this part of the staircase. The reason cited for this is essentially related to the amount of (current) headroom to the upper flight and that the proposals would enlarge the amount of headroom, provide additional light to the upper flight and ease access into the attic spaces.
- 7.15 The roof is recognised as being of important historic significance and the '*most notable of all the surviving structural elements*' (Heritage Impact Assessment). The above justification recognises that the removal of this section of the historic roof structure 'is likely to result in some localised harm to fabric' which would have a 'modest impact on the significance of the building'. Whilst it is acknowledged that the purlins give a restricted headroom to the upper flight the roof structure this scenario is original in its design and form and has always been like this (i.e. the relationship between the upper flight and the roof structure). In this regard, it presents (and has presented for 300 years+) an original design concept, that, notwithstanding its issues and condition, is an important element/part of the listed building. The proposed rooflight, whilst not being the full width of the stairwell, is large and in that regard is un-domestic in its size. This, therefore, is likely to introduce an anomalous and modern introduction into this historic part of the listed building to its character and appearance. It is considered that the proposed (permanent) removal of the purlins and the introduction of the large, associated, rooflight would have a negative and harmful impact on the fabric, character, appearance and significance of the historic stairwell.

Extension

- 7.16 A single-storey extension off the western gable end of the property is proposed. The proposal, as submitted, is to include a rectangular, single-storey, extension of brickwork construction and a dual pitched roof over. The north facing roof slope is to be covered in 'natural slate' and the south facing roof slope covered in 'solar voltaic tiles – artificial slate with matching border'. The extension would be in-set slightly to each side and would have a door on the south elevation, a small window on the west gable elevation and tri-partite sliding glazed doors to the north elevation (all in powder-coated aluminium). It is to serve as a Dining Room. The proposal will involve the creation/formation of a new access doorway from ground floor room G.02 into the extension.
- 7.17 The western gable end of the property comprises of an off-set brickwork plinth capped with a chamfered stone plinth course. Stone quoins to each corner and a double brick projecting horizontal string-course. Stone kneelers and a stone coped gable verge. The roof space has a small rectangular window to the upper gable end. It is possible that the upper gable end window is a later addition, but, apart from that the western gable end of the property is as originally designed and built. The Heritage Impact Assessment acknowledges and recognises that the '*internal and external structure does not suggest any significant phases of extension or alteration to the main house....and as such, the current house likely presents as a wholesale rebuild of any earlier dwelling should one exist*'. The Heritage Impact

Assessment also recognises the original 'T' plan form and design of the property. In its existing form and layout the property (in acknowledgement of its early 18th century date) conveys a distinctive hand in its design and planning comprising of a principal rectangular block with off-set plinth and chamfered stone course, implied symmetry to the south elevation and stone and brick string-courses, stone quoins to corners and stone coped gable verges and central brick stack. Fashionable architectural awareness is depicted in the skewed stone window/door lintels and keystones to the south elevation. On the north side is the centralised, two-storey, northern projection, given architectural subservience by the use of the topography and the slightly lowered plinth and chamfered stone course, stone quoins to its corners, the lowered roof eaves line and ridge, centralised gable end chimneystack and the omission of the string-coursing to its elevations. Whilst a later small porch occupies a corner of the eastern elevation the property displays a strong holistic and unified architectural concept, narrative and design in its distinctive 'T' shaped plan-form/layout and in its external architectural treatments and detailing which is recognisable and readable as an architectural/historic entity. This is considered to be of high significant architectural and heritage value and interest to the listed building.

- 7.18 It is considered that the proposed extension off the western gable end of the property, in its presence, scale, and mass etc., would seriously compromise and distort the identified and recognised architectural and historic significance/interest of the building. It would require the loss of a significant section of historic and original brickwork in the formation of the new access doorway from room G.02. Furthermore, the formation of this new structural opening (which would require the insertion of new lintels over etc.) would require the plinth and chamfered stone course to be cut through and removed. The extension would subsume the majority of the horizontal brick string-course to the western gable end and its roof abutment would require the insertion of lead flashings into the brickwork face of the western gable end. In terms of its proposed character and appearance, the extension, whilst using matching brickwork for the walls is to have 'natural slate' for the roof and solar PV tiles (and artificial slates). This is contrary and alien to the existing use of traditional clay tiles for roof coverings and would set the extension apart from the host building. The design of the extension appears to be agricultural in character (and nominally contemporary) with its doorway on the south elevation and large (glazed) opening on the north elevation (incorporating powder-coated aluminium). It is considered that this proposed architectural narrative, and materials, would be alien and anomalous to the design and form of the host building and further diminish and erode its significance.
- 7.19 It is known from early/historical maps that the vehicular access to the property was, until the 20th century along the southern boundary of the site then a right angle turn northwards to adjacent to the western gable of the property (more, or less, following the alignment of the current public footpath). This former access has remained archaeologically extant. Whilst there is now an access to the eastern side of the property this historic layout/access has some significance in that it dictated the layout of the farmstead in the 18th and 19th centuries (and perhaps before). It is considered that whilst now part of the garden to the property this historic route way contributes to the overall significance of the history and archaeology of the site. In this regard, a proposal to build an extension to the main house over part of this particular element is considered harmful to the sites historical/archaeological interest and narrative.
- 7.20 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the listed building in terms of the proposed alterations to the elevations and architectural elements and fabric of the existing building and the physical and visual presence (and materials) of an extension in this location and context. Individually and cumulatively the proposals would be harmful to the significance, fabric and narrative of the designated heritage asset. On this basis, the principle of the extension and its identified impacts to the significance/narrative of the listed building are deemed to be harmful.

Porch

- 7.21 The submitted Heritage Impact Assessment, in referring to the porch, states that it *abuts* the main house indicating that it is a later addition although part of it is identified as being constructed from ‘*early brick*’. The later brickwork to the porch (and possibly its roof) are all of 20th century date. The proposal is to dismantle the existing porch and rebuild it – to a very similar footprint and roof form/shape – but with a dwarf brick wall (using the reclaimed brick) above which will be an open timber-framed construction and a mono-pitch clay tiled roof.
- 7.22 It is considered that the significance of the porch and its ‘early brick’ section (possibly built using reclaimed brick in the 19th century) is low in comparison to the main ‘T’ shaped house. It is a later addition but has been in place since the later 19th century (OS map evidence). It is considered that the proposal to dismantle and rebuild (to the design as submitted) is generally acceptable, however, the proposed timber framing part of the design should be of painted timber (as there is no external oak timber framing associated with the host building). Full construction details of the porch should be required by condition (on any approval).

Windows

- 7.23 The property has a number of window types and patterns, including an un-authorized upvc window frame to the bathroom. All of the painted timber windows are single glazed. It is proposed to ‘*replace all windows with flush fitting timber casements, subject to details*’ and the Statement states that ‘*double-glazing is desirable*’. With regard to proposed window replacement there are some window frames of historic origin (19th century) and their design, form and pattern should be respected where these are located in 19th century structural openings. There are some later 20th century timber casement windows and their replacement with windows frames to an appropriate form, design and pattern is likely to be acceptable.
- 7.24 It is considered that all replacement windows should be of painted timber and of traditional construction and detailing. It will be important to recognise the differences in the date of the structural openings and there should be no proposal to ‘unify’ the fifteen, or so, window design/pattern across the various elevations (i.e. each opening needs to be assessed and considered on a ‘window-by-window’ basis). In this regard, a condition (on any approval) should require full constructional details, design and pattern on a ‘window-by-window’ basis.
- 7.25 With regard to the introduction of double-glazing to replacement timber window frames the Authority will consider this, however, there are a number of strict compliance criteria for that consideration – including, for example, ‘thin’ double-glazed units (max. 12mm thick), white spacer bars, solid/though timber glazing bars (max. on-face width of 22mm), traditionally sized timber window framing and casements and the glazing units putty pointed into the frames. No proposed construction details have been submitted, however, if, under a condition (on any approval), suitable and appropriate replacement window designs, pattern, form and construction can meet these strict criteria then double-glazing may be considered acceptable.
- 7.26 There are two back-to-back fireplaces in rooms G.01 & G.02. Both of these have had 1960s/70s ‘fireplaces’ built within them. The proposal is to remove these two modern ‘fireplaces’ and install solid fuel stoves and hearths and new flue linings. Whilst the proposed removal of the modern fireplaces is acceptable a condition will need to be imposed, on any approval, requiring a sequential unblocking and un-covering methodology of what may survive behind the modern fireplaces and which can be repaired and displayed etc. As important and primary elements of the ground floor rooms and of the listed building as a whole, it would be expected that such investigation, assessment, analysis and interpretation will require the services (and report/proposals) of a professional buildings archaeologist. Full details of the repairs to what is discovered, or for any new, proposed, works will be required

via the condition. It should be noted that no conjectural new work will be permitted (all works must be based on sound and compelling archaeological evidence).

- 7.27 It is proposed that room G.02 becomes the new kitchen. Whilst this use of the former parlour may be acceptable for such a use the installation of the necessary services (including holes in walls etc. for services/pipework etc.) may have undesirable and harmful impact(s). Full details etc. would, therefore, be required via a condition on any approval. The removal of modern partitioning in the 'old' kitchen (G.03/05) has revealed the original inglenook fireplace with massive oak beam over and (archaeological) remnants of the former fireplace and range etc. It is stated that this is to be 'restored' (and a new solid fuel stove and hearth and flue lining etc.). A condition will need to be imposed, on any approval, requiring an assessment/analysis of what has been discovered and its proposed repair and display etc. As an important and primary element of the listed building as a whole, it would be expected that such investigation, assessment, analysis and interpretation would require the services (and report/proposals) of a professional buildings archaeologist. Full details of the repairs to what has been discovered, or for any new, proposed, works would be required via the condition. It should be noted that no conjectural new work would be permitted (all works must be based on sound and compelling archaeological evidence).
- 7.28 It is proposed to install a new divisional partition within room G.04 to create a utility room and small w/c. It is considered that, subject to detailing, abutment details and proposed pipework/drainage etc. that the insertion of a new partition and door to form a w/c is acceptable. It is proposed to re-configure rooms F.05 & F.06. The removal of modern partitions is considered to be acceptable and the intended new layout is depicted on the proposed plans. In general terms this re-configuration is considered to be acceptable. Subject to detailing (via a condition on any approval) the internal drainage, power water and heating proposals are considered to be acceptable.
- 7.29 Landscaping and land drainage proposals are depicted on the submitted drawings. In terms of below ground excavation this includes many trench lines etc. It would be expected that the excavation of trenches within the curtilage of the listed building would, potentially, require an archaeological watching brief.
- 7.30 Refurbishment of the out-building to west of house (previous stable) as store and water treatment plant room may be acceptable. A condition, on any approval, should require full 'refurbishment' details (external and internal) of the building and details of the water treatment plant room and its associated apparatus etc. Adapting the outbuilding to east of house as suitable for a bat-roost this is likely to be acceptable, subject to full details of the proposed provisions for a bat roost, being approved via a condition on any approval.
- 7.31 In respect of the ground source heating and drinking water supply bore-holes and associated pipework, the submitted Statement cites that "*the ground source heat pumps and water supply boreholes are to be wholly contained within the ground, and associated plant inside the outbuildings, therefore, will have no detrimental impact on the character or significance of the Listed Building*". Based on this statement this is considered acceptable, although a condition on potential archaeological input and the nature of the 'plant' within the outbuildings should be imposed.
- 7.32 There are a number of proposals contained within the application that will, it is considered, result in harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The 1990 Act directs that in considering whether to grant Planning Permission, a local planning authority shall 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". It is considered that the proposed alterations and extensions/additions to the property would not preserve the listed building, its setting or its features of special architectural or historic interest. Whilst the

identified harm to the listed building may not be substantial harm, the NPPF directs that where a proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The public benefit would be bringing back into use a vacant property for the benefit of the owners and its associated restoration of a heritage asset for the benefit of future generations. However, it should be noted that this building is not on the 'Heritage at Risk' register. Associated benefits include construction employment. It is considered that the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset is not outweighed by the limited public benefits (as defined by the NPPG).

7.22 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". Paragraph 200 states: "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". It is on this basis that is considered that the harm outweighs the public benefits and refusal is recommended.

7.24 To conclude, whilst some elements of the application are deemed acceptable, the rooflight including the removal of historic purlins and the extension are not. These elements are considered harmful to the significance of the heritage asset.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be Refused

REASONS:

1. The proposed extension would be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the listed building by reason of the proposed alterations to the elevations, architectural elements and fabric of the existing building and the physical and visual presence (including materials) of an extension in this location and context. Individually and cumulatively the proposals would be harmful to the significance, fabric and narrative of the designated heritage asset. This identified harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits to be derived contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The proposed rooflight would introduce an anomalous addition that would have a negative and harmful impact on the fabric, character, appearance and significance of the historic stairwell. This identified harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits to be derived contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

INFORMATIVES:

1. The Local Planning Authority considered the merits of the submitted application and shared the assessment of the application with the applicant who decided not to seek to negotiate changes. On this basis the requirement to engage in a positive and proactive manner was considered to be best served by the Local Planning Authority issuing a decision on the application at the earliest opportunity and thereby allowing the applicant to exercise their right to appeal.

2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents:-

Plan no's Location and block plan OnS676-320, Proposed block plan 08, site detail 08, Proposed elevations 08, existing elevations 07 extension details 08, Survey elevations 07, Ex Outbuildings 07, proposed GF plan 08, proposed UF and FF plans 08, Sections B-B C-C 08, Proposed site landscaping 07 and Ex site 07,
Stairwell 08
Design and Access Statement
Planning Statement March 2023

Ecological Impact Assessment dated 31st December 2021 and agent's email dated 4th January 2022
Heritage Impact Assessment March 2023
Structural Assessment Report dated 22nd August 2020
Roof timber inspection Report dated 23rd September 2021
Statement of Significance September 2020
Schedule of proposed works Part 1 and 2 dated 23rd March 2023