

**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL  
DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION**

1.	<b>Reference No:</b>	4/21/2124/0L1	
2.	<b>Proposed Development:</b>	LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR WORKS ASSOCIATED IN CONVERTING A BARN INTO A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING	
3.	<b>Location:</b>	BARWICKSTEAD, BECKERMET	
4.	<b>Parish:</b>	Beckermet with Thornhill	
5.	<b>Constraints:</b>	ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Flood Area - Flood Zone 2, Safeguard Zone - Safeguard Zone, Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change, DEPZ Zone - DEPZ Zone, Listed Building - Listed Building	
6.	<b>Publicity Representations &amp; Policy</b>	Neighbour Notification Letter	Yes
		Site Notice	Yes
		Press Notice	Yes
		Consultation Responses	See Report
		Relevant Policies	See Report
7.	<b>Report:</b>		
	<b>Site and Location</b>		
	<p>This application relates to a detached barn at Barwickstead which is located within the centre of Beckermet. The barn is located within the Beckermet Conservation Area and is Grade II Listed along with the hennery-piggery located at the entrance to the site. The building is accessed from Morass Road and is set back from the highway behind a sandstone wall.</p>		

## **Proposal**

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for works associated in converting the existing barn to a residential dwelling. The proposal is to form a single dwelling using the existing footprint and structure of the building. Part of the existing rear ginnery is to be retained, however, the remaining modern alterations to the rear of the barn are to be removed to reinstate the existing barn and to create a walled garden and parking area. The application originally also sought to completely remove the ginnery to the rear of the site, however, following concerns raised part of this structure will now be retained.

As part of the proposed conversion the lower ground floor will remain unchanged and will not be converted. Within the proposed upper ground floor of the property the development will create a large open plan living/kitchen/dining room, a utility room, two bedrooms and a bathroom. The proposed first floor of the dwelling will incorporate a mezzanine study, two double bedrooms and a bathroom. In order to accommodate the proposed conversion four additional windows will be installed within the north elevation of the property and an existing opening within the west elevation will be extended to create a doorway. Within the proposed east elevation the existing corrugated lean to roof will be replaced with slate, and a glazed Juliet balcony will be installed on the upper ground floor door opening.

This Listed Building Consent application is being considered alongside a planning application for the same works (ref: 4/20/2265/0F1). The building was listed in December 2020 during the initial consideration of the planning application. The planning application originally sought permission to convert the detached piggery barn to annex accommodation and alter the existing boundary wall to set it back from the front of the site. However, following concerns these elements were removed from the application.

## **Consultation Responses**

### Beckermet Parish Council

No comments received.

### Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer

*19<sup>th</sup> April 2020*

**Conclusion:** Request further information and design

### **Assessment:**

- The hennery-piggery conversion has been removed from the planning application, previously made in 2020. This was problematic from the point of view of the conservation area, and even more so from the perspective of a listed building, but I would be happy to see a sensitive

conversion proposal come in at a future date.

- The front boundary wall should not be rebuilt or moved. The continuity of this line with the side of the road, punctuated by gate piers, is important and should be retained.
- Main barn – Proposal entails conversion of upper floor
  - The majority of the barn’s interesting features lie in the ground floor, which is sensibly being excluded from this proposal.
  - The first floor – the main volume of the barn’s interior – is mostly open, although features an inserted pigeon loft that doesn’t appear to be of particular significance.
  - The conversion will entail the subdivision of the space and the removal of the pigeon loft, which I could consider less-than-substantial harm, justified on the grounds of giving the building a more secure and viable future, and mitigated in the sensitivity of the conversion and retention of ground floor unaltered.
- Ginnery – Proposal is to remove the main part of the volume, justified on grounds of removing fabric that detracts from the assets.
  - The wall to the rear is unlikely to be stable alone. This will probably need some kind of structure for support and structural advice should be taken. Tom Short’s report covers the main barn only, so it seems likely that designing any intervention here will be contingent on the results of such an assessment.
  - The loss of this volume will leave a gap in the middle of the group of buildings, which is considered harm as the buildings are a collection that work together.
  - Could both of these problems be addressed in a way that brings benefit? A timber frame that occupied the same volume as the existing building would support the wall, and essentially play the role of a pergola used for growing plants that would create a translucent form maintaining the building massing but allowing light access and lines of sight to the house, as well as some cover for the cars parked below. This might even enable retention of the large timber beams inside, which are a striking agricultural feature.
- Outbuildings – The proposal to create walled gardens is an attractive and sensitive one. The spaces are currently unroofed and the low impact of this proposal strikes me as well judged.
  - Would any removal of floor surfaces, e.g. historic flagstones, be needed?
- The heritage statement needs a couple of updates to reflect the updated circumstances and applications:
  - P.2 (Volume) refers to the hennery-piggery conversion, which has now been removed.

The hennery-piggery is also mentioned on p.5

- P.2 (Layout & Scale) refers to the barn as unlisted, though it has since been listed grade II
- The following information also needs adding to the application to allow sufficient specificity:
  - Sample of the slate to be used over the new courtyard entrance (images rather than a physical example)
  - Details of the proposed windows and rooflights
  - Details of new doors and staircases to be used inside and out

**Summary:**

I am supportive of the proposal to give this vacant building a the following element of the design should be either removed from the application or better justified:

- Works to the front boundary wall onto the road and yard entrance.

The following element of the design should be worked up more:

- Work to the former horse ginnery should be a clear response to any need for structural stability the rear wall will need, and explore options for how the visual mass of the building could be retained in a playful and creative way. The pergola suggested may be one such avenue, but I'd be very happy to look at other design solutions;
- Building Control may be able to advise on the extent to which the rear wall would need supporting. Any stipulations from their end should be sought prior to finalising the design to prevent any need to revisit work after consent.

The following pieces of information need adding to the application to clarify the proposals:

- Any removal of floor surfaces from within outbuildings to permit use as gardens;
- Image sample of slate for roof replacing corrugated metal;
- Details of the proposed windows and rooflights;
- Details of new doors and staircases to be used inside and out.

The following updates need making to the heritage statement to reflect the updated proposal:

- P.2 (Volume) refers to the hennery-piggery conversion, which has now been removed. The hennery-piggery is also mentioned on p.5;
- P.2 (Layout & Scale) refers to the barn as unlisted, though it has since been listed grade II.

16<sup>th</sup> June 2020

**Conclusion:** Request more information

**Assessment:**

As before, I'm supportive of the principle of converting this building, and supportive of most of the execution which I view as sensitive and reasonable. There are still one or two areas where detail is needed, so I provide the following comments in the hope they'll be useful.

Following my previous consultation response, dated 19/4/21, the agent has updated the design, access and heritage statement reflecting a couple of errors that had made their way in from the first draft last year.

I have received confirmation that the front boundary wall of the yard will not be modified by the proposals.

Details of the proposed rooflights have been submitted and appear suitable.

I request info on the following:

1. Confirmation of whether it's intended to retain and reuse main barn roof trusses etc. as visible internal features
2. Confirmation on intention to remove any floor surfaces from within the outbuildings that will be used for gardens.
3. If the agent is committed to removing the horse ginnery roof and front wall as part of the vision for the proposal, the following will be needed:
  - a structural report will be needed on whether the rear wall of the horse ginnery will need any stabilising if the rest of the structure is removed.
  - More complete description of significance. In order to know whether the harm of demolishing a section of the arrangement is justifiable, we would need to have a fuller understanding of the significance of the horse ginnery – its age, use, completeness and importance of its formal arrangement to that of the other spaces. This relates to how the constituent parts of a historic farmstead contribute together to its significance.
    - NPPF 189 states: *In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.*
4. Details of new windows, doors and staircases to be used inside and out (the agent has requested to leave this to last and I personally don't object to that if these other points are

resolved

20<sup>th</sup> October 2022

**Conclusion:** Request further information

**Assessment:**

Additional information has been supplied, however I still request info on the following:

- Confirmation of whether it's intended to retain and reuse main barn roof trusses etc. as visible internal features.
  - The Structural Inspection Report from 2020 notes that "the roof structure, if retained, will have to be inspected by a timber specialist".
  - In the event that structural timbers appear decayed, a microbore drilling survey will be necessary to ascertain the depth of the decay and extent of sound timber.
  - The report states that purlins and rafters will need removing as they are not in accordance with standards, but also speculates that it may be possible to strengthen the purlins.
  - The approach for surveying, replacing or modifying the roof timbers needs understanding in more detail.
  - Although preferable to cover this within the application, this could potentially be conditioned to be discharged prior to removal of current timbers.
- Confirmation is needed on intention to remove any floor surfaces from within the outbuildings that will be used for gardens.
- My view on the horse ginnery is that its removal would constitute less-than-substantial harm to the significance of the building group, and that its poor condition and relative lack of originality are should be considered. There appear to be three possible approaches: repair it as-is to structural soundness (which appears less reasonable given its lack of originality and the substantial replacement of remaining material that would be needed), replace it with a new structure on the same footprint (this would introduce a multitude of other questions, but on principle does not appear to be viable), or to remove it (in which case, attention would turn to the stability of the rear wall).
  - I would not support lowering the height of the rear wall.
  - A structural report will be needed on whether the rear wall of the horse ginnery will require any stabilising if the rest of the structure is removed. A structural engineer experienced at working with traditional buildings should be consulted to produce this

report.

- This information would need to be known, and any remediation specified, in advance of consenting removal of the wall's lateral support.
- There may also need to be discussion about the side wall on the SW side, with its timber gates into the former stables. A demolition plan should be produced indicating which parts of the structure specifically are proposed for demolition.
- In the event of demolition, it may be desirable to ensure that any slates needed to the main barn roof are made up from the horse ginnery roof stock, so thought should be given to this.
- Details of new windows, doors and staircases to be used inside and out (the agent has requested to leave this to last and I personally don't object to that if these other points are resolved

*21<sup>st</sup> March 2022*

**Conclusion: Request further information**

**Assessment:**

Additional information has been supplied, however I still request info on the following:

- Confirmation of whether it's intended to retain and reuse main barn roof trusses etc. as visible internal features.
  - Clarification has been provided that the different legislative circumstances relating to the barn being listed provide enough leeway that the conversion can be carried out without need to remove the king post trusses and purlins.
- Confirmation is needed on intention to remove any floor surfaces from within the outbuildings that will be used for gardens.
  - No information appears to have been submitted yet
- Since the last consultation response, an updated plan has been proposed for the horse ginnery, shortening the structure and refronting it in a more attractive manner in order to provide a covered parking bay and home office, while providing lateral support to the rear wall and retain the building form.
  - This strikes me as a good and inventive proposal with a number of upsides that weren't captured in the previous proposal.
- Details of new windows, doors and staircases to be used inside and out

- The design, access and heritage statement is helpfully descriptive on the topic of new doors and the proposal, however the applications are not accompanied by detail drawings or spec sheets for new doors and windows.

*7<sup>th</sup> April 2022*

**Conclusion: No objection (See summary)**

**Assessment:**

Previously requested:

- Details of new doors, windows and staircases
  - Details of doors and windows have been provided.
- Either a note in the design/heritage statement relating to the stone paving in the currently unroofed outbuildings of the west range, or an annotation on the proposed plan, clarifying whether it is proposed to retain this or alter/replace it.
  - Confirmation has been provided that the flagstone floors to the spaces to the west of the horse ginnery will be undisturbed.
- Details relating to rain water goods and whether these are proposed to be retained or replaced.
  - Cast iron existing to be retained and overhauled.
- Specification sheet or similar for cladding to be used at the front of the altered horse ginnery.
  - Western red cedar has been specified. This will provide an improved appearance to the replaced front of this structure.

**Summary:**

All the details I previously requested have been provided, although I was not able to locate a drawing showing the two proposed new staircases. I would be happy to see this detail submitted via a condition, if that would be preferable to the applicant.

Cumbria County Council – Historic Environments Officer

I defer to any comments that your conservation adviser may have regarding the suitability and design of the proposed development on the designated heritage asset.

I do recommend however that, in line with advice provided in a letter dated 18 January 2021 regarding the application 4/20/2265, in the event consent is granted, the buildings are recorded prior to conversion work commencing. This recording should be in accordance with a Level 3 Survey as described by Historic England in Understanding Historic Buildings A Guide to Good Recording

Practice, 2016. I advise that this can be secured by attaching a condition to any planning consent.

## Historic England

29<sup>th</sup> June 2021

### **Summary**

Proposal seeks to change the use of the barn and associated ancillary buildings to residential accommodation.

We have serious concerns relating to the level of information provided in support of the application, as such we do not support the application in its present form.

### **Impact**

Proposal seek to convert the barn buildings at Barwickstead to residential accommodation. The intention is to retain the lower ground floor as a workshop/service area and provide living accommodation above in the open double height granary space above.

Unfortunately, we cannot complete our assessment as to whether the impact of the proposals will be acceptable or understand their potential impact on the building's significance. Whilst a Heritage, Design and Access Statement has been provided (and subsequently revised) which provides a brief overview of the proposals, it does not satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 189 of the NPPF in that it does not describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by the proposals.

We would expect a submission seeking to change the use of a nationally significant building noted as being remarkably complete and retaining highly legible features to be accompanied by a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). This assessment should be undertaken using appropriate expertise where necessary and should identify the significance of the heritage asset before going on to assess the level of impact the changes will have on this significance.

We have serious concerns that the proposals have been put together without a detailed understanding of the building's significance. No clear or convincing justification (NPPF 194.) has been put forward for works either, some of which have the potential to have a significant negative impact.

In addition to the above we have concerns and questions regarding the following and recommend that additional and revised information is provided to address them:

- Level of demolition needs to be clearly defined, justified and the impact of this on significance assessed
- Details to cover proposed internal modifications and assessment of impact on any surviving features and significance

- Photographs of all internal spaces, buildings and wider site to provide context and aid understanding
- Details of the new proposed construction i.e. are new floors required, what will their construction be, what is the construction of new partition walls, how will the building be serviced and insulated, is the roof to be replaced or retained etc
- Proposals for the rear most building (stabling, storage and boiler house) need to be defined. Other than an annotation on a photograph in the DAS there is no information provided
- Detailed assessment of condition of the pigeon loft proposed to be removed and justification why removal is the only viable option and why replacement isn't possible
- Detailed assessment of timber condition. We note the Structural Engineers report recommends further assessment and suggests that replacement of elements such as rafters, lintels and floor joists may be required
- Landscaping details
- Details of the changes suggested to the boundary wall adjacent to the road

### **Recommendation**

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 127, 189, 193, 194 and 196 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

*25<sup>th</sup> October 2021*

### **Summary**

Proposals seeks to change the use of the barn and associated ancillary buildings to residential accommodation. This would involve the demolition of a pigeon loft within the principal barn and the demolition of the former gin house which is part of the designation.

We consider the proposals would have a negative impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset and we have serious concerns relating to the level of information, assessment and justification provided in support of the application. We do not support this application in its present form.

## Impact

Proposals seek to convert the principal barn building at Barwickstead to residential accommodation retaining the lower ground floor as a workshop/service area and living accommodation above; demolish the former gin house to provide parking but retaining the stone built south gable; consolidate the former stabling to create an enclosed garden.

We have previously raised concerns over the level of information provided and assessment of significance undertaken, and we maintain these concerns. Whilst a Heritage, Design and Access Statement has been provided (and subsequently revised) which provides a brief overview of the proposals, it does not satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 189 of the NPPF in that it does not describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by the proposals.

We would expect a submission seeking to change the use of and demolish a significant section (gin house) of a nationally significant building noted as being remarkably complete and retaining highly legible features to be accompanied by a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment. This assessment should be undertaken using appropriate expertise where necessary and should identify the significance of the heritage asset before going on to assess the level of impact the changes would have on this significance and where proposals would lead to harm to, or loss of, the significance clear and convincing justification in-line with national policy.

Proposals lack enough detail to fully understand the impact on the significance of the principal barn, which also include the removal of a pigeon loft which is an important element of the building's development and special interest. Whilst some evidence of rot and infestation has been noted from ground level, the condition of the pigeon loft has not been fully assessed and options for its retention or adaptation and re-use have not been considered.

Similarly, we still note that no assessment of impact has been made of the proposed changes on the principal barn such as impact on surviving features and the buildings significance. No details of the proposed interventions have been provided such as new floors, new partitions, how the building is to be serviced and how it is to be thermally upgraded etc.

Proposals also lack sufficient detail and justification for the demolition of the former gin house. We acknowledge that its condition is a cause for some concern and whilst we agree that of the complex the rear additions are of less special interest than the main barn it is still of interest, contributes to the significance of the whole asset and is an integral element of the listed building. Its loss would lead to harm to the designated heritage asset and would lessen the special interest and significance of the rear section and wider site.

The submitted brief structural appraisal only considers the principal barn and not the remainder of the listed building. The advice appears to be made on a series of assumptions e.g. whether the roof can be retained, that all the lintels need replacing etc. No assessment has been provided of the rear

buildings.

We consider the proposals would harm the significance of the Grade II listed Barwickstead Barn and attached ancillary buildings. Proposals as they stand would see an integral part of the designated heritage asset demolished and the special interest and significance of the listed building diminished.

**Position**

We have previously raised concerns over the level of information provided, the lack of justification, and assessment of significance undertaken, we maintain these concerns.

Whilst a revised Heritage, Design and Access Statement has been provided it does not satisfy the requirements of Paragraph of the NPPF in that it does not describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by the proposals.

Applications including such a high level of intervention as demolishing integral sections of a listed building should be supported by a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by suitably qualified and experienced consultant. This assessment should identify the significance of the designated heritage asset and then assess the impact proposals would have on this significance. Where changes would have a negative impact then they should be clearly justified and supported by convincing evidence such as Structural Engineers reports, detailed condition surveys, options appraisals etc.

We are unable to define the exact level of harm the proposals would amount to due to the lack of information and detailed assessment. However, we do have serious concerns over what is being proposed and recommend that if this detail is not forthcoming that the application be refused.

**Recommendation**

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds.

We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 194, 196, 197, 199, 200 and 202.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022

I am happy for you to continue to negotiate this application with the support of your own in house conservation officers.

National Amenities Societies

No comments received.

### Public Representation

This application has been advertised by way of a site notice, and press notice. No comments have been received in relation to the statutory notification procedure.

### **Planning Policy**

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Development Plan**

#### **Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)**

#### Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

#### Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

National Design Guide (NDG).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation Area Design Guide SPD (Adopted December 2017)

#### Emerging Copeland Local Plan (ELP):

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has recently been the subject of a Publication Draft Consultation. The Publication Draft Consultation builds upon the previously completed Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations. Given the stage of preparation of the Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 some weight can be attached to policies within the Publication Draft where no objections have been received. The Publication Draft provides an indication of the direction of travel of the emerging planning policies, which themselves have been developed in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Assessment**

The main issues raised by this application are the principle of development; and impact on the heritage asset.

### Principle of Development

Policy ST1 of the Copeland Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the Boroughs historic features and their setting. Policy ENV4 seeks to enhance the quality of the Boroughs built environment and heritage assets, including the protection of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

Policy DM27 supports development proposals that protect, conserve and enhance the Boroughs historic sites and their setting. It establishes the principle of development which affects heritage assets subject to compliance with a number of criteria which seek to limit their impact.

### Impact on Conservation Area & Heritage Asset

Policy ST1, ENV4, DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan seek to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character of the Borough's historic sites.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a need "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works [for the Local Planning Authority to] have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest" [Section 16(2)]. This requirement also applies to the granting of planning permission affecting a listing building or its setting [Section 66(1)].

Section 72 of the 1990 Act states that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of [a conservation] area."

Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation..."

NPPF para. 199 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation", irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 202).

Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when making decisions.

Referring to assets in a conservation area, NPPF para. 207 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area should be treated as either substantial (under para. 201) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 202). In new development, opportunities should be

sought to enhance or better reveal the significance of conservation areas (NPPF para. 206).

During the application process for the planning permission for this site, the buildings were Listed as Grade II therefore a Listed Building application was submitted alongside this full application.

As part of the original full planning application concerns were raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the conversion of the detached barn/piggery to form an annex as this conversion and extension was considered to have serious harm to the heritage asset. This element of the proposal was therefore removed from the proposal following the concerns raised.

Based on this removal extensive discussion were undertaken with the agent for this application with regard to the conversion of the main barn at this site. Although the Officer was supportive he requested additional information to justify a number of the proposed works within the site.

Based on the submission of amended/additional information for this application, the retention of the boundary wall to the front of the application site, and the retention of the ginnery to the rear of the site the Officer has offered no objections to the development, subject to securing details of the internal staircases. These details will be secured by an appropriately worded planning condition to require the submission of these specifications before they are installed within the development.

Heritage England objection to the original Listed Building application, Following the significant amendments to the application they have since confirmed that they are happy for the Council's Conservation Officer to advise in order to progress the application.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies ST1, ENV4, and DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan and provision of the NPPF.

#### Planning Balance & Conclusion

The application seeks Listed Building Consent for various alterations as part of the proposal to convert a vacant barn within Beckermet. Given that there are no major external alterations to the property to accommodate the change of use, the development is considered to conserve the historic, cultural and architectural character of the Boroughs historic site.

Whilst concerns were originally raised by the Council's Conservation Officer amendments have been sought to the scheme to remove the detached annex conversion from the application and to retain the front boundary wall and ginnery to the rear of the site. The Officer has now confirmed that he has no objections to the development.

On this basis the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the objectives of Policies ST1, ENV4 and DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2018 and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and LBCA Act.

8.	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Approve Listed Building Consent (start within 3yr)</p>
9.	<p><b>Conditions:</b></p> <p><u>Standard Conditions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The works hereby permitted must be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.  Reason  To comply with Sections 18 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</li><li>2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them:-<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Site Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li><li>- Block Plan, Scale 1:500, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li><li>- Site Block Plan (Amended), Scale 1:500, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022.</li><li>- As Existing First Floor Plan, Scale 1:50, Dwg No: 02, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li><li>- As Existing Section, Scale 1:50, Dwg No: 03, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li><li>- As Existing Plans &amp; Elevations, Scale 1:100, Dwg No: 10, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</li><li>- As Proposed Plans &amp; Elevations (Amended), Scale 1:100, Dwg No: 11, Rev D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022.</li><li>- As Proposed Site Section, Scale 1:250, Drg No: 12, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021.</li></ul></li></ol>

- Heritage Impact Assessment (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.
- Door Detail, Scale 1:2, Dwg No: 14, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.
- Window/Door Detail, Scale 1:2, Dwg No: 13, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.
- Material Specification, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.
- Roof Light Details, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021.
- Visual Structural Inspection, Prepared by WDS Ltd, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.
- Protected Species Survey: Bats and Barn Owls, Prepared by John Temple July 2019, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020.

Reason

To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Pre Commencement Conditions:

3. Prior to the carrying out of any conversion work the existing buildings affected by the proposed development must be recorded in accordance with a Level 3 Survey as described by Historic England's document Understanding Historic Buildings A Guide to Good Recording Practice, 2016. Within 2 months of the commencement of construction works a digital copy of the resultant Level 3 Survey report must be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that a permanent record is made of the buildings of architectural and historical interest prior to their alteration as part of the proposed development.

Prior to Installation/Use Conditions:

4. Prior to their first installation within the development hereby approved full details of the two proposed staircases must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details and must be maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of protecting the heritage asset.

5. All rooflights to be installed in the building must in accordance with the approved document 'Roof Light Details, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021', and must remain as such at all times thereafter.

Reason

To safeguard the traditional appearance of the converted building in the interests of visual amenity

6. The development hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Door Detail, Scale 1:2, Dwg No: 14, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.
- Window/Door Detail, Scale 1:2, Dwg No: 13, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

The development must be carried out and maintained in accordance with this approved detail at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of protecting the heritage asset and Conservation Area.

7. The development hereby approved must be completed in accordance with the approved materials detailed within the approved documents:

- Material Specification, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

The development must be retained in accordance with these approved details for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity.

8. Any alterations, repairs or replacements of the existing roof slates must be local graduated green slate as per the existing building and must be carried out in accordance with the approved documents:

- Heritage Impact Assessment (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

The development must be carried out and maintained in accordance with this approved detail at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of protecting the heritage asset and Conservation Area.

**Statement:**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Case Officer:** C. Burns

**Date :** 24.05.2022

**Authorising Officer:** N.J. Hayhurst

**Date :** 25.05.2022

**Dedicated responses to:-**