

Recommendation: GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

07/62510/002 - Conversion of existing barn to dwelling house and erection of detached garage., PERM,20/08/2007

APP/10/00179 - Discharge of Condition No's 2, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of Planning Permission 07/62510/002., PERM,22/07/2010

APP/10/00911 - Variation of Listed Building Consent 07/62510/001., INV,

APP/14/01143 - Variation of Condition No. 2 of Listed Building Consent 07/62510/001

, ,
APP/14/01158 - Variation of Condition No. 9 of Planning Permission 07/62510/002 ,
UNK,

3 Proposal

Listed Building application for conversion of barn to dwelling house (part retrospective)
- alternative scheme of conversion to that approved under Listed Building Consent 07/62510/001

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

- CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
- CS16 (High Quality Design)
- CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
- CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
- CS21 (Developer Requirements)
- DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

- DM20 (Historic Assets)
- AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
- DM24 (Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Grade 2
Conservation Area: St Peters

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

Final Comments:

I can confirm the following:

- The amended plans have address many of the concerns regarding the proliferation of windows that previously formed the scheme. Its was clear on site that some of the doors and windows have already been altered which have start to improve the appearance of the property.
- The barn doors need to be reinstated as part of this process, The barn doors offer further advantage in providing enhanced security when the building is not occupied and additional weather protection. They are shown on the amended plans to be reintroduced. However, I would like a condition attached to any permission given ensuring the barn doors are constructed within 3 months.

Following the other internal alterations that have also been agreed I believe we are now in a situation where listed building consent can be granted for the works.

Officer comment: *As at May 2019 the barn doors have not yet been implemented, although they remain as part of the overall proposal. After further discussion with the Conservation Officer (and following enquiries received regarding other works on the site) it has been concluded that it would not be appropriate to require the doors to be installed within a strict time limit. Instead the barn doors will remain as part of the overall proposal and can be implemented by the applicant at any point in the future.*

Previous Comments:

The works that have been undertaken compromise the listed barn in three main ways.

A) Loss of substantial elements of the timber frame. The primary frame remains and the majority of the roof structure but on the framing within the northern wall is extant.

B) The loss of spatial openness. In the original scheme two full bays remained open full height. In the implemented scheme a mezzanine floor has been inserted, with the upper floor serving a bedroom with en-suite. On the opposing side what was shown as a full open gallery is now partially enclosed with a bathroom.

C) External visual appearance. The fenestration follows a domestic pattern, the main carriage entrance glazed screen has weaker proportions (influenced by the linking gallery floor), and the absence of the barn doors further weakens the resulting design.

How to proceed?

The applicant has presented some evidence to show the poor state of the barn. A structural frame has been inserted consisting of a goal post arrangement on each of the principal frames (5 in total) with some lateral ties. The steel work is doing the primary work as the timber frame is not fully functioning. Braces are missing or incomplete. The steel work has been largely concealed. There may be other preferable design solutions, but given the extent of intervention that has already taken place, I feel it is more productive to work with what we have got, but to develop an outcome that addresses the basic design principles embodied in the earlier approach.

A large number of barn conversions have been undertaken across the country. The principles of retaining spatial character, minimising openings, means of achieving light and maintaining character are well established and best articulated in the English Heritage publication *Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings – A Guide to Good Practice* – available to download from www.helm.org.uk This is not radically different from the design philosophy which underpinned the original proposal as set out in the accompanying Design & Access Statement.

The structural steelwork means the original intention of maintaining two bays fully open is not readily achievable. I am assuming the goal post arrangement is necessary in all bay divisions. Simply removing the floor would reveal an ugly frame.

Working on this basis I have sketched a pragmatic solution which is not ideal, but is probably the best that can be secured short of a more radical approach.

What is achieved.

Once a mezzanine floor is installed the space beneath is compromised as you lose the sense of space. The converse is true of the space above the

mezzanine, as although the spatial dynamics are altered the volume of the building is more clearly apparent, It is therefore best to sit cellar spaces beneath the inserted floor and keep the space above open as far as possible. This is a reversal of the traditional way of living. It is well established and works,.

Spatial Openness

The scheme granted consent provided for two bedrooms with a largely open living area in the main barn. The insertion of the further mezzanine is unfortunate as the one fully revealed timber wall frame becomes partially concealed. I have sketched purely for illustration purposes very much a compromise solution. This utilises the area beneath the new mezzanine as an enclosed space – suggest bedroom. This allows the removal of the bedroom and en-suite above so that this more crucial area can be fully opened up allowing reinstatement of missing braces. In this way the frame and roof structure will be better revealed.

On the opposing mezzanine (already agreed) a boxed in bathroom has been incorporated which sits poorly with the spatial arrangement. Advantage has been taken to reduce the number of stairs to one (more efficient use of space) and this seems to work without compromising the tie beam. The headroom although tight appears workable. The space beyond has been laid out as two bedrooms (previously one). The sub-division of the space beyond the [partition is less of an issue. There are options here. To retain the status quo, or to revert to a single space and to incorporate an en -suite. The incorporation of the ceiling (as designed) sits uncomfortably. Consideration needs to be given to improving the visual appearance of the upstand.

The central two bays on the ground floor become the primary living space – kitchen/dining space. The open gallery space above providing a lounge and study. The open galleries take advantage of views out and borrowed light from the main glazed screen. Each of the gallery spaces are served by separate stairs. This is for two reasons. A) the location of the linking gallery floor impinges adversely on the proportions applied to the glazed screen and B) the existence of the gallery link prevents the re-instatement of the braces.

External Appearance

The fenestration needs to better respect the character of the building in number, form and location. The barn doors need to be reinstated as part of this process, The barn doors offer further advantage in providing enhanced security when the building is not occupied and additional weather protection. The barn is exposed to the elements. In stormy weather the doors could be closed at night giving additional protection.

CONCLUSION

The building has suffered some loss of interest. It is unfortunate that the local planning authority was not engaged at an earlier stage which would have prevented abortive work. The current situation is not acceptable for the reasons detailed. If the application falls to be determined in its current form I would have to recommend refusal with the issue of listed building and planning enforcement notices. Although a listed building application has been submitted the changes also require planning permission. I am satisfied on the basis of established policy, and the contraventions that have taken place the local planning authority would be supported were the matter to be taken to appeal.

I would rather resolve productively which is the reason I have gone to the lengths I have in explaining and proposing an illustrative solution which subject to detailing up I would be minded to support. It sets out a means of addressing the key issues. While there may be a case for minor refinement,

the package as a whole has to be agreed. It is not a bargaining chip to be progressively watered down.
I have attached an addendum which sets out the planning history and potted history.

ADDENDUM

Background

Planning History

04/62510/00/FUL: Conv of barn to 4 bed dwelling – WITHDRAWN

07/62510/001/LBC: Conv of Barn to dwelling – Consent 22/07/10

07/62510/002/FUL: Conv of Barn to dwelling & garage – Permission 20/08/10

APP/10/00179/D: Cond. Discharge 2, 4, 5, 6 & 7 (PP 07/62510/002/FUL)

APP/10/00911/LBC: Variation of LB Consent 07/62510/991/LBC - Invalid

APP/14/01158 : Variation of Cond. 2 of PP 07/62510/992/FUL) – Invalid

APP/15/00002/LBC: Current appln. Retention of unauthorised works carried out

Building Control

09/03522/RS/BN: Full plans submission REJECTED 29/07/09. Work being undertaken by means of Building Notice submitted 12/07/10.

Last recorded BC inspection 23/09/13. (BC work appears to relate to foundations and pad foundations for steelwork)

Potted History

04/62510/00/FUL

Initial enquires were made in 2004 for the conversion of the then unlisted barn and attached cartshed to residential use (4 bed dwelling). The Agents were Pro-Vision acting on behalf of Mrs J M Pike. The plans were reviewed by the Council's Conservation Consultant – Henry Caswell who identified the building as potentially listable, together with recommendations on how the design would need to be improved to make acceptable. In summary:-

- ☐ The main barn is worthy of preservation and should not be demolished.
- ☐ It is borderline whether it is listable but could be worth a try as this could help keep it and could justify a use that would preserve it.
- ☐ Its conversion should be on the basis of keeping it as open as possible using the existing openings
- ☐ A correct survey is needed of the openings and of the frame of the barn
- ☐ Windows should take the shape and position of existing openings avoiding any temptation to regularise them as domestic styles and shapes.
- ☐ To increase the extent of visible full internal height I suggest bed 2 could be a gallery room with just a balustrade division from the upper level of the living area.
- ☐ The smaller barn (*cartshed*) at right angles could provide garaging but its level needs to be shown on survey and elevations as it is set lower down.
- ☐ Rooflights should be kept to a minimum and so should openings towards the countryside beyond. Only one rooflight should appear on this side.
- ☐ The rear curtilage should be minimal and bounded by a traditional hedge
- ☐ The proposed rear extension to the barn is not acceptable
- ☐ The flue is shown on the west instead of the east elevation
- ☐ The main barn doors should be rebuilt to traditional interlocking ledges form
- ☐ A method statement will be needed as to the methods and extent of repairs needed.

The drawings accompanying this request are not held on Meridio and can not be traced.

The building was added to the statutory list on 30 July 2004.

The application was withdrawn on 3 August 2004.

07/62510/001/LBC & 07/62510/002/FUL

Plans prepared for A H Brown Ltd – submitted and validated on 29 March 2007 by Mr B E Ayling acting as Agent. Design Statement dated 16 February 2010 accompanying application to create a 2-bed dwelling.

Listed building consent granted 22/07/10 subject to the following conditions:-
Doubt over compliance with condition 2. Condition 3 not complied with – roof structure replaced. Condition 4 not complied with. Condition 5 advisory intended to ensure temporary shoring during the carrying out of the work.
Planning permission 07/62510/002/FUL granted 20/08/07 subject to the following conditions:-

Conditions 2, 4, 5, 6 & 7 discharged under application APP/10/00179 on 22/07/10. Condition 3 not discharged.

Unauthorised work

April 2014 Conservation Officer noted when passing development at an advanced stage. Preliminary external investigation flagged up work not being carried out in conformity with consent/permission granted. Numerous discrepancies. Flagged up to case office. Follow up meeting held with Mr Sam Wilson on 25/04/14 on site. For more detail see David Eaves letter dated 4 May 2014. Office meeting held with Mr Wilson on 23 May with follow up email of the same date providing advice on way forward.

Principal changes/irregularities flagged up in David's letter:-

The most significant changes to the approved scheme are listed below:

External Changes:

East Elevation

☐ Rooflights - 2 x additional rooflights and minor re-positioning of rooflights on roofslope

☐ Windows:

1 x additional window inserted

Metal framed rather than timber framed windows inserted (excepting 'French doors')

French door incorporates 3 rather than 4 lights

☐ Additional opening to the north of the French doors inserted

☐ UPVC gutters and downpipe

☐ Flue not in place (details required prior to any insertion of the flue under condition 4 of Listed Building Consent reference 07/62510/001)

South Elevation

☐ Windows

2 x windows inserted in wrong position (1 previously approved in a different position)

Metal framed rather than timber framed windows inserted

☐ UPVC gutters

☐ Door not yet inserted

West Elevation

☐ Rooflight - 1 x rooflight not installed

☐ Windows

2 x additional windows inserted

Windows of different design with 'domestic' appearance

Windows, main barn opening windows and door all incorporating metal framing not timber framing

☐ Barn doors not in place

☐ UPVC gutters

North Elevation

☐ UPVC gutters

Internal Changes:

Additional Sub-division of the building

Steel Framework

Steel framework has been inserted to bays 1 and 2 (southern bays) and bay 4 (northern bay). The approved plans show an oak framed freestanding framework structure within bays 1 and 2 only.

Additional first floor accommodation within bay 4.

☐ Walkway provided between 2 mezzanines

☐ The bay 4 mezzanine is enclosed by a wall with a central opening

☐ Staircases shown on approved plan not provided alternative staircase to bay 1 and 2 provided

☐ Further sub-division at 1st floor level by provision of 2 bedrooms in bay 1 and bedroom, en-suite and another room in bay 4.

☐ Further sub-division at ground floor level with additional room in bay 1 and 2.

☐ Bedroom in bay one to be playroom

Timber Frame

☐ It would appear that a significant proportion of the original timber frame has been lost. This is particularly evident to the southern end of the building where it is understood a partial collapse had taken place.

☐ Timbers have also been replaced/repared or removed in other parts of the building.

☐ the steel frame structure has been positioned unsympathetically and obscures important original framework.

It should be noted that this list of changes to the approved details is not exhaustive.

The works being applied for also require planning permission, due to the material change in appearance. The owner has been advised but has declined to submit an application. In order not to further delay determination and any required follow up actions, the listed building submission has been validated for determination.]

Policy

At national level planning policy in relation to historic buildings is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), supported by the extant Practice Guide to PPS.5- Planning and the Historic Environment and more recent National Planning Policy Guidance. At local level policy C.11 – Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough. A key objective (Chapter 7 – Caring For Our Borough) is to:-

Deliver the effective stewardship of the unique qualities of the borough's built and historic heritage and natural environment

English Heritage

No comments received.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre:

Within 50m Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Sites

6 **Community Involvement**

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 6

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 06/02/2015

Number of representations received: 3

1 Support

2 other comments

Comment	Officer Comment
On moving to 1, Westhaye Cottages in 2007, it was pleasing to note that consent had been obtained to convert the barn next door for habitation. It is good to see that the building retains its essential character and form, whilst at the same time it has sufficient windows to ensure bright interior rooms. The building has been thoughtfully restored, and the bifolding doors add a modern touch. As agricultural buildings these barns are now often obsolete, but it is good to see this barn has been thoughtfully developed to cater for the needs of family life.	Comments Noted
North East Hayling Residents Association: I am writing in on behalf of the North East Hayling Residents Association, regarding the above application. Two or three of us have looked round the barn conversion at the request of the applicant so that we could see the variations from the original approved application and conditions. Whilst we have some sympathy and understanding of the changes to the windows and internal layout, and the possible need for the introduction of some steelwork to stabilize the structure, we feel this latter item needs some discussion with the engineers to justify it, in terms of the conservation implications. We have discussed with the applicant the overall effect of the site, and the importance of the landscape conditions, to completing the visual effect of the barn within the village setting, which we also see as important. The perimeter hedgerows and vehicular access need to be completed as approved, and the farm machinery stored elsewhere to maintain the emphasis on the	Comments noted and addressed in part 7 of this report.

residential aspect.	
I do not have any concern as a neighbour either to the inclusion of steel frames within the barn conversion, nor to the fact that the internal lay out is not in accordance with the original planning permission, and do not believe the re sited windows are a nuisance to me. I do understand that there are, or may be, conservation issues in all three changes as the barn is a listed building. I do have concerns about other aspects of the original planning application and conditions, and compliance with it over the last 8 years. The conditions in the original permission required the retention of hedges, and replacement where damaged. In fact the hedges on the north, west and south side have been substantially removed. I understood that the original permission was for a personal gate in the hedge along side the cart shed into the field track on the north side of the site. In fact a car parking space has been built directly opposite the entrance to our drive, and over this weekend vehicular gate posts have been cemented in and a gate hung opposite our drive, and a green plastic link fence put up on posts down the north side of the site towards the road. The conditions included no incursion into the SINC to the west of the property. In fact there has been a container there for some years now. No attempt to landscape the site in accordance with clause 4 has been made. I do not know whether the caravan on site should have planning consent. Finally I do have a concern about the gas canisters proving gas to the cart shed standing, unprotected, in the field track in the gap between the cart shed and West Haye cottages, a narrow gap through which large farming equipment passes, at some speed.	Noted. Antrims Barn has not been converted in accordance with the original planning and listed building consents. Essentially the applicant has implemented an alternative barn conversion. The current application for Listed Building Consent is seeking to regularise the works carried out in terms of the Listed Building and the Council has requested a planning application to be submitted along side this (this has not yet been forthcoming). With regard to caravans and containers on the site, these do not normally require separate consent where they are associated with development works carried out by the applicant which is likely to have applied in this case. In relation to the Gas Canisters and safety concerns, having discussed the matter with colleagues in Environmental Health, concerns that relate to a domestic property or farm land should be addressed to the Health and Safety Executive.

7 **Planning Considerations**

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

- (iii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building
- (iv) Impact upon residential amenity
- (v) Other matters

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated outside the urban area where further development needs to justify its location. This application is for the conversion of an existing building for residential purposes and has previously benefited from Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent. The barn was not considered suited to modern agricultural needs and prior to its conversion to residential use was in a poor state of repair. As a Listed Building it is recognised that the buildings long term retention requires a viable use which residential could provide.

As the building is Listed and within the St Peters Conservation Area it is necessary under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to consider:

Listed Building:

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Conservation Areas:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

These matters are central to the acceptability or otherwise of the proposed development and are considered further in parts (ii) and (iii) below.

It should be noted that a separate application for planning permission, or Lawful Development Certificate, is required for the development.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

This application relates to the conversion of the main Antrims Barn. It does not include the cartshed or works within the grounds of the Listed Building including landscaping.

In terms of the works to the main barn the main impact on the Conservation Area is considered to be the residential use (previously approved) and the external alterations to the building.

The residential conversion of the building is considered acceptable in principle. It is noted that the building is located within Northney Village which includes mainly low density residential properties interspersed with agricultural and community buildings/uses. In terms of activity at the site the previous agricultural use would potentially have included the housing of farm equipment with associated activity and vehicular movements. It is not considered that the residential use that has already taken place would be harmful to the character of the Conservation Area.

In terms of the physical alterations to the building, the barn is set well back from St

Peters Road and not prominent in the street scene. Views across the fields to the west are afforded of the building from public rights of way. The alterations carried out include new openings and utilising existing openings in the building. These have been subject to detailed consideration during the application process and the window openings and finishes amended. Whilst the conversion works do result in a more domestic appearance than that of the original barn (in part an inevitable consequence of a residential conversion but also partly as a result of the applicants work carried out), on balance it is considered that the works have retained/reinstated the Listed Barn which was in a deteriorating and precarious state. The works are on balance considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area such that the area would be preserved.

(iii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building

The application has been made part retrospectively and has been amended during the course of the application following concerns raised by the Councils Conservation Officer. There are considered to be three main aspects to be considered in relation to the alterations to the Listed Building as follows:

The timber frame structure and its integrity;
The internal divisions within the building;
The alterations to the exterior of the building.

The timber frame structure and its integrity

The four bay timber framed barn was in a poor state of repair and had been damaged by storms in recent years. In that respect an earlier intervention following the earlier granting of planning and listed building consent would have potentially preserved more of the original timber frame structure. One end of the barn in particular having been significantly compromised.

The works have nevertheless retained significant parts of the original timber frame and these have been reinforced by the insertion of a steel frame work within the building. This also acts in part to support the first floor areas at either end of the building. The framework has largely been concealed. It is considered on balance that the works have retained original timber framing where possible with a modern frame inserted to help support the building and help to retain the structural integrity of the building.

The internal divisions within the building

The building has been subdivided internally to create accommodation. The form of the sub-division has been subject to negotiation which has resulted in alterations to the proposals and a more open appearance within the building. This is more in line with advice from English Heritage with regard to barn conversions. This seeks to retain the open aspects of the interior of the building so that its historic integrity and form can be appreciated and retained wherever possible. From north to south the bays are arranged as follows:

Bay 1 first floor gallery open to vaulted ceiling.
Bay 2 fully open except 'gallery link' walkway.
Bay 3 first floor gallery open to vaulted ceiling.
Bay 4 first floor accommodation with flat roof above - views to vaulted ceiling retained above.

Whilst ideally the retention of at least two bays as fully open would have been

desirable, it is considered that the plans have retained good views up into the vaulted ceiling and overall the sense of openness would continue to be appreciated within the building.

The alterations to the exterior of the building

As with other aspects of the work, the alterations to the exterior of the building and in particular the addition of windows and rooflights has been considered in detail. Negotiations have taken place and this has led to the removal of some openings, the re-instatement of barn doors and some other improvements.

Whilst there remains a degree of concern in relation to the amount of glazing and the materials used, the Conservation Officer has re-visited the site and confirms that listed building consent can now be recommended.

Overall, the works to the listed building can be supported and have helped to preserve the listed building following its deterioration prior to works taking place.

(iv) Impact upon residential amenity

The closest residential properties are 1 & 2 West Hay, The Brents (these properties share access with the site) and Waldron to the north of the site. There are no proposed openings within the barn facing north and therefore no overlooking would take place.

Whilst the residential use would attract additional activity, the residential use has been previously accepted and the former agricultural use would itself have had the potential to attract vehicular movements to the building for storage of crops or agricultural machinery.

It should also be noted that Listed Building Consent applications could not in any case be refused in relation to potential impacts on neighbours.

(v) Other matters

It should be noted that the granting of Listed Building Consent is a separate matter to the requirements for planning permission. No planning application has been submitted for this development to date and it is considered that a separate planning permission (or Lawful Development Certificate) is required. The applicant has been advised accordingly.

Listed Building Consent does not consider the needs for landscaping of the site. In addition CIL requirements and SRMP contributions would be considered under a subsequent planning application.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion, the principle of a residential conversion of this listed building is considered to be acceptable. The conversion is on balance considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Barn and the Conservation Area. Listed Building Consent is therefore recommended.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT** for application APP/15/00002 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Planning, Heritage, Design and Access Statement received 26th January 2015
Location Plan received 26th January 2015
Elevations and Sections Drawing No. 14-1002 02 Rev B
Floor Plans Drawing No. 14-1002 01 Rev B
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.