



**PLANNING STATEMENT  
HERITAGE STATEMENT**

**PROPOSED DWELLING**

**AT**

**CAT HILL MEWS**

**CAT HILL**

**HOYLANDSWAINE**

**S36 7JB**

**NOVEMBER 2013**

---

*CLIENT: MR H TAYLOR*

## Introduction

This Planning Statement / Heritage Statement (PS/HS) has been prepared to support a planning application for a proposed dwelling at Cat Hill Mews, Cat Hill, Hoylandswaine.

## Site location and summary of the proposed development

The proposed development site lies within the curtilage of Cat Hill Mews, one of a small number of dwellings that form the hamlet of Cat Hill. Cat Hill Mews is former barn (now converted) and forms an “L” shape on the site. It is a listed building (grade II).

The hamlet lies approximately 3km to the north of Penistone and approximately 1km to the west of Hoylandswaine and contains dwellings of varying ages and two further listed buildings - Cat Hill Farmhouse (grade II\*) is located to the south of the site behind Cat Hill Mews and Nether Lea Farmhouse (grade II) is similarly located behind Cat Hill Mews but to the west.

The site is accessed directly from Firs Lane, almost at its junction with Cat Hill Lane

The proposed development consists of the erection of a Passivhaus-type development set within the curtilage of Cat Hill Mews (the development site is currently occupied by a garage and gardens) to the north east of the main house.

## Planning history

Various planning and Listed Building Consent applications for extensions to Cat Hill Mews were submitted in 2008 and subsequently refused (however, an appeal in respect of a Listed Building Consent application for an extension to the farmhouse was allowed in 2009). A garage / outbuilding on the site of the proposed development was approved in 2007.

Pre-application discussions in respect of the proposed new dwelling were held with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in mid-2013. At the time, the LPA was unable to support the development in principle as it did not appear to meet any of the exceptions in national planning policy guidance which would allow inappropriate development in the green belt and there appeared to be no “very special circumstances” to overcome the inappropriateness of the development.

## National and local planning policies

**National planning policy guidance** is provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

As the site is considered to be in the green belt, then section 9: “Protecting green belt land” is material to this application. Paragraph 87 states –

*As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*

Furthermore, the first part of paragraph 89 states –

*A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt...*

However, section 6: “Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes”, at paragraph 55 it states that –

*.....Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:*

*.....*

- *the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling.*  
*Such a design should:*
  - *be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;*
  - *reflect the highest standards in architecture;*
  - *significantly enhance its immediate setting; and*
  - *be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.*

Section 12: “Conserving and enhancing the historic environment”, paragraphs 128 and 129 state that –

*128. 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. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary...*

129. *Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*

Furthermore, paragraph 131 and 132 state that –

131. *In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*

.....

- *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

132. *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. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

Paragraph 134 goes on –

134. *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.*

Notwithstanding the green belt and conservation issues outlined above, section 7 "Requiring good design" states, at paragraph 61 –

*"Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment."*

Paragraph 63 of the NPPF goes on to state –

*“In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area”.*

**Local planning policy guidance** is provided by the Replacement Barnsley Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) and the saved policies contained therein and the Barnsley Core Strategy (CS).

With reference to the proposed development, the CS contains policies relating to sustainability at CSP1 and CSP2, with policies regarding the design of new buildings at CS29 and the historic environment at CS30.

Policies GS7, GS8 and GS9 of the RUDP in relation to development within the green belt have not been saved, as national planning policy on green belts are deemed to provide the necessary policy guidance on this issue. Therefore, the principle of development in the green belt should be judged in the light of the NPPF.

## **Development Appraisal**

It is contended that the proposed development represents an opportunity to provide a dwelling which meets the criteria laid out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

The design and construction of the building, given its Passivhaus-type approach, high quality design and materials, and contemporary architecture, leads to a development that it is truly outstanding in terms of its visual appearance and sustainability of design and construction, which should help to raise standards of design more generally. It is believed that there is only one such development within the wider area (at Denby Dale) and that there are no such developments that have been built to date within the Barnsley district. As such, the proposed development represents an excellent opportunity to introduce an innovative and outstanding design to the district in general as an exemplar scheme for others to follow in such rural locations.

Further details of design appraisals and sustainability are provided in the supporting Design and Access Statement (DAS) but it is contended that the proposed development represents an architectural design concept of the highest quality which significantly enhances its immediate setting. The detailed narrative within the DAS evidences how the proposed development is sensitive to the defining characteristics

of the area, and in particular its sensitive relationship with the nearby listed buildings (see below).

It is therefore contended that the proposed development meets the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF with the consequence that it represents “very special circumstances” to allow inappropriate development within the green belt.

As it is held that the principle of development on the site has been established as above, then the detailed issue of the impact of any development on the setting of nearby listed buildings must be considered. Paragraph 128 refers to the requirement to describe the significance of the heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

The flowing extract is taken from the Heritage Gateway and is a description of Cat Hill Mews –

**SE 20 NW PENISTONE CAT HILL LANE**

(west side)

**1/14 Barn approx. 10 metres  
north east of Cat Hill  
Farmhouse**

(Formerly listed as  
Barn approx. 10 metres  
23rd June 1965 south of Cat Hill  
Farmhouse

GV II

Barn. Mid C18. Coursed, squared rubble. Stone slate roof. Quoins. Central cart entry with oak lintel. Wide entrance to left with quoined surround. Inserted door to right. Rear: opposing doorway with quoined surround. Other openings are later. Small vent in each gable apex. Single-storey addition to left not included in the item. Interior: principal rafter trusses with large-scantling tie-beams.

It is contended that this is the listed building most affected by the proposed development, as the other two listed buildings are physically separated from the site by Cat Hill Mews and therefore any impact on the setting of these buildings is very limited. The proposed building itself will “sit down” within the site and has been designed to take account of the natural fall of the site to reduce the visual impact of the new building from all directions, but particularly the views northwards from Cat Hill Mews.

The overall contemporary nature of the design of the proposed development, and in particular its use of natural materials and architectural detailing, is held to complement and enhance the setting of the listed building and, as such, it is considered that the proposed scheme causes less than substantial harm to the

designated heritage asset. It also is held to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness by virtue of its innovative and creative architectural design, detailing and materials.

For the sake of completeness, the listing descriptions of the two other listed buildings are shown below –

**PENISTONE CAT HILL LANE**

SE20NM

(west side)

**1/13 Cat Hill Farmhouse**

23rd June 1965

GV II\*

Farmhouse. 1634. Deeply-coursed dressed stone. Stone slate roof. Two-cell plan with projecting rear kitchen wing. Two storeys and attic. Near-symmetrical three-bay front. Chamfered plinth. Central two-storey gabled porch with elaborate doorway with moulded surround, imposts and deep shaped lintel. Hoodmould over with large moulded stops. 2-light window to 1st floor and a single light to gable apex. The left and right bays are both gabled. The left bay has a 6-light transomed parlour window with king mullion, a 4-light 1st-floor window and a 2-light attic window. The right bay has a 4-light transomed ground-floor window and a 4-light 1st-floor window both with ornamental hoodmould stops, diagonal to ground floor and heart-shaped to 1st floor. 2-light attic window. Moulded gable copings, roll-top parapets and finials. Two large square ashlar stacks, one central, in line with door, the other relating to the kitchen wing. Rear: extensive rebuilding, in keeping. Gabled kitchen wing projects on left. Right return: the left part is gabled with a 2-light transomed window to ground floor under a hoodmould with big square stops. The kitchen wing to right is of two near-symmetrical bays with central, Tudor-arched door with 3-light window to left and 2-light window to right, both transomed and all under continuous hoodmould which rises over the windows. Two 3-light windows to 1st floor. Interior: slightly cambered-arched fireplace with keystone and moulded surround in parlour. Wide elliptical-arched fireplace in kitchen.

Hunter states that the hall, formerly known as Catling Hall, was dated "I T 1634" (date not found at resurvey) and was occupied by the Sotwell family in the C17.

Rev. J. Hunter, History of the Deanery of Doncaster and South Yorkshire, 1820.

L. Ambler, Old Halls and Manor Houses of Yorkshire, 1913.

**PENISTONE CAT HILL LANE**

SE20NW

(west side)

**1/15 Nether Lea Farmhouse**

18th November 1975 and adjoining barn to north

GV II

Former farmhouse and barn. C17 house with considerable rebuilding, at time

of resurvey. C18 barn, altered, on earlier core. Coursed, squared rubble. Stone slate roof to barn. Two storeys and attic. Barn with house as gabled cross-wing on left, giving L-plan. Quoins. The farmhouse is mostly demolished, with roof covering removed, at time of resurvey. The rear gable has been rebuilt (c1980s) with new entrance and a 4-light window to ground floor; on 1st floor a 4-light window and in gable apex a 2-light window, both double-chamfered and with dripmoulds. The barn has a large segmental-headed cart entry to right, and a stable door to left. Square pitching hole at high level. Rear of barn has opposing threshing door and 2 smaller doorways (one part-blocked). Several inserted unfinished openings.

Interior: in the wall between house and barn is a cruck frame.

P. Ryder, Report for South Yorkshire Archaeological Unit, c1980.

Therefore, it is contended that the proposed development is acceptable in conservation terms and meets the requirements of both national and local planning policies in this regard.

The overall design and construction of the proposed development is also held to meet the criteria laid down in the relevant national and local planning policies. The NPPF states that “great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs” that “raise the standard of design more generally in the area” and that new development should integrate into the natural, built, and historic environment. For the reasons set out above, it is contended that these criteria are met. The proposed development also meets criteria laid down in local planning policy CSP29 “Design” in that it contributes to place making, is of high quality, and enhances the heritage character of the local area, including scale, layout, and materials. Further details and a more comprehensive design appraisal are contained within the DAS that should be read in conjunction with this PS/HS.

As the building will be of a Passivhaus-type, then clearly the methods and materials used in construction will be highly sustainable, thus meeting the criteria laid down in local planning policies CSP1 and CSP2. Further details are contained within the DAS.

Access to the site remains unchanged, with two points of access leading from Firs Lane to serve Cat Hill mews and the proposed development. Further details are contained within the DAS.

## Conclusion

The proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable in principle, in that the innovative nature of the development is sufficient to provide for “very special circumstances” to allow inappropriate development in the green belt in this particular location.

In addition, the high quality of the proposed design and materials leads the development to being sympathetic in its relationship to the setting of the nearby listed buildings, and will thus have little impact on, and cause less than substantial harm to, these designated heritage assets.

The overall high quality of the design of the proposed development is also held to meet the general design guidance within the NPPF and the more detailed local planning policies in the CS. The highly sustainable nature of the proposed development is similarly considered to meet the requirements of sustainable construction policies within the CS.

Therefore, the proposed scheme is held to meet the requirements and criteria of relevant national and local planning policies and to be acceptable in principle and in detail.