- 10A DCSE2007/0089/F CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO 4 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS AND ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION. PROPOSED GARAGES. LLANROTHAL COURT FARM, LLANROTHAL, MONMOUTH, NP25 5QJ.
- 10B DCSE2007/0090/L CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO 4 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS AND ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION. PROPOSED GARAGES. LLANROTHAL COURT FARM, LLANROTHAL, MONMOUTH, NP25 5QJ.

For: Guild Homes Ltd per A.P. Architecture Limited, E-Innovation Centre Suite SE 107 University of Wolverhampton Telford Campus, Priorslee TF2 9FT

Date Received: 10th January 2007Ward: LlangarronGrid Ref: 46804, 19034Expiry Date:7th March 2007Local Member:Councillor Mrs. J.A. Hyde

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Lanrothal Court Farm is at the north-western end of the unclassified road leading off the Welsh Newton Tregate Bridge road (C1247) and is close to the County boundary. The farm complex, which is no longer used for agricultural purposes comprises: (i) an 'L'-shaped building, the south-western section of which is a substantial timber-framed barn, the remainder are stone threshing barns; (ii) a smaller granary building to the south-east of the main barn; (iii) an 'L'-shaped monopitch cow houses with attractive stone columns and stone tiles. Together these enclose a rectangular farmyard, with the gap between cow houses and timber-frame building closed by a stone wall, on the west side of which there is a small partly derelict agricultural building. The land falls to west and north of the complex to the River Monnow. Llanrothal Court (a listed building) lies to the south of the farm.
- 1.2 Planning permission (SE2003/2298/F) was granted in October 2004 for the conversion of the barns to residential use (5 dwellings). A subsequent application (DCSE2006/2060/F) to convert the 'L'-shaped barns into 5 dwellings (i.e. 7 dwellings in total) was refused permission for the following reasons:
  - 1. "The proposals would adversely affect the character and appearance of these attractive traditional rural buildings and the character of this rural area and settlement; which is defined as within an area of Great Landscape Value in the Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan. The proposed development conflicts therefore with Policies CTC2, CTC13 and CTC14 of Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan, Policies C8, C36, C37 of South Herefordshire District Local Plan and Policies LA2 and HBA12 of emerging Herefordshire

Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Re-Use and Adaptation of Traditional Rural Buildings."

- 2. There is clear evidence that bats are using these buildings and the submitted scheme does not include measures which have been shown through a site survey are necessary to mitigate the harm that would be caused to these protected species. The proposals conflict therefore with Policy C16 of South Herefordshire District Local Plan and Policies NC5, NC6, NC7, NC8 and NC9 of emerging Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft).
- 3. Notwithstanding the permission granted previously for conversion of the barns for residential use (five dwellings), it is considered that any further intensification of use of the narrow sub-standard lanes arising from further development of site (three additional dwellings) may increase the risk of vehicle conflict, which is not in the interests of highway safety."

More recently (November 2006) the barns have been added to the list of buildings of architectural and historic interest (grade II).

- 1.3 The current application is for conversion of the main 'L'-shaped building into 4 rather than 3 dwellings as currently approved plus the erection of garages, a new access drive and larger gardens. The cow shelters would be used as ancillary accommodation (home office and sun lounge) and the small agricultural building reconstructed as a triple garage for the adjoining unit. The two blocks of garages (one double, one triple) would be built into the bank. The application site does not include the granary which has been converted into 2 dwellings under the earlier approval (SE2003/2298/F). The scheme as a whole would therefore result in 6 dwellings.
- 1.4 As in the approved scheme the timber-framed barn would form one large dwelling (6 bedroom). The main change compared to the approved scheme is the sub-division and treatment of the stone barns. These would now form 3, 4-bed dwellings. Some alterations to external elevations are proposed to provide access and lighting, in particular a line of rooflights along the south-east facing roof slope.

# 2. Policies

### 2.1 Planning Policy Guidance

PPS.7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

# 2.2 Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

Policy HBA1	-	Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings
Policy HBA3	-	Change of Use of Listed Buildings
Policy HBA4	-	Setting of Listed Buildings
Policy HBA9	-	Protection of Open Areas and Green Spaces
Policy HBA.12	-	Re-use of Traditional Rural Buildings
Policy HBA13	-	Re-use of Traditional Rural Buildings for Residential Purposes
Policy LA.2	-	Landscape Character and Areas Least Resilient to Change
Policy S1	-	Sustainable Development
Policy S2	-	Development Requirements
Policy S3	-	Housing
Policy S7	-	Natural and Historic Heritage
Policy DR1	-	Design

Policy DR4	-	Environment
Policy H7	-	Housing in the Countryside outside Settlements
Policy H13	-	Sustainable Residential Design

# 2.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

Re-Use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings

### 3. Planning History

3.1	SE2003/2298/F	Conversion of barns to residential use.	Approved 27.10.04
	DCSE2006/3380/F	Proposed conversion of farm buildings to 5 - residential dwellings, home office and ancillary accommodation. Proposed garages.	Withdrawn 12.1.07
	DCSE2006/3378/L	Conversion of farm buildings to 5 - residential dwellings, home office and ancillary accommodation. Proposed garages.	Withdrawn 12.1.07
	DCSE2006/2060/F	Conversion of farm buildings to six - residential dwellings.	Refused 24.8.06

# 4. Consultation Summary

### Statutory Consultations

4.1 No statutory or non-statutory consultations required.

### Internal Council Advice

4.2 The Traffic Manager points out that the site lies approximately 4 km from the main A466 road at Welsh Newton and is accessed via the C1247 and U71218. These lanes are narrow (typically 2.5 metres wide), hilly in places and with poor forward visibility generally. There are few formal passing places, apart from a limited number of property entrances and field gateways. Hedges are close to the carriageway with restricted highway verges and there appears to be little scope for improvements along most of the route without involving third party land.

Although the current proposal is now for only 1 additional dwelling (over the 5 residential units originally approved), I do still have concerns about the suitability of these lanes to serve residential development; however it is considered that the intensification caused by 1 additional unit would not along justify a recommendation for refusal in this case.

The 1:2500 scale drawing (received 13th December 2006) showing 5 possible passing places only relates to the last 900 metres from the site (of the 4 km route to the main road). Nevertheless these should be investigated. Although the Design and Access Statement refers to these passing bays as "within the highway", most of the bays do not appear to be within the historical highway boundary and we have no record of the land involved.

In addition the proposals would affect public footpath L05 which runs through the site. The position for the LPG tank is unacceptable. The wicket gate should be relocated to

its correct position with an acceptable surface. The new gate annotated "emergency access only" is across line of public footpath and gate must therefore remain unlocked at all times and should be capable of being opened easily. The route of the footpath should be clearly marked. The developer should ensure that parked vehicles do not obstruct access along the footpath.

4.3 The Conservation Manager's comments are as follows:

"The recent spot listing has forced the applicants to adopt a less intensive scheme and this is broadly welcome, as it reduces the impact on the character of the buildings. However I would still note the following points:

- Unit 6, ground floor window to breakfast room the wide window which replaces the double doorway would be better proportioned if it were divided into four lights rather than three.
- Unit 6, staircase a transverse section (minimum 1:50 scale) is required to clarify the relationship of the staircase to the internal structure, and to indicate the extent of historic fabric removal. In this respect it is somewhat perverse that the existing void is to be floored over whilst another is opened up but there may be compelling functional reasons for this.
- Units 5 & 6, rooflights standard Velux rooflights are not acceptable, and details should be controlled by condition.
- Shelter sheds although it is not entirely clear at 1:500 scale, the site plan (dwg no LP1/D) suggests that the open shelter sheds are to be re-built, as per earlier schemes. It has been emphasised several times that these structures must be retained in their present form and dimensions, and if this is a draughting error, it should be rectified before any approval is granted.

### Conclusion/Recommendation:

Recommendation: no objection subject to the provision of the additional information and amendments set out above. Standard conditions will also be required."

### 5. Representations

- 5.1 The following Design and Access Statement has been submitted by the applicant's agent:
  - 1.0 The design is informed by the existing Council approvals for conversion of the buildings into five dwellings, Development Plan Policies and the listing of the barns on 16.11.06.
  - 3.0 The principle of conversion is not at issue, given the valid permissions, upon which a substantive start has been made where there is no change proposed.
  - 4.0 The Council rely upon the County Structure Plan and Local Plan Policies for the most part in respect of the character. These are unchanged, and they and the approved scheme have informed the design.
  - 4.1 With regard to "Area of Great Landscape Value" designation the proposal would make no difference because this is a conversion scheme, with landscaping as

per the approved proposal and as indicated on the site plan. Hence the screen planting of native trees and hedges, including around the garages that are to be set into the existing bank. The overall impression is to retain the farm group and take advantage of the rising land to enclose where cars would be parked, and soften the necessary hard surfacing, that has long been associated with the buildings.

This enhancement planting will also help to improve the local landscape, which has a "detractor" in the form of overhead electricity lines just to the north.

A management (five year) plan for the landscaping could be incorporated into the planning permission. This measure would also help to ensure compliance with Policy NC8 of the emerging UDP in respect of habitat creation and enhancement.

- 5.0 The amount of development, its layout and scale are all determined by the fact that this is a building conversion scheme; and its ongoing character can be safeguarded by removal of permitted development rights. You may wish to include control of satellite dishes and aerials too.
- 5.1 The revised scheme respects the listing, and follows discussions with Conservation Officer. Accordingly, the large corn barn is not now to be divided into two dwellings, and the accommodation is changed to avoid roof lights in the north western elevation.
- 5.2 The internal divisions and use of existing openings is maximised to the full, commensurate with what has already been permitted.
- 7.0 Drainage is not an issue, the proposal being for a septic tank and soakaway (Condition 7 of approval 2003/2298 could be attached).
- 9.0 Vehicular access is acceptable to the Authority for the approved five barn conversions. For an additional dwelling only, there would not be a material increase in traffic flow along the lane.
- 9.1 A plan showing passing bays as a road improvement along the access lane has been submitted. These are sufficient "highway gain" to justify the marginal increase in traffic that the extra dwelling would make.
- 9.2 The proposal removes the possibility of farm re-use or business use of the buildings with all the attendant large vehicle movements they did and could still generate.
- 9.3 At the junction with the major road, visibility is good in both directions towards Tregate and Welsh Newton, and the bell mouth of the minor road is about 9m wide.
- 5.2 Llanrothal Parish Council unanimously object to both proposals and ask that the following comments be taken into consideration:
  - 1. No significant or indeed relevant improvements to the Refused Application no. DCSE2006/3380/F have been offered.
  - 2. The Parish Council wish to reiterate their previous comments that these proposals would inauspiciously affect the character and appearance of these

traditional rural buildings and consequently conflict with Policies LA2 and HBA12 of the emerging herefordshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 3. The new site plan is considerably larger than the approved 2004 plan and includes agricultural land which is to be used for domestic purposes such as parking.
- 4. Numerous points contravene SPG 2002:

a) 4.28 b) 4.36 c) 4.37

- d) 6.3
- e) 6.4
- f) 6.8 g) 6.19
- h) 6.37

also PPG15 3.15

- 5) If approved, this application would allow for SIX dwellings and garages on this site.
- 5.3 Five letters have been received expressing objections and matters of concern:
  - (1) No notice taken of previous representations regarding development on the ancient road (for which Modification Order application has been made) currently footpath L05.
  - (2) Now propose tree planting, walls, septic and LPG tanks on line of this road is LPG tank a Health and Safety issue?
  - (3) Emergency access is on route of footpath and gate should remain unlocked and accessible at all times.
  - (4) No drainage assessment or porosity tests of concern for 3 reasons:
    - (a) at another site developed by applicant, sewerage system was inadequate and residents were left with considerable costs;
    - (b) objector house replaced a smaller dwelling but old septic tank remained increased occupancy and poor soil porosity led to backing up and need to replace whole system; and
    - (c) current proposal is for more dwellings and higher occupancy rates than approved scheme.
  - (5) Unacceptable due mainly to many contraventions of Council's own guidelines (SPG).
  - (6) Conflict with guidelines for listed buildings and conversions with regard to
    - (a) rooflights should be used sparingly on least conspicuous elevation
    - (b) garaging should be provided without need for new buildings

- (c) full details of proposal (eg window from details, sections etcx) should be submitted plus schedule of works
- (d) ventilation holes should be retained not knocked out and widened by 50% more than on original plan
- (e) submission of full list of materials, colours, wood types, etc.
- (f) inserted floors should be kept to a minimum large barn shows plans for a fourth floor
- (7) Inaccuracies in submission:
  - C1247 is not a major road
  - 7 not 3 homes served by the road
  - number of garages is incorrect
  - elevations and plans for units 3-8 do not match with regard to rooflights
- (8) Stated that only marginal increase in traffic but with no buses and 7 miles from nearest shopping centre and school it is unlikely that 18 extra bedrooms plus 7 for the smaller granary will create only a minimal increase. Car access has only been accepted for fewer dwellings.
- (9) Regarding removing possibility of re-use as a farm the farmhouse and buildings have already been relocated and land is rented our (part for potato crops which will mean movement of large machinery).
- (10) Cow barns shown with an increase in depth. How is this to be achieved?
- (11) Would ask that proposals fulfil spirit of Council's guidelines that schemes should respect the original structure and features (1.15); retain qualities and characteristics that led to decision to list with exceptionally high standards and minimal alteration (4.7). (New guidelines suggest conversion of listed buildings to residential should be resisted): large expanses of tarmac, fencing and gates avoided (6.9).

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Southern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

### 6. Officer's Appraisal

- 6.1 The principle of conversion of this attractive group of buildings has been accepted by the Council in granting permission for 5 units. The issues in relation to the current proposal are whether, bearing in mind the recent listing, the more intense scheme, retains the character and appearance this group of buildings and protects their setting; the effect on the landscape/rural character of the area; and the adequacy of the local road network.
- 6.2 Compared to the approved scheme (SE2003/2298/F) there would be one extra dwelling; compared to the refused scheme (SE2006/2060/F) there would be 2 less dwellings. A major advantage of the current proposal over the latter is that the timber-frame barn would be one dwelling and not sub-divided. This building has ample existing window openings and with the addition of rooflights would not require major changes externally. The threshing barns would have more sub-divisions internally to form additional units and rooms but externally would not require any significant changes. Subject to some minor changes, to which the applicant has agreed, the

Conservation Manager considers that the character and appearance of these listed buildings would be adequately protected.

- 6.3 Further information is being sought regarding the proposed treatment of the cow shelters and small stone building and the sub-division and surfacing of the farmvard. In principle however, the proposals should not harm the setting of this attractive group of traditional farm buildings. The new drives extending to the east and looping around the northern end of the complex and open parking areas are not ideal but with appropriate surfacing and careful landscaping would not be unduly obtrusive. The existing fence that currently defines the northern and eastern boundaries of the site is aligned along the edge of the relatively level, higher ground and beyond the fence the land falls to the River Monnow. The new access and turning area should not intrude on the latter and its use as garden area would also be detrimental to this attractive landscape. The alignment of the drive and extent of the proposed gardens are being clarified by the applicant's agent. A more acceptable area for an extended garden would be to the south-west of the cow shelters as this is already defined by hedges and adjoins the garden of Llanrothal Court. Subject to these concerns being met I consider that the setting of these listed buildings and the character of the landscape would not be harmed significantly. The new garages would be set into the rising ground and would be much less assertive in the landscape that the now demolished agricultural buildings they would replace.
- 6.4 The farm is at the end of a long (about 1.5 km) narrow and winding dead-end highway. There are few opportunities for vehicles to pass and it is not clear whether the proposed passing places would be on highway land. If not they may not be achievable. Nevertheless although of concern, the Traffic Manager does not consider that this is sufficient reason to refuse permission, taking into account the small number of dwellings served by this unclassified road.

### RECOMMENDATION

In respect of DCSE2007/0089/F:

That subject to submission of acceptable drawings showing design and appearance of the barns, treatment of cow shelters, small store, alignment, treatment of drives and definition of garden areas, the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue planning permission subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions considered necessary by officers:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 C02 (Approval of details)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

**3** G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

4 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

5 G01 (Details of boundary treatments)

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

6 H14 (Turning and parking: change of use - domestic)

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety.

7 RB1 (No Permitted Development)

Reason: To ensure the character of the original conversion scheme is maintained.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 N19 Avoidance of doubt
- 2 N15 Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission

Decision: .....

Notes: .....

# **Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.

### In respect of DCSE2007/0090/L:

### RECOMMENDATION

That subject to submission of acceptable drawings showing design and appearance of the barns, treatment of cow shelters, small store, alignment, treatment of drives and definition of garden areas, the officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to issue listed building consent subject to the following conditions and any additional conditions considered necessary by officers:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 C02 (Approval of details)

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of this building of [special] architectural or historical interest.

**3** G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

4 G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the area.

5 G01 (Details of boundary treatments)

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 N19 Avoidance of doubt
- 2 N15 Reason(s) for the Grant of Listed Building Consent

Decisio	on:	 	 	 	 
Notes:		 	 	 	 

### **Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.

21ST FEBRUARY, 2006

