

16 DCNC2005/0991/F - CHANGE OF USE OF DISUSED DUTCH BARN INTO GARAGING ADJACENT TO POPLANDS BARN, RISBURY, LEOMINSTER, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR6 0NN**For: Mr E Clark per Mr J I Hall, New Bungalow, Nunnington, Hereford, HR1 3NJ****Date Received:**
29th March 2005**Ward:**
Hampton Court**Grid Ref:**
55065, 55481**Expiry Date:**
24th May 2005

Local Member: Councillor K Grumbley

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 The application site lies on the west side of Poplands Lane just north of Popland Farm, Risbury.
- 1.2 The proposal is for the conversion of an existing Dutch barn to provide garaging at ground floor with storage above. This requires the cladding of the barn with timber boarding but retention of existing corrugated iron sheet roof. The floor area of the existing building measures approximately 8.9 metres by 5.5 metres. The submitted plans also indicate a new access to be created immediately to the north of the building, with that existing to the south to be closed off. If this work were to take in place alongside any other permitted development work it would of itself be permitted development.

2. Policies**2.1 Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire)**

A9 – Safeguarding the Rural Landscape
A24 – Scale and Character of Development
A56 – Alterations, Extensions and Improvements to Dwellings
A54 – Protection of Residential Amenity

2.2 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

H18 – Alterations and Extensions

3. Planning History

NC2004/4063/F - Proposed change of use of Dutch barn to garaging with new access. Refused under delegated powers 13th January 2005. In contrary to policies A24 and A60 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire).

NC2004/2395/F - Same application refused for the same reasons in October 2004

NC2002/0999/F - Siting of temporary mobile home during renovation of barn. Change of use of disused hay barn for storage purposes. During consideration of this application the conversion of the dutch barn element was removed from the proposal, planning permission being granted for the remainder of the development on the 30th May 2002.

NC2000/2534/F - Barn conversion and formation of garden at Poplands Farm, Risbury. This application did not include any reference to the Dutch barn.

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic manager - Recommends conditions

4.3 Conservation Manager - No objection on ecology grounds but is concerned the garaging will introduce an urban element into the site with consequent loss of character.

5. Representations

5.1 Humber Parish Council has no further comment to make on this application.

In response to the previously refused application they advised, "the Parish Council regards this application has been in all respects identical with application DCNC2004/2395/F. The Council does not see any reason to change its views on this new application and so approves this application by a majority".

5.2 Letters of objection have been received from:

Mr. D Harcombe, The Field Stud Farm, Poplands Lane;
Mr & Mrs J Dixon, Moreton Cottage, Poplands Lane;
Mrs D Burgess, Rail Meadow, Risbury;
Mr G W Burgess, Rail Meadow, Risbury;
B. Chilton, Field Track, Poplands Lane;
Mrs S Harcombe, The Field Stud Farm, Poplands Lane;
S & C Lawley, Gilhorn Cottage, Poplands Lane.

Objections can be summarised as follows:

1. Just because similar buildings elsewhere have been converted in this manner doesn't mean this one should. The additional photographs and information has been submitted to confuse the issue and are of no relevance.
2. This has already been refused on landscape impact grounds.
3. Converted barn already over dominant feature in landscape don't want another one.
4. Photos submitted with the application of other buildings indicate how unsightly they are.
5. Loss of view and detrimental to visual amenity of the public using public footpath HU5.

6. The wishes of a number of people affected should be taken into account over the wishes of the applicant.
7. Contrary to quoted policies and policy A.9.
8. Access on a blind section of Poplands Lane.
9. If developed would be another substantial gap disappearing in the landscape least resilient to change.
10. Should be subject to appeal to The Planning Inspectorate.

5.3 In support of the application the applicant's agent advises:

We are resubmitting for planning in the light of additional information to support our application. We are of the opinion that nearby Popland Barn and the adjacent metal clad barn are both on high ground and dominate the landscape unlike the Dutch barn. The roof and apex would remain in corrugated iron sheeting with the sides clad in horizontal sawn softwood boarding treated with a preservative. The boarding to match the adjacent Popland Barn Conversion. Windows to be moved to the front elevation (east) to give a clear rural effect from the roadside. Additional trees to be planted alongside the timber fence to supplement the existing Acers and Sorbus trees to enhance the rural landscape of the lane. The Parish Council supports the proposal.

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

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 This relatively modest proposal has attracted much criticism over a number of applications in recent time and has been held to be detrimental to the rural landscape as an over dominant structure.
- 6.2 The first point of consideration for the proposal is Policy A.56 of the Leominster District Local Plan (Herefordshire) this states proposals for extension and alterations to dwellings or buildings ancillary to the enjoyment of a dwelling will be permitted where they respect the form, architectural characteristics and details of the original building. The policy then goes on to set a number of criteria to be met. These include 'a scale and design which does not overwhelm the original structure nor harm the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties'. In this respect the policy refers to Policy A.54. In so far as the criteria are set out here are concerned it is not considered that the proposal is contrary to this particular policy nor has it been previously said to have been so.
- 6.3 Policy A.60 refers to the residential conversion of rural buildings. Had this proposal been for residential use i.e. for living accommodation then clearly the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of this policy. However, whilst intended for ancillary residential purposes it is not intended that the building be used for living accommodation.
- 6.4 Policy A.24 deals with the scale and character of development. In this instance the criteria most appropriate is criteria 6 which states proposals should not introduce features out of keeping with the landscape or settlements character. On previous occasions this proposal has been considered to be contrary to that aim.

- 6.5 Policy A.9 safeguarding the rural landscape has not been previously quoted as a reason of refusal however clearly is similar in aim to criteria 6 of Policy A.24.
- 6.6 This proposal has been subject to a number of discussions with the applicant and agent in an attempt to overcome the concern. One suggestion has been to take down a building and replace it with a purpose designed garage and storage building but this idea has been rejected.
- 6.7 The application has been amended to delete the windows from the east elevation of the building i.e. of that facing the lane although the design is still rather incongruous and photographs submitted by the applicant's agent in support for the proposal of other barns which have been similarly treated in this manner merely serve to indicate that this approach is less than successful. However the issue is one of impact on landscape and how the building when clad differs from the building as it currently exists. Whilst there may be an appreciable difference in the immediate vicinity it is not considered that the wider landscape concerns are so materially affected that the continued objection to the proposal is sufficient to substantiate the reason for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 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 - B01 (Samples of external materials)**

Reason: To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings.

- 3 - E08 (Domestic use only of garage)**

Reason: To ensure that the garage is used only for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling.

- 4 - E10 (Use restricted to that specified in application)**

The premises shall be used for garaging and storage and for no other purpose.

Reason: To suspend the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order currently in force, in order to safeguard amenity.

- 5 - A07 (Development in accordance with approved plans)**

Reason: To ensure adherence to the approved plans in the interests of a satisfactory form of development.

- 6 - G04 (Landscaping scheme (general))**

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

- 7 - G05 (Implementation of landscaping scheme (general))**

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

8 - H01 (Single access - not footway) (6m x 0.6m)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

9 - H05 (Access gates)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Informatives:

1 - HN10 - No drainage to discharge to highway

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.