

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Plan Ref.
Mr Iain Johnson	Proposed Extension The Granary, Dagnell End Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 9BE	16/0841

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be Refused.

### 1. Consultations

**Alvechurch Parish Council** Consulted 25.08.2016

Objections: APC have concerns that this proposed extension exceeds 40% of the original footprint.

**Beoley Parish Council** Consulted 25.08.2016

No comments received.

**Conservation Officer** Consulted 25.08.2016

The Granary comprises an interesting farm building, which is listed Grade II in its own right. The 1884 1st Edition of the Ordnance Survey shows the Granary on the edge of the farmstead facing a courtyard between the barn ranges noted above, but with a clear working area in between, and more formal gardens to the rear (to the east). The 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey shows the same set up, but with a very small lean to attached to the north side of the cartshed. By the time of the Ordnance survey in 1927 this small structure has been replaced by another building slightly to the north, detached, and at a right angle to the granary, however it is significantly less than the width of the gig house and granary/cartshed elements of the building, and less than half the depth. This layout continues until the early 1970s, but by the 1980s the barn to the west and the extensions to the north have disappeared. The structure attached to the north of the granary would not appear to have been particularly historic having been added in the early 20th century and its disappearance over 30 years ago hints at a more ephemeral structure than the other buildings which still exist. This structure would also appear to have been significantly smaller than the Granary building which continues to survive.

The extension proposed here is for a freestanding structure attached by a small link to a highly distinctive listed rural building. Its design, size, height and materials would result in a highly visible, dominant structure, out of scale with the listed building. No reasoning has been submitted to justify what amounts to clear harm to the setting of the listed building. The design of this listed building appears to prevent the possibility of extension. To the rear are the original steps to the Granary, so the building could not be extended in this direction without the loss of a significant architectural feature. The low pitch of the roofs on the side wings again would seem to prevent a small extension on either side. Given the design of the building I could not support any proposal to extend it, a position which has been made clear to the applicant at the pre application stage. The freestanding option put forward by the applicant, would in my opinion, due to its dominance in terms of

its size, positioning and materials harm the character of the listed building and its setting. This would be contrary to s 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF and guidance in SPG 4. I would therefore have to recommend that this application is refused.

**Highways Department- Worcestershire County Council** Consulted 25.08.2016

No objection subject to the provision of an additional parking space

## **2. Public Comments**

2.1 16 letters of support received summarised as appropriate:

- The applicant and his family are long-time residents of the local area
- The applicant has already improved the property and invested considerably in it
- The refusal of the application will impact negatively upon the applicants family, neighbours, family and friends in the local community
- The application would enable the applicant and his partner to remain in the local area
- The new extension would complement the surroundings and reflect the vernacular character of the Granary
- The proposal has been reduced to take account of the advice of Council Officers
- The proposed extension would not be visible from Dagnell End Road and would not have any impact on residential amenity
- Lack of housing supply

## **3. Relevant Policies**

### **3.1 Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):**

DS2 Green Belt Development Criteria  
C27C Extensions to Converted Rural Buildings  
S39 Alterations to Listed Buildings

### **3.2 Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan**

BDP4 Green Belt  
BDP20 Managing the Historic Environment

### **3.2 Others:**

SPG4 Conversion of Rural Buildings  
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

## **4. Relevant Planning History**

B/2001/0107 Conversion of redundant wagon shed and granary into ancillary domestic accommodation Granted 22.03.2001

B/2001/0140 Conversion of redundant wagon shed and granary into ancillary domestic accommodation - Listed building consent Granted 22.03.2001

16/0842 Extension - Listed Building - Consent pending

16/0843 Internal and External Alterations - Listed Building Consent pending

## **5. Assessment of Proposal**

### **5.1 Site Description**

The site is located in the Green Belt to the north side of Dagnell End Farm. The Granary comprises an interesting farm building, which is listed Grade II in its own right. The original farmstead is almost a double courtyard plan with the farm house and a range of barns to the west grouped around one courtyard, and the Granary facing a further courtyard created by a further barn to its west which faces the southerly barns across another enclosed space. It originally comprised an open cart shed in the centre with a granary above approached via an external staircase to the rear. Detached granaries are generally of 18th and 19th century date and were often built over stables and cart sheds, as is the case here. Farm buildings of this period often display an attention to architectural detail, as The Granary does with a brick dentil eaves cornice. As with the neighbouring historic buildings to the south the Granary is constructed in a local red brick, but with pitched slate roofs rather than clay tiles. It's unusual design and appearance no doubt contribute to its significance and hence its listing.

5.2 The building was converted under applications B/2001/0116 and B/2001/0140) to provide ancillary residential accommodation to the farmhouse. This work including some rebuilding of the lean to elements to the north and south incorporated large glazed openings to the west elevation, where there had previously been openings to the granary and gig house. The subservient nature of the side wings, the gig house and what were the pig sties has been maintained with the mono pitched lean to roofs being positioned lower than the pitched roof above the central part of the building. The contrasting roofs give the building is striking appearance.

### **Proposal**

5.3 The proposal is to extend the property by constructing an adjoining single storey wing to the north of the building partly set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. It would be approximately the same depth as the original, 7 metres, and at 5 metres wide will be slightly wider than the central original granary element of the building and wider than the side wings of the original building. The proposal also relates to the provision of a parking and bin storage area to the north of the building. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, Planning Statement and Heritage Statement which Members are encouraged to read in full.

5.4 The primary issues for Members to consider are whether the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the impact of the proposal on the character and setting of the listed building.

### Green Belt

- 5.5 The extension amounts to an addition of 36sqm to the original dwelling which has a floorspace of 115sqm and has not been previously extended. This represents a 30% addition. Policy DS2 of the BDLP and paragraph 89 of the NPPF set out a list of development types which may be appropriate in the Green Belt and not amount to inappropriate development. The extension of a dwelling provided that it is not a 'disproportionate' addition is one such exception. Whilst the term disproportionate is not defined, it is not considered that this proposal would amount to a disproportionate addition on the basis of the floorspace being added. The addition of the parking /bin storage area is noted but this would be within the established curtilage of a dwelling and could be carried out under the provisions of Class F Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015. Thereby, the proposal does not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This consideration is entirely separate from the assessment of the impact of the proposal on the listed building.

### Listed Building

- 5.6 Members should note the comments of the Conservation Officer and the proposal has been the subject of detailed pre application discussion. The complex of buildings have evolved over the years and the previous structures on the site reflected the agricultural use of the site with a building or structure apparent on the early OS plans to the north of the Granary. This structure appears to have been significantly smaller than the Granary building which continues to survive. With the remaining farm buildings now having been converted to residential use, the Granary building no longer sits on the edge of a farm yard, but has a more spacious rural setting. The current access is not via the remaining farmyard space adjacent to the farmhouse but via a track to the east of the farmhouse which allows for clear views of the building across paddocks of the rear of the building before one approaches more directly from the north, giving a view of the north elevation of the building. Historically there would have been views across the fields from the east and north towards the Granary as the later farm building was detached from the Granary and comparatively small. The uninterrupted views of the Granary allow for a full appreciation of the building.
- 5.7 The applicant is proposing to extend the property by constructing an adjoining wing to the north of the building partly set back from the front elevation of the existing building, it will however be the same depth as the original, approximately 7 metres, and at 5 metres wide will be slightly wider than the central original granary element of the building and noticeably wider than the side wings of the original building. It will have a pitched roof structure, the ridge being higher than the adjacent monopitched roof, and the angle of the roof following the pitch of the gables on the farm house to the south rather than the more gentle pitch of the roof above the central element of the Granary. The extension will be constructed in timber beneath a pitched slate. It is positioned 400mm from the existing building with an opening of approximately 1 metre being created to connect the two. It is in effect a freestanding structure with a small link.

- 5.8 The applicant has appropriately referred to the Historic England 2015 document 'Historic Environment - Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 - The Setting of Heritage Assets' and this has been taken into account in the assessment of the Case Officer and Conservation Officer.
- 5.9 The proposed extension will form a large and prominent addition to the existing listed building. It may be set back from the front elevation of the Granary but it should be noted that the building is currently approached initially from the rear and then from the northwest. Therefore, it will block and dominate views of the listed building. Its height, steeper roof pitch, close proximity to the listed building and contrasting materials all contribute to its visual dominance, so rather than being a subservient extension to the listed building, it is likely to dominate it. The other proposed changes to the immediate landscape, will also result in a domestication of the immediate vicinity. Cars are currently parked opposite the Granary in an area which had originally formed part of a historic farmyard. The parking and bin storage is to be moved to the rear of the extension. The effect would be to suburbanise the approach to the listed building. It is not considered that the proposed landscaping in the vicinity would offset the harm to the setting of the listed building.
- 5.10 Paragraph 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to 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' when assessing listed building consent applications. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states '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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. In addition Paragraph 134 states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.'
- 5.11 Guidance on the conversion of rural buildings is contained within SPG4, and a number of sections are worth considering in the context of this application, notably 2.5 (b) 'The building should be large enough or the proposed use without the need for significant enlargement or alteration', and 3.7, 'Extensions will not normally be permitted as these would detract from the plain, simple and utilitarian appearance of most rural buildings.'
- 5.12 The proposed extension due to its location, proximity to the listed building, size, height and contrasting materials will result in a building that rather than being subservient to the listed building will visually dominate the listed building. Although set back at the front, its depth, equal to the depth of the listed building, will extend back beyond the rear of the listed building, and will therefore be highly visible as one approaches on the existing entrance drive. The ridge being higher than the roofs to the gig house/pig sty side wings results in a building competing with the listed building in terms of height, and will detract from the interesting form of the

original building. The use of contrasting materials, combined with the 'neat' residential finish, rather than a rougher utilitarian agricultural one, will contrast greatly with the listed Granary building and the other listed buildings in the complex.

- 5.13 As the NPPF highlights 'great weight' should be given to an assets' conservation, and significance can be harmed as a result of alterations within the setting of a listed building, as is the case here and any harm requires 'clear and convincing justification'. The only justification provided in this case would appear to be the desire of the current owners to continue living in the property. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that the harm to any listed building as a result of a proposal where assessed as 'less than substantial' needs to be weighed against the public benefit including securing its optimum viable use. There is clearly no public benefit to this proposal, and the initial conversion scheme would appear to have secured the optimum viable use of the building, as a two bedroomed residential property.
- 5.14 The extension proposed would clearly be contrary the guidance in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 (Conversion of Rural Buildings) Section 2.5 (b) requires that 'the building should be large enough for the proposed use without the need for significant enlargement or alteration'. The current building has been used for the last 10 years as a residential dwelling, and does not therefore appear to require a further extension to enable it to function as such. Section 3.7 states that 'extensions will not normally be permitted as these would detract from the plain, simple, utilitarian appearance of most rural buildings'.
- 5.15 The applicant has questioned the relevance of SPG 4 in relation to the appeal at Chadwich Grange Farm, Redhill Lane (Application Ref: 15/0688) (Appeal Ref APP/P1805/WD/16/3146071) which related to the conversion of a rural building and an extension. The appeal decision suggests that less weight should be attached to this document but states that the principles of good design are clear within the NPPF and therefore the principles of SPG4 apply. Members should note that this appeal was dismissed in any event. The applicant has also cited the application at 9 Lower Hill Farm, Pound Lane, Frankley (Ref: B/2011/0987 Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/12/2175201) which clearly references SPG4. This appeal was allowed for what was a comparatively small extension to a barn complex, of a similar height to the existing building to which it was attached. It was considered 'an unobtrusive and appears as a natural extension to the original barns'.
- 5.16 The applicant has also referred to the application at Oak Tree Barn, 1 Brickhouse Lane (Ref: B/2010/1202 Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/11/2148797) which is not considered comparable to this application. The appeal allowed a proposal for a single storey extension to replace a larger previous lean to element of an original barn. The evidence of the existence and appearance of the original lean to was submitted. The extension is different to the current proposal being considered and it should be noted that the decision pre dates the NPPF. The references to another farm building adjacent to the Granary, are in respect of a building which was not attached to the Granary, considerably smaller than the proposed extension, appearing only in the early part of the 20th century, so comparatively, not particularly historic. It disappeared over 30 years ago. No evidence has been

put forward in respect of the appearance of this building, and no evidence of it remains.

- 5.17 Finally the appeal decision at The Dairy, Hartle Lane (B/2014/0513, Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/14/2228770) references SPG 4 and the appeal was allowed on the basis that the proposed small extension on the footprint of a former pigsty would reflect the original character and layout of the traditional range of former agricultural buildings.
- 5.18 It should be noted that none of the appeal decisions were in respect of *listed* buildings. Equally, each planning application/listed building application has to be considered on its individual merits. There are some rural buildings where a small extension would not impact on the character of the building, as these cases indicate. They do not outweigh the harm to the character or setting of the listed building as set out above. Whilst the proposal is not considered to amount to inappropriate development in Green Belt terms, it is considered to significantly harm the character of the building and an extension in this position would not be considered an acceptable addition to a rural building, even if it was not listed. The fact that the building is a designated heritage asset means that the proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of the adopted Local Plan, the NPPF and the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.
- 5.19 Members should note the public comments received in support of the application. Whilst some of the comments provide a view on the design and context of the proposal or to residential amenity, they generally relate to the personal circumstances of the applicant which are not considered to carry significant weight in favour of the proposal.

**6. RECOMMENDATION:** That planning permission be Refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension would not respect the architectural character or setting of the listed building by virtue of its position, design, size, height and materials and would result in a highly visible, dominant structure, out of scale with the building. The matters raised by the applicant do not justify the clear harm to the character and setting of the listed building. The proposal to relocate the parking area would not respect the setting of the building. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to a designated heritage asset contrary to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy S39 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, the guidance of SPG 4 (Converted Rural Buildings) and paragraphs 132 - 134 of the NPPF.

**7. Informatives**

- 7.1 The local planning authority is aware of the requirement of the NPPF and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 to work with the applicants in a positive and proactive manner, seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to applications.

7.2 However the principle of development in this case was contrary to development plan policy and was not considered being a sustainable form of development from the outset. This fact has been communicated to the applicant during a site meeting, email exchanges and telephone conversations with the Case Officer and Conservation Officer at the pre application stage of the planning process. The applicant however chose to continue with the proposal.

**Case Officer:** Mr David Kelly Tel: 01527 881345

Email: [d.kelly@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:d.kelly@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)