

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/17/00983

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/17/00983

Address: Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RX

Proposal: Change of use from agricultural building to 1No. dwellinghouse subject to prior approval.

Case Officer: David Eaves

Consultee Details

Name: Consultee Heritage Team

Address: Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant PO9 2AX

Email: Havant.Heritage@havant.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Conservation Officer

Comments

Site

The buildings in question are locally listed. This Due to their age, appearance, detailing and their association with traditional farming methods.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications along with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Assessment

Traditional agriculture/stable buildings are a significant part of our heritage and one of the objectives for allowing conversions is to enable these buildings to be retained for future generations. It is therefore essential that the characteristics of the buildings survive to be identifiable in the future.

The design of a conversion must commence with the existing building and not with a preconceived notion regarding the size or type of accommodation required, or the most profitable scheme. Applicants may have to accept that the building imposes constraints that will require compromise to retain its character. The opportunities and limitations presented by the buildings will determine the form of accommodation possible and an approach exploiting these features will be the only way to reach an acceptable design solution that conforms to the planning policy. In essence the finished building and its surroundings should complement its original use.

The buildings are a key element of the character of this site, providing a significant feature within the original arrangement of agricultural buildings.

The works proposed include a number of external alterations which will have a significant impact upon the character of the building, which introduces an altogether more residential feel to the structure which contradicts the established character of the building and the site as a whole. This domestic character is particularly emphasised by the addition of a number of modern windows and doors and the loss of original openings.

The historic pattern of windows is a direct product of the function of the building over time. Consequently traditional agricultural buildings are characterised by few external openings. Existing openings are a fundamental element of the buildings character and allow the original form and function to be understood. In a conversion maximum, use should be made of existing openings without changing their size, while limiting the formation of new openings. The current scheme does not achieve this with the south, west and eastern elevations being largely rebuilt with new openings proposed and others bricked up.

Due to their simplicity and visual prominence roof forms of agricultural buildings are often a sensitive part of the character. Therefore any interventions to the roof need to be particularly carefully considered. The scheme has a proliferation of roof lights which are intrusive to its character. A roof such as this which has a number of dormer windows and roof lights punctuating its length undermines its simplicity of form that is fundamental to the design of these buildings. The need for a number of roof lights also suggests the over intensification of accommodation proposed. These features have a radical effect upon appearance advertising the fact that it has been subject to a conversion.

I also note that no structural assessment has been submitted with the application. It is therefore very difficult to ascertain how much of the original structure will be maintained as part of this conversion. I would therefore recommend that any further applications for these buildings contain a full structural assessment.

A sensitively thought out and design scheme for a single dwelling might be appropriate and would allow for a future use of these buildings. However, in this case and for the reasons above I cannot support the proposals in front of me.

