

2023/0995

2023/1003 (Listed Building Consent)

Address: Farmhouse, Jowett House Farm, Bark House Lane, Cawthorne, Barnsley, S75 4AS

Description: Subdivision of farmhouse to provide two dwellings. Installation of air source heat pumps and parking areas

This is a combined report for planning application 2023/0995 and, listed building consent application 2023/1003, in regard to the development proposed at the Farmhouse, Jowett House Farms, S75 4AS.

Site & Location Description:

The dwelling is located within a farmstead accessed by Jowett House Lane, a single carriageway, paved track leading from New Lane, shortly after the junction of New Lane and Bark House Lane, at the car park entrance for the Cannon Hall Estate. The dwelling is approximately 0.5 miles from the Canon Hall Car Park, and 1.8 miles Northwest of the village centre of Cawthorne. Whilst parts of the farmstead appear to be a working farm, there are three dwellings located within the farmstead, including the currently unoccupied application dwelling. An additional agricultural building has also recently been granted prior approval consent for conversion into a single residential dwelling.

The application dwelling itself is an historically listed Grade II, late seventeenth century stone-built farmhouse with a stone slate roof. Both the Historic England listing and Conservation Officer's report highlight how the western section of the dwelling is a later addition to the original dwelling, and although there is no definitive planning record, Historic England believes the dwelling's latter addition was substantially renovated in the late twentieth century, presumably after its historical listing in 1968. Possible evidence of the building's renovation may be found in Planning application B/83/1497/PR or its associated B/83/1498/PR. In their report, the conservation officer notes how there has been difficulty in finding tenants for the dwelling due to its current layout and dilapidation, including damp.

Included within the red line boundary of the existing dwelling is an extended area of grass located at the west of the dwelling, whilst the area immediately to the rear and east side of the dwelling is more similar to a residential garden, although due to no occupancy of the dwelling is unkempt.



Planning History: Across the Jowett Farmstead, the following planning applications have been made:

- 2024/0514 - [Jowett House Farm] Prior approval application for change of use of agricultural buildings to single dwelling - Prior Approval – Granted 23rd July 2024
- 2021/1151 - [Jowett House Cottage] Conversion of a redundant Dovecot to form offices – Approved 12th November 2021
- 2021/0477 - [Jowett House Cottage] Change of use of building to independent dwelling (Listed Building Consent) – Approved with conditions 10th May 2021
- 2021/0278 [Jowett House Cottage] Change of use of building to independent dwelling – Approved with conditions 10th May 2021
- 2020/0365 - [Jowett House Cottage] Conversion of a redundant Dovecot to provide a living accommodation annexe to the existing farm - Approved with conditions 12th October 2020
- B/83/1498/PR/LB - [Jowett House Farm] Alterations to Dwelling and Conversion of Agricultural Building to form part of Dwelling [Listed Building Consent] – Approved with conditions 8th February 1983
- B/83/1497/PR - [Jowett House Farm] Alterations to Dwelling and Conversion of Agricultural Building to form part of Dwelling – Approved with conditions 8th February 1983
- B/82/1653/PR – [Jowett House Farm] Erection of three detached garages – Approved with conditions 20th January 1983
- B/82/0432/PR - [Jowett House Farm] Erection of agricultural building – Approved with conditions 17th June 1982

Proposed:

The proposal is for the subdivision of the dwelling into two dwellings; comprehensive refurbishment including underfloor heating provided by two air source heat pumps (ASHPs); landscaping of the immediate garden area and an area of land adjacent to the dwelling with the latter area including parking provision

Approximate Measurements:

All existing roof and eaves heights have been checked on the existing plans and remain unaltered on the proposed plans. The first floor is approximately a mirror image size of the ground floor.

| Approximate Size: | Current Dwelling | Dwelling One | Dwelling Two |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Width (rear elevation): | 21.33m | 12.41 | 8.92m |
| Width (Front elevation) | 21.33m | 12.2m | 9.13 |
| Length (side elevation 1): | 8.66m | 8.66m | n/a (shared) |
| Length (side elevation 2): | 9.02m | n/a (shared) | 9.02m |
| Area | 359.14 sqm | 197.55 sqm | 161.59 sqm |

The overall size of each dwelling, along with the gardens exceed the guidance for minimum size of new dwellings and garden areas respectively. Internal rooms standards meet or exceed the minimum sizing standards for each room, excluding two specific rooms. Bedroom 2 has been measured at 11.85 sqm, instead of the minimum of 12sqm. In the other proposed dwelling, the ground floor room described as an 'office/snug/utility/bedroom' is equally 0.15sqm under the 12m minimum.

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations





Local Plan Designation: Green Belt

Conservation Area: No

Neighbour Representations:

Letters were sent to nearby addresses; No comments were received.

Publicity: A site notice was posted close to the application address and a notice was published in the Local Barnsley Chronicle Newspaper

Consultees

Cawthorne Parish Council: No comments or objections received.

Conservation Officer: The conservation office provided a full and detailed report in regard to the existing dwelling, which is a Grade II Listed Building with National Heritage List for England number of 1314731, and the proposals for it. Subject to some amendments to the original plans, which have been adhered to, there was no objection from the Conservation Officer.

Forestry Officer: The removal of an existing fruit tree within the site, adjacent to the proposed Orchard Cottage has been approved by the forestry officer. There was no formal requirement to replace the tree but in the landscaping plans, also approved by the forestry office, seven fruit trees are proposed to be planted within the redline boundary of Jowett Farmhouse, along with Grasscrete and grassed areas. The native fruit trees are shown with indicative locations within the site plan and are to be · Three Domestic apple (*Malus x domestica*) trees, two Wild cherry (*Prunus avium*) trees and two Pear (*Pyrus communis*) trees.

Highways DC: Highways provided no objection to the proposal subject to a standard condition which requires a solid bound surface for parking and an informative about the public right of way. The proposal was assessed on the original site plan which included Grasscrete for the provision of parking and the turning circle. Although the site plan has gone through several revisions, the access arrangements, parking provision, materials including Grasscrete, and the boundary treatments shown on the original plan approved by Highways DC have remained constant.

Highways Drainage: Confirmed that the proposed plans were satisfactory.

Local Ward Councillors: No comments or objections received.

Pollution Control: Following initial concerns over the impact of the Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) units on neighbouring dwellings and noise; a noise impact assessment was carried out and additional mitigation of an acoustic fence, and relocation of an ASHP have been undertaken. Pollution control have now approved the application subject to a condition to be included on any decision notice issued.

Public Rights of Way: Subject to the public right of way remaining open and accessible, and a standard informative to be added to any decision notice, there is no objection.

Yorkshire Water: Acknowledgement was made by Yorkshire water of the proposal but as per their acknowledgement; no further consultation was provided in excess of the 21 days quoted, so it can be assumed that they had no further comments to make.

Policy Context

Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The Local Plan was adopted in January 2019 and is also now accompanied by seven masterplan frameworks which apply to the largest site allocations (housing, employment, and mixed-use sites). In addition, the Council has adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Neighbourhood Plans which provide supporting guidance and specific local policies and are a material consideration in the decision-making process.

The Local Plan review was approved at the full Council meeting on 24th November 2022. The review determined that the Local Plan remains fit for purpose and is adequately delivering its objectives. This means no updates to the Local Plan, in whole or in part, are to be carried out ahead of a further review. The next review is due to take place in 2027 or earlier if circumstances, require it.

NPPF

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in

the Framework as a whole; or where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted or unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In respect of this application, relevant policies include:

Section 12: Achieving well-designed and beautiful places -

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

Within section 12, paragraph 139 is the most relevant which indicate: -

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Within section 12, paragraphs 200 and 201 under sub heading 'Proposals affecting heritage assets' are the most relevant which indicate: -

200. 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. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

201. 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 into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Local Plan

In reference to this application, the following Local Plan policies are relevant:

D1 - High Quality Design and Place Making: Development is expected to be of a high quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and other features of Barnsley.

GB1 - Protection of Green Belt: The general extent of the Green Belt is set out on the Key Diagram. The detailed boundaries are defined on the Policies Map. Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national planning policy.

GB2 - Replacement, extension, and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt:

Provided it will not have a harmful impact on the appearance, or character and will preserve the openness of the Green Belt, we will allow the following development in the Green Belt:

Replacement buildings where the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than that which it replaces.

Extension or alteration of a building where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions does not exceed the size of the original building.

Dividing an existing house to form smaller units of accommodation.

All such development will be expected to:

Be of a high standard of design and respect the character of the existing building and its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and

Have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.

GD1 - General Development – Development will be approved if there will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents.

GS2 - Green Ways and Public Rights of Way We will protect Green Ways and Public Rights of Way from development that may affect their character or function. Where development affects an existing Green Way or Public Right of Way it must:

Protect the existing route within the development;

or Include an equally convenient and attractive alternative route.

Where new development is close to a Green Way or Public Right of Way it may be required to:

Provide a link to the existing route; and/or Improve an existing route; and/or Contribute to a new route.

HE1 - The Historic Environment: Positively encourage developments which will help in the management, conservation, understanding and enjoyment of Barnsley's historic environment, especially for those assets which are at risk.

HE2 – Heritage Statements and General Application Procedures: Proposals that are likely to affect known heritage assets or sites where it comes to light there is potential for the discovery of unrecorded heritage assets will be expected to include a description of the heritage significance of the site and its setting.

HE3 – Developments affecting Historic Buildings: Proposals involving additions or alterations to listed buildings or buildings of evident historic significance such as locally listed buildings (or their setting) should seek to conserve and where appropriate enhance that building's significance

SD1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development: When considering development proposals we will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

T4 - New Development & Highway Safety: New development will be expected to be designed and built to provide all transport users within and surrounding the development with safe, secure and convenient access and movement.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions

Design of Housing Development

The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide

It will be used by the four South Yorkshire local authorities to support their assessment of proposals. It incorporates both their planning and highway responsibilities.

Assessment

Principle of development

The dwelling is a Grade II historically listed structure and is located within land designated as Green Belt. Extensions or alterations to residential properties are in general considered acceptable where they do not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of surrounding residents, visual amenity or on highway safety. For both historically listed dwellings and those located within the Green Belt, additional specific local and national policies provide further restrictions and requirements in regard to the information required from the applicant, the assessment of the proposals and restrictions to what development may be allowed. This includes the provision of a heritage statement by the applicant; assessment by the Conservation Officer; the maximum size of an extended dwelling; the material choices used within the development; consideration of its appropriateness; and finally, the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.

Heritage Assessment

The conservation office provided a full and detailed report regarding the existing dwelling and the proposed works. The recommendations at the end of the below appraisal have been implemented accordingly with the removal of a proposed third door at Jowett Farmhouse and ground mounting and screening of both ASHPs, with one requiring an acoustic barrier fence in regard to pollution control (noise), whilst the ASHP at Orchard House is screened as suggested by a low boundary stone wall.

Appraisal

“This application seeks permission to subdivide Jowett House Farmhouse (NLHE 1314731) into two dwellings and generally improve the interior through re-arrangement, with underfloor heating supplied by air source heat pumps. The house is currently vacant and has failed to attract long term tenants owing to its inflexibility of layout and somewhat outdated and dilapidated internal fit out. Damp is present in several locations with mould obvious on a number of timber structures including

within the roof space and in the understairs cupboards owing to poor circulation and lack of effective heating. The building has obvious heritage significance reflected in the listing and it is a relatively complete and good example of an early C17 Yeoman's farmhouse. The building illustrates two distinct phases of development with the eastern thinly coursed section being the early C17 end, and the western end being later, with both ends having heavy quoins. Windows are mullioned and deeply set with deep internal chamfered jambs. There are two stacks in ashlar on a stone slate roof. To the south the roof has straight eaves but to the north the roof has two catslides. The submission includes a detailed heritage statement that sets out the significance of the asset, the sensitivity of the setting (there are 2x listed buildings adjacent), and the overall impact of the proposed changes. Usefully, the HIA also includes a comprehensive set of photos (section 7) of the building (both external and internal) and at section 8. There is also an assessment of each intervention, its relative impact on the significance, proposed measures to mitigate and an overall evaluation of each item of works. Generally, I agree with the assessment and overall, I am comfortable with the proposal. The internal re-organisation is relatively light touch and involves the blocking of the GF and FF connecting door that links the older section to the new. This achieves the subdivision into two units with various other alterations or removal of lightweight partitions. These create an ensuite, bathroom, and a new stair enclosure at the western end of the western dwelling in the area where modern blockwork walls can be seen. In the eastern dwelling a north south dividing stud will create a new utility room. At the east end of the eastern dwelling there is a partition wall that runs east-west beneath an oak beam that currently stops at a small window. It is proposed to move this wall a small distance to the north and block the doorway (it is modern so of little harm) and open the small, chamfered window into a doorway allowing access from the east. My presumption is that this is required for fire safety reasons, and I feel although the loss of the small, chamfered gable window is regrettable and introduces some harm, this is justified. However, I feel the new GF doorway in the southern elevation between the mullioned windows is not required (this would total x3 doors for the dwelling) and is not justified. Generally, I note a new ventilated cavity fixed on tracks above and below (not to the walls) with insulation (wool / Thermafleece) to all external walls. New insulation is also proposed at roof level, and detailed sections of both these measures are included which is welcome. The underfloor heating is acceptable as I noted on my site visit the floors are mainly screed at GF. However, where any stone flag floor or historic boards remain, these should be carefully lifted then replaced following installation of the heating. I note the proposal to utilise air source pumps to serve the underfloor heating with the units on the east and west gables. I see little harm in the unit on the western gable as this is hidden and will be partly screened by cars. However, I do have a concern over the degree of visibility of the eastern gable both from within the curtilage but also from the setting of the other adjacent listed buildings. Consequently, I feel the air source heat pump on the eastern gable should be screened from view. In fact, both units should be mounted on the ground and hidden as much as is possible. Screening by planting or even a low drystone wall would avoid visibility of the unit's harming views of the gables (particularly the eastern gable).

Overall, however there are few issues with the application and if my suggested amendments can be incorporated I'd raise no objections."

Residential Amenities

The principle of a residential dwelling is already established and no expansion of the dwelling is proposed. There are limited modifications to the external appearance of the dwelling although external modifications are predominantly limited to renovation, landscaping, the installation of an air source heat pump (ASHP) at each property, and a new entrance door on the northeast side elevation. The primary concern would be the potential impact of one dwelling house becoming two. On this occasion, whilst undoubtedly there would be a change within the farmstead, this change would be limited. Rather than two completely new dwellings being constructed, a former but recently unoccupied dwelling is being brought back into use as two smaller individual dwellings. As there appears to be a working farm within the broader farmstead, the additional daily use of two dwellings as homes should not cause any significant issues in comparison to a working farm; there is no indication that the dwellings would be used as short-term holiday lets. Following the provision of a noise impact assessment and assessment by Pollution Control regarding noise, subject to a planning condition, the ASHP units have been deemed not to have a significant impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwellings.

In consideration of the amenity of the occupants of the two new dwellings, the overall minimum space standards have been met for both houses and their gardens. The rooms within the dwelling to be known as Jowett Farmhouse, all rooms with the exception of one bedroom meet the required space standards. Bedroom 2 has been measured as approximately 12.25sqm on the original plan but possibly due to installation, this is reduced to 11.85sqm on the proposed plans, which is less than the guidance of 12sqm. With the difference being only 0.15sqm, , and with the remaining rooms and combined house exceeding the size guidance, it would seem sensible to accept this slight inadequacy on the size of this room. For the dwelling to be known as Orchard Cottage, all rooms meet the required size standards both overall and for each room, when the house is considered as a two-bedroom, three-person house.

Visual Amenity

Excluding a proposed new door on the front elevation and the new ASHPs heat pumps, there are limited changes to the appearance of the actual dwelling, and the external changes which would be undertaken would be in order to improve the appearance and maintain historical value of the dwelling. Internally understandably more significant changes have been proposed but approved by the Conservation Officer. Landscaping around the dwellings would be undertaken to increase the amenity value of the potential residents of the dwellings, whilst also minimizing the impact on visual amenity, openness of the green belt and to an extent improvement to both the visual and subsequently residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings within the broader farmstead.

Starting with Orchard Cottage, the proposed landscaping would include the provision of two Grasscrete parking spaces, reducing the requirement for out of character tarmac, block paved or similar out of character parking provision. This parking provision would require the removal of an existing tree and a small boundary wall, but an increased number of trees are proposed elsewhere on site, and a replacement 1m stone wall would be provided behind the parking provision to provide formal separation of the parking provision and garden area. The ASHP for Orchard cottage would also be positioned on the side elevation of the dwelling, but behind the stone wall, helping to

reduce its visual impact, as required by the Conservation Officer. Of the two proposed dwellings, Orchard Cottage would have the larger of the two newly defined rear gardens, also extending to a side garden at this dwelling.

Jowett Farmhouse would feature a smaller formal rear garden, but this would still be considerably larger than the minimum outlined in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide. The parking provision for three vehicles would be located within the proposed redline boundary for Jowett House but would be outside of the more formal garden area and located within the stone wall and hedged garden area, which would also be the location for ASHP, an existing telegraph pole, a proposed small orchard and a Grasscrete turning area for tractor access to the orchard. Regarding visual amenity, the existing stone wall of the extended garden area would be broadly maintained but with a section removed to allow new access, this would really only be visible within the farmstead. The access would be approximately 5.15m wide, with a 1.5m boundary hedge at either side, approximately 5m in length to the east of the access, and 6m to the west of the access, which would also continue south for approximately 18m, including a small access gate for the telegraph pole and ASHP enclosures, whilst also dividing the extended garden area from the formal rear garden and house. This hedge would support the screening of the parking and turning area from both Jowett House Farm and other dwellings, or buildings within the farmstead.

Grasscrete has again been used for both the parking provision, turning circle and access into the garden area, again reducing the requirement for unsympathetic materials, the rest of the garden/orchard area would feature grass as currently it is. Between the proposed hedge at either side of the access point and the parking/turning area are two areas of additional lawn, which minimize the amount of Grasscrete being used to what is essential for parking and turning. A 1.5m high timber fence and a twin 5 bar gate internally separate the proposed seven tree orchard from the parking and turning area. Such a fence would be a typical feature of what may be found on or around a farm, so would not have a negative impact upon visual amenity.

Potentially less visually appealing but something which is required to reduce the noise impact of the ASHP is a 1.8m high timber fence enclosure around the exiting telegraph pole and proposed ASHP. Including an access gate from the rear garden of Jowett Farmhouse, enclosure is just under 8 sqm, so within the broader scale of the large development, and its proximity to the dwelling would have a modest impact on visual amenity but would be more visually appealing than an ASHP unit, which has additionally been required to be screened by The Conservation Officer.

Impact Upon Green Belt and Heritage

Undoubtably there would be some impact upon the historic farmhouse, its setting and the openness of the Green Belt. However, on balance there is not any single or combined aspect which has a significant enough impact to be considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt nor would it have a significant impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or have significant detrimental impact on the historical dwelling or its setting. Each modest impact, from the division of the dwelling into two units, the use of ASHP units, the increase in parking provision, to a loss of a tree, and sections of stone wall can all be justified. Furthermore, each aspect has sustainable credentials, both economically and environmentally, and would use of appropriate materials within the existing setting. Focusing on this immediate setting of a working farmstead, the material choices

such as timber fencing and hedging would be akin to what is expected whilst the use of Grasscrete would reduce the visual and environmental impact of more traditional materials. When viewed from afar, even the timber ASHP enclosure would become less significant, with the existing telegraph pole being more prominent. In a similar manner the proposed hedging and timber fence within the proposed orchard area, along with the Grasscrete would be less prominent but when visible would appear suitable in comparison to the broader farmstead. Finally the proposed orchard would eventually, as it matures, help diffuse the view of the cottages, although with the historic nature of the cottages, this would not be a requirement but may help disguise the parking area and acoustic fence further.

Green Belt Calculations

It would appear unclear from the available evidence that the original converted dwelling has been extended post 1948, with a query over a 1980's application. However, with no proposed extension to the building in this instance, the dwelling has been assessed as being as it originally stood in 1948. The current presumed size of the original dwelling, as stood in 1948, and the individual size of each proposed dwelling are detailed below and show that the proposal would have no significant detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Approximate Measurements:

| Original Dwelling | Jowett Farmhouse | Orchard Cottage |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ground floor: 179.61 sqm | Ground floor: 98.8 sqm | Ground floor: 80.82 sqm |
| First floor: 179.53 sqm | First floor: 98.75 sqm | First floor: 80.77 sqm |
| Total: 359.14 sqm | Total: 197.55 sqm | Total: 161.59 sqm |

Highway Safety

There are no proposed changes to access to the site and highways have confirmed existing access is suitable, but new parking arrangements and a turning circle have been provided in locations adjacent to each dwelling. Subject to conditions, Highways DC raised no objections to the proposals which include adequate parking provision for each dwelling. Consequently, there would be no significant detrimental impact on highway safety.

Recommendation: Approve with conditions