

5.40 The SPD suggests the following design points should be followed:

- A structural survey will be required as part of any planning application;
- The existing appearance of the building(s) should be retained. With any adaptation or conversion a balance must be struck between practical requirements of a new use and protection of the special character, significance, and appearance of the barn and its setting.
- Existing openings should be used and minimum of new openings would be expected. In particular, glazing and frames should be deeply recessed, or bedded directly into or behind masonry to reduce reflections and visual impact. Wherever possible, existing joinery should be repaired and retained. New doors and window frames should be timber, and doors should be vertically boarded, ledged and braced.
- The introduction of dormer windows is generally inappropriate unless evidence clearly exists of their use.
- Rooflights may be appropriate, but these should be traditional in design, of low profile, vertically emphasised, and with a single vertical divider.
- Wall and roofing materials should match the existing materials (generally coursed sandstone or stone flags/slates to the roof), and pointing should be lime mortar and recessed in the joint.
- The building should be capable of alteration with the minimum of extensions.
- Extensions (when required) should normally be located on the short or gabled elevation of the barn, typically incorporating a single pitch or 'lean to roof' avoiding deviations from a single rectangular plan.
- Where proposals include any extension on the longer elevation, clear and convincing justification for this departure must be provided. This should include robust design rationale and evidence of locally occurring historic precedents (such as side aisled barns) that show the proposal reflects and enhances the locality and the building.
- A survey of existing trees and hedgerows and proposals for their retention should be submitted where appropriate.

[Supplementary Planning Documents: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations \(May 2019\)](#)

5.41 Regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings in the Green Belt, the guidance states the following:

- The total size of the proposed and previous extension should not exceed the size of the original dwelling.

- The original dwelling must form the dominant visual feature of the dwelling as extended.
- Domestic outbuildings within the curtilage of the dwelling will be treated as part of the dwelling or an extension to it, except for the purposes of calculating the original size of the dwelling.

5.42 In terms of listed buildings, the guidance advises that restrictions apply and as such the applicant should engage with the Conservation Officer at the earliest opportunity.

[Supplementary Planning Documents: Design of Housing Development \(May 2019\)](#)

5.43 The Design of Housing SPD covers provides guidance on the design of new housing development and conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use. It covers points such as space standards, character, health and wellbeing, designing out crime, design of residential car parking and garages, gardens and boundary treatments, landscape design, trees and hedgerows and other features of ecological value, public rights of way and waste provision.

5.44 Other relevant SPDs produced by the Council are:

- Mortar Mixes for Historic Buildings (Adopted May 2019)
- Heritage Impact Assessment (Adopted May 2019)
- Parking (Adopted November 2019)
- Biodiversity and Geodiversity (Adopted May 2019)

[Historic England Enabling Development and Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4 \(June 2020\)](#)

5.45 The above document sets out advice on enabling development, against the background of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guide (PPG).

5.46 The note defines enabling development as:

“development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset’.

5.47 The note states that, paragraph 202 of the NPPF (N.B. this is now paragraph 208 so it will be referred to as such) recognises that conflict with planning policies may be justified if the development proposed would secure the future conservation of the asset(s) and the wider benefits outweigh the disbenefits of not adhering to those policies. In such cases, enabling development is an entirely legitimate planning tool. Paragraph 80b of the NPPF also indicates that enabling development may be an acceptable exception to the restriction on isolated homes in the countryside. However, such circumstances may only transpire once all the relevant tests in the NPPF, including paragraph 208, have been addressed.

- 5.48 Paragraph 8 of the note states that a typical example of enabling development may be a proposal for houses near a listed building that would not normally be given planning permission (for example because it would be in breach of countryside policies), but where the listed building's long-term future can only be secured by using the uplift in value of the land resulting from that development. Some enabling development might result in an adverse impact on the asset even though if possible it should be sited so as to avoid doing so. Well-designed enabling development will minimise potential adverse effects.
- 5.49 Paragraph 9 of the note clarifies that the case for enabling development rests on there being a conservation deficit. Simply put, this is the amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair or conversion, allowing for appropriate development costs.
- 5.50 Enabling development is generally considered to be a last resort as the harm done by enabling development contrary to other planning policies is likely to be permanent and irreversible. Other reasonable alternative means should be considered initially to conserve the heritage asset, for example, preventative measures, grant-funding for repairs and reuse, transfer of ownership to a building preservation trust or similar charity, sympathetic development proposals or the possibility of using enforcement or compulsory purchase powers.
- 5.51 In terms of when enabling development might be justifiable, the Historic England Guidance states at paragraph 15 that this is when the enabling development would secure the future of a heritage asset when other reasonable efforts have failed, and the balance articulated in paragraph 208 is met, i.e. the future conservation of the asset is secured and the disbenefits of departing from conflicting planning policies are outweighed by the benefits.
- 5.52 Paragraph 25 details that if the local planning authority decides that a scheme of enabling development is justified in principle, it will need to ensure that long-term conservation of the heritage asset is secured, thereby avoiding the need to revisit consents with a view to approving further development. This can be achieved by using conditions and planning obligations to ensure the repair and maintenance of the asset can be secured and enforced. The planning authority should also closely monitor the implementation and use enforcement powers where necessary. In some cases, depending on circumstances, a performance bond may offer a method of providing funds to complete the repairs to the heritage asset should the developer fail to do so.
- 5.53 The note recommends undertaking a number of preliminary tasks before moving onto a detailed enabling proposal. These may include:
- Engaging with the LPA and other consultees as appropriate;
 - A preliminary assessment as to whether the future of the heritage asset may be secured by alternative uses, through sale to another owner, other ownership arrangements, e.g. a charitable trust, or through funds available from other sources. This will involve an initial assessment of the level of the conservation deficit.
 - Begin market testing early in the process;

- If, after this, enabling development appears to be genuinely necessary, a desk-based viability assessment can identify the need for further detailed evaluation to improve confidence in pursuing a successful enabling development scheme.

5.54 Paragraph 29 sets out a list of actions which should be followed in order to provide a full case which meets the requirements of paragraph 208:

- Carry out a condition survey of the heritage asset which should inform a conservation statement or management plan which established the importance of the asset as a whole;
- Undertake an options analysis comprising an assessment of alternative solutions by which the asset's future might be secured;
- Carry out an assessment of the cost of repairs and how future maintenance liabilities might be met;
- Make an assessment of the market value of the heritage asset in current and repaired condition. The conservation deficit may then be calculated;
- Draw up a detailed scheme design for the preferred option;
- Produce a development appraisal that demonstrates the financial contribution the development will make to the conservation of the heritage asset;
- Create a delivery plan that demonstrates how the heritage benefits will be secured in a timely manner.

SECTION 6: PLANNING ASSESSMENT

6.1 This section considers the proposals within the context of the planning policies and guidance set out in Section 4 of this statement. The key matters on the determination of the applications for full planning permission and listed building consent include:

- Principle of Development;
- Enabling Development;
- Design and Heritage Considerations;
- Amenity Considerations;
- Highways Considerations;
- Biodiversity and Landscape;
- Drainage;
- Other Material Considerations;
- Very Special Circumstances; and
- Planning Balance.

Principle of Development

6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) states that the local development plan should be the starting point when considering a planning application. The development plan of relevance in this case is the Barnsley Local Plan 2019.

6.3 In policy terms, the Application Site is located outside of any settlement area and it is wholly within the Green Belt.

6.4 Paragraph 149 of the NPPF makes clear that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt except for in a limited range of circumstances. In terms of these proposals, the restoration of the existing Hall and Cottage are acceptable in principle on the basis that the use of neither has been abandoned and subject to the proposed alterations and extension being acceptable in design terms. Similarly Green Belt policy considers the conversion of existing buildings and extensions that do not represent disproportionate additions to be appropriate forms of development in principle. However, the proposed erection of 4no. new dwellings utilising the historic footprints of buildings which are no longer in situ, in policy terms are deemed to be 'inappropriate development' (policy 147 of NPPF) and should only be granted where Very Special Circumstances can be demonstrated. Taking into account the wording of paragraph 148 of the NPPF, Very Special Circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposals, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In this instance there is considered to be compelling Very Special Circumstances and these are discussed in detail later in this section.

Purposes of the Green Belt

6.5 Paragraph 137 NPPF details the five purposes that the Green Belt serves. Below the scheme is assessed against each of these purposes:

to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

- 6.6 As the Site is located away from the edge of a large, built-up area and the development itself is very much contained within an existing, developed site, it will not impact this purpose.

to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

- 6.7 As above, as the Site is already developed it does not prevent towns from merging into each other. The proposals are well contained within the boundaries of the existing Site.

to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

- 6.8 The development will not extend beyond the boundaries of the existing built-up Site and as such will not encroach into the wider countryside. Furthermore, it will seek to mirror historic buildings which were present on the Site between 1850-1950 by utilising their footprints. The proposals have also been designed to be agricultural in appearance, which are more sensitive within a countryside location.

to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

- 6.9 The Site is not located within or close to a historic town and as such this criterion is not applicable.

to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

- 6.10 The proposals do largely seek to reuse derelict land, with the addition of some sensitive new build elements in order to make the scheme viable. As such it is in line with this purpose.

Impact on the openness of the Green Belt

- 6.11 In terms of the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt, the new build elements of the scheme are contained within the boundaries of the existing Site and will be very much viewed as an extension of an existing, developed site. The new build elements have been designed to be subservient to the existing built structures on the site, in order to minimise impact to the openness of the Green Belt. The Site also benefits from a good level of screening from existing mature trees, as is detailed in the accompanying Arboricultural Report.
- 6.12 The LVIA finds that whilst the landscape setting of the Application Site is potentially highly sensitive to change, due to its location within an agricultural setting within the Green Belt, the Proposed Development is however anticipated to have limited effects on the local and wider landscape character of the area, or on the openness and purpose of the Green Belt by virtue of its location within an established farmyard.
- 6.13 A plan has been submitted as part of the proposals (ref: Footprints 808_PL06A) which compares the existing footprints and the proposed footprints of the development. This shows that the buildings located on the Site between c1850 and c1950 (as established from reviewing

historic maps) totalled 1,453sqm. There are an additional 382sqm of more modern buildings which post-date the historic maps which are proposed to be demolished. These proposals total 1,220sqm, which is overall a reduction in floorspace when compared to what has been on the Site historically. The removal of the imposing portal framed barn and metal containers on the Site will have the benefit of tidying it up and opening up part of the landscape. As such the impact on the openness of the Green Belt will be limited when considered in context.

Enabling Development

6.14 Notwithstanding the Green Belt policy considerations outlined above, as identified in the previous section of this statement, Historic England have provided concise guidance on 'Enabling Development' which is of particular relevance to these proposals with this being considered in detail below.

6.15 The fundamental premise of enabling development as outlined in Historic England's guidance 'Enabling Development and Heritage Assets' is that it is in itself development which is not in compliance with local and/or national planning policies and would not normally be given planning permission except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset and in such instances it is a "perfectly legitimate planning tool".

6.16 Paragraph 9 of the aforementioned guidance states that the case for enabling development rests on their being a conservation deficit with this being defined as;

"The amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair and conversion, allowing for all appropriate development costs."

6.17 In this regard, at the inception of these proposals, the Applicant first considered a scheme which would facilitate the restoration of the Grade 2 Hall with it being apparent from the outset due to the significant lack of investment over many years, the rising cost of materials and the relatively modest sales values in the area that even excluding the costs of acquiring the Site, that it would not be viable to undertake this restoration in isolation of other development. Fine Country who are local residential agents have calculated the GDV of a conversion scheme which restores the Hall and Cottage and converts the remaining barns to 3no. additional dwellings and Lucas Lee have undertaken a cost plan with this showing that this scheme will result in a significant financial loss which no developer would be prepared to pursue. Even excluding the original cost of acquiring the Site would result in a financial loss.

6.18 Having determined that the above scenario would not provide a viable solution for the Site, an alternative scheme which provides an additional 5no new dwellings which are based upon the historic footprints and reinstates the original farm complex has been prepared. This has also been valued by Fine Country and costed by Lucas Lee and demonstrates that this scheme is viable with a modest developer profit achieved.

6.19 It is evident from these figures provided within these reports that even with a policy compliant scheme comprising a total of 5 dwellings that there will be a significant conservation deficit and in order to overcome this and ultimately facilitate a comprehensive restoration of the

Listed Hall, additional development is required.

- 6.20 The specific heritage merits of the proposed scheme is given detailed analysis later in this section as well as in the accompanying Heritage Impact Assessment, but as is demonstrated in the accompanying Fine Country Valuation and Lucas Lee costings, the addition of a further 5no. new build dwellings which will be based upon historic footprints of buildings which have since collapsed and/or been removed will require a significant investment and will deliver a profit which is below the level of return most developers would expect given the inherent risk associated with development, particularly involving historic buildings such as this where there can be substantial defects and abnormalities.
- 6.21 The level of development that is proposed is the minimum level required in order to create a viable scheme with this being robustly demonstrated within the accompanying documents and as is discussed later in this section has been designed in a sympathetic manner which seeks to minimise harm upon the heritage assets and the Green Belt. At the centre of these proposals is the restoration of the Listed Farmhouse and bringing it up to a standard which secures its long term future by creating a family home that meets modern living standards. The amount of restoration to this building is substantial and includes the following;
- Water ingress/damp and timber infestation damage throughout, including water ingress in the attic which has caused the collapse of part of an historic lath and plaster ceiling, all of which needs to be repaired through a scheme of sympathetic timber repair and conservation
 - Significant repair works to the roof is likely. The roof will need to be stripped with slate stockpiled and reused, new softwood battens and potentially the replacement of existing hardwood oak rafters with new softwood rafters.
 - Roof covering of the outbuilding is in very poor condition and a full new roof is expected to be required.
 - Some of its copings have been lost and need to be replaced
 - The Farmhouse has also been vandalised with most of its ground floor windows smashed, which will require replacement.
 - Modernisation of the building.
- 6.22 Given the location of the Site which has accesses only suitable for domestic vehicles and not commercial traffic, together with the low values with the area, it is considered that a residential led development is the only way in which to secure a viable scheme which minimises the overall level of new-build. A commercial led scheme would not be attractive to the market and with lower per sqft sales values would require a more significant level of new development to achieve a viable scheme which would have a greater impact upon the Green Belt and the heritage assets. Furthermore, it is necessary to develop the Site holistically, as prospective purchasers of the farmhouse and cottage are far more likely to be interested in buying a dwelling that is surrounded by well-maintained buildings than a 'ghost' farmstead in a derelict

state that is likely to target further anti-social behaviour. The proposed works are therefore designed to provide a new use for the defunct outbuildings on the Site whilst sensitively upgrading the disused dwellings to encourage their re-habitation. The provision of a viable use for the outbuildings and a strategy to make occupation of the existing residential structures an appealing prospect and will provide an economic catalyst for the consolidation of all of the buildings on the Site which, in turn, will enhance their longevity and the contribution they make to the historic environment.

- 6.23 In terms of securing funding, despite the fact that the farmhouse is classified as being at risk, it would not qualify for grant aid as it is Grade II listed rather than Grade I and Grade II*, which precludes funding from Historic England, and will remain in private ownership, which precludes other sources of funding.
- 6.24 Historic England's guidance on Enabling Development outlines how such development can be secured and promotes the use of conditions/obligations as appropriate to secure the repair and maintenance of the asset itself can be secured and enforced with the funds necessary to secure restoration being made available as early as possible in the course of the scheme. In line with this guidance, the Applicant is happy to agree the mechanics of how this restoration can be secured with the Local Planning Authority including the preparation of a delivery plan as it has not been possible to do so as part of the pre-application dialogue that was available.
- 6.25 However, in the pre-application comments from the LPA's conservation officer dated 13th July 2021 it is stated that:

"I would support a genuinely conservation-based approach to conversion and enabling development based on a detailed assessment of the historic farmstead. I would suggest this will require a detailed building recording which forms a comprehensive analytical record to Historic England level 4. This will then be used to maximise the conservation of surviving buildings / fabric and guide the design of enabling development."

- 6.26 The Applicant's are happy to accept a condition requiring a level 4 recording, should permission be granted.

Design and Heritage Considerations

- 6.27 A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been produced by 1 Voyage, who have provided detailed feedback to the architects during the evolution of the proposals.
- 6.28 The report assesses the significance of all of the buildings on the Site. Recognising that the Farmhouse is Grade II listed, the HIA concludes that the Farm Cottage is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset due to it containing a medieval cruck blade and an attached wattle and daub partition which contains a door opening. Furthermore, the cart shed/stables which are attached to the Farm Cottage (referred to in this report as Barn 1) are considered to be curtilage listed, as they have the closest visual and psychological connection with the farmhouse and are connected to the house by a stone path and therefore contribute the most to its immediate setting. Whilst the agricultural outbuildings on the Site contribute to the setting

and significance of the listed Farmhouse, these are not themselves curtilage listed for reasons detailed in the HIA.

- 6.29 The HIA considers that the works proposed to the listed Farmhouse are modest and alterations are limited to the creation of a subservient, ground floor extension on the western gable which will enable the curtilage listed coal store and w.c. to be brought into use. This extension will be well contained by existing structures. A single new opening is also proposed to create better flow between the drawing room and proposed living space. This opening will undermine the historic separation of the ancillary service space and formal living accommodation and lead to limited loss of historic skirting board. However, the harm is considered to be justified by the need to attract new residents to the farmhouse and will be offset by the economic investment in much needed repairs which will consolidate this building at risk and prevent its further decline.
- 6.30 The proposals include retaining the curtilage listed stable as a workshop space, which represents a sensitive approach to the conservation of this building and is a use which will enable the retention of the features which contribute to the building's historic interest. The connection to the adjacent cow shed, creation of new openings for light and introduction of modern floor and wall surfaces will lead to the loss of a small amount of historic fabric and minor harm to the floor plan and historic character of the building. However, the work is considered to be essential to provide a new use for the structure and promote its longevity. The harm is therefore considered to be justified and offset by the public benefit of consolidating this curtilage listed structure. The minor harm will be further offset by the blocking up of the opening in the original cart shed gable which will better reveal the fact that this was originally a discrete structure.
- 6.31 The works to Farm Cottage (a potential non-designated heritage asset) are also sensitive and conserve those elements which contribute most to its heritage significance, namely the medieval cruck and historic ceiling timbers, the wide stairs and the Victorian fireplace. The modern windows with horizontal, top hung casements and boarded openings will be replaced with simple, side-hung casement windows of more traditional, vertical proportions. The modern doors will be replaced with a vernacular, boarded doors and the modern ceiling above the stair will also be lifted to increase head height. The building will additionally be repaired to limit further structural decline. All proposed works will conserve or better reveal the heritage significance of the building. Works to enhance the appearance, and better reveal the historic interest, of the front elevation will also enhance the setting of the listed Farmhouse and curtilage listed cart shed/stables.
- 6.32 The HIA states that the works to convert the outbuildings which contribute to the setting and significance of the listed farmhouse will lead to some harm to the setting of the Farmhouse. This will result from the creation of new openings in external walls and roofs, the introduction of new boundaries to create individual curtilages and the introduction of modern surface materials and lighting to the yards, all of which will undermine the agricultural character and historic interest of the farmstead. This will erode the contribution that these structures make to the historic interest of the listed building's setting. These works are, however, considered to be essential to provide a new use for these structures, in order to promote their longevity and the

positive contribution that they make to the significance of the listed Farmhouse. The harm is therefore considered to be justified and offset by the public benefit of consolidating these historic, vernacular buildings. Further mitigation and public benefit will arise from the demolition of the large, modern agricultural sheds which will limit the encroachment of modern structures to the west and enhance the approach to, and setting of, the listed farmhouse (see Figure 5 below). As non-curtilage listed structures, the internal impact of the proposals on the farm buildings is not considered to result in harm to significance. The proposals will also provide an opportunity for these buildings to be recorded prior to conversion.



Figure 5: View towards Farmhouse from western approach with modern structures seen

- 6.33 The HIA considers that the construction of the new dwellings, which utilise the footprints of former outbuildings will cause some harm to the historic interest and setting of the listed farmhouse through the introduction of contemporary, non-vernacular structures with a non-agricultural ratio of wall to void. The proposed structures are considered essential, however, to help fund the conservation deficit which enable the historic structures on site to be consolidated and conserved for future generations to enjoy. The proposed structures will also better reveal the historic extent of the farmstead, whilst the proposed arrangement of the staggered dwellings will also better reveal the historic use of structures within this part of the Site. They will therefore better reveal the heritage significance of the Application Site. There is therefore sufficient public benefit arising from the construction of these replacement structures to offset the less than substantial harm to heritage significance that they will generate.
- 6.34 Further public benefit will arise from exposing historic, stone paths and potential cobbles within the yards which have become overgrown. The exposure and retention of these historic surfaces will also better reveal the historic interest of the site.
- 6.35 The report concludes that some harm to heritage significance will arise from the loss of compromised historic fabric, changes to both the buildings and their settings which are required to facilitate the proposed residential use, and the introduction of new, contemporary dwellings within the rural setting of the listed farmhouse. It does acknowledge however that the harm will be offset by the restoration of the historic buildings which will help conserve the historic and artistic interest that the setting of the listed farmhouse contributes towards its significance.
- 6.36 It is considered that the proposed conversions will provide a new use for the redundant, historic