

**2021/1127 (Planning)**  
**2021/1361 (Listed Building Consent)**

Chris Carr

Demolition of walling, erection of rear two storey extension, installation of velux roof windows, erection of garage block, erection of stone boundary walls, amendment to vehicular access and installation of gates

Bank House Farm, High Street, Silkstone, Barnsley, S75 4FZ

**Relevant Planning History**

There are no relevant planning applications for Bank House Farm. Other planning applications associated with the site relate to the conversion of the barns to the rear of Bank House Farm.

**Site Description**

Bank House Farm is a prominent Grade II Listed Farmhouse. To the rear of the Farmhouse are two barns which have been converted into residential dwellings. Bank House comprises a former estate building and later farmhouse built in the early 19th Century and associated with prominent landowners John Smyth and Robert Coldwell Clarke. The building retains its original form and many of its external architectural details, although its interior has suffered from later changes and extensive damage caused by fire and disuse. The house is of national significance on account of its architectural and historical interest owing to its age, quality of design, and association with historic figures. This is reflected in its status as a Grade II Listed Building.

The site is prominent from the A628, with the two storey Grade II Listed Farmhouse being situated at the front of the site with the barns being situated behind at a higher level. The Farm has an access and separate parking area for the farmhouse which is an unmade track that joins onto the A628. A Public Right of Way runs along the northern boundary of the site.






### **Proposed Development**

The applicant is seeking Planning and Listed Building Consent approval for the demolition of walling, erection of rear two storey extension, installation of velux roof windows, erection of garage block, erection of 1.5m dry stone boundary walls along the boundaries of the site, amendment to vehicular access and installation of electric 1.5m high gates at Bank House Farm, Silkstone.

The alterations and extensions would be made good using matching reclaimed materials. The position of the garage has been slightly altered during the processing of the application so that it is sited further to the rear of the site in order for the Listed Building to be set in front of the building line.

**plans as proposed  
site plan**





## Policy Context

The new Local Plan was adopted at the full Council meeting held 3rd January 2019 after it was found to be sound by the appointed Planning Inspector following the examination process. This means that it now takes on full weight for decision making process in planning law terms as the development plan for the Borough, superseding the remaining saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan (adopted in the year 2000) and the Core Strategy (adopted in 2011). In reference to this application, the following policies are relevant:

GD1: General development – Proposals for general development will be approved providing there is no significant adverse effect on residential amenity, highway safety, the current or future use of nearby land and it upholds good quality design in accordance with local plan policy D1.

D1: High quality design and place making – This policy sets the overarching design principles for the borough. Development is expected to be of high-quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and features of the local area.

GB2 – Replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings within the Green Belt – Provided that the development will not have a harmful impact on the appearance or character and will preserve the openness of the Green Belt, we will allow 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.

HE1: Historic Environment - We will 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.

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. In such circumstances proposals will be expected to respect historic precedents of scale, form, massing, architectural detail and the use of appropriate materials that contribute to the special interest of a building.

T4: New development and highway improvement - 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.

Poll1: Pollution Control and Protection - Development will be expected to demonstrate that it is not likely to result, directly or indirectly, in an increase in air, surface water and groundwater, noise, smell, dust, vibration, light or other pollution which would unacceptably affect or cause a nuisance to the natural and built environment or to people. We will not allow development of new housing or other environmentally sensitive development where existing air pollution, noise, smell, dust, vibration, light or other pollution levels are unacceptable and there is no reasonable prospect that these can be mitigated against.

Developers will be expected to minimise the effects of any possible pollution and provide mitigation measures where appropriate.

BIO1: Development will be expected to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and geological features of the borough.

#### SPDs:

House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations

#### NPPF:

The NPPF 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.

#### **Consultations**

Silkstone PC – No comments received

Highways DC – No objections subject to condition

Conservation Officer – No objection subject to amendment and conditions.

SYAS – No comments received

#### **Representations**

Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding residents and a site notice placed nearby. 1 comment has been received which states:-

- Fencing has been erected to fence off the public right of way, along with gates. The path is currently unsafe as there are raised manhole covers and drainage holes. It is a route that is used by lots of locals, including cubs, scouts and beavers to walk to Silverwood. This new fencing does not appear on the plans.

## **Assessment**

### Principle of development

As the building is set within the Green Belt, the replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings within the Green Belt are acceptable in principle provided that the development will not have a harmful impact on appearance or character and will preserve the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with policy GB2 of the Local Plan.

GB2 states that we will allow extension or alterations of a building where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions does not exceed the size of the original building. The floor spaces have been calculated and the proposed extensions do not exceed the size of the original dwelling. There are no records of the dwelling having been extended previously and the proposed extension and garage do not exceed the floor limit of the original dwelling and are therefore acceptable in terms of policy GB2.

The dwelling is a Listed Building therefore policies HE1 and HE3 are also of relevance. These aspects are discussed below within the visual amenity section of this report.

### Visual Amenity/Impact on Historic Environment

The Conservation Officer has been consulted given that the building is Grade II Listed and is of national significance. The Conservation Officer has provided the following detailed comments:-

‘This application follows pre-application submission 2021 ENQ 00300 for the same scheme. In response to this I advised that for the application a detailed heritage statement would be required setting out the heritage interest of the building, the contributing values and factors that make up the historic significance and a properly weighted / justified impact assessment. I am pleased to say this has been included with the app in the form of the TJC report. This is detailed logical and well written and sets out clearly the historic context of the farmstead and its architectural form and evolution. The statement also objectively describes the heritage values that contribute to the historic significance and how the proposal will impact on this. I have discussed the contents of the statement with James Thompson (TJC) in detail and agree with its conclusions.

Essentially, the building retains its original form and some of its original layout and externally exhibits many original and characteristic details. The building is of national significance on account of its architectural and historical interest, and this is reflected in its status as a Grade II Listed Building. However, there have been later changes and additions and a fire in the recent past followed by extensive water ingress that has caused much damage to the interior. Importantly, the rear wings abut the original house body on straight joints with little tying in evident. This fact plus historic settlement / subsidence and the action of weathering has resulted in the rear walls separating from the vertical. This is evident internally where floors no longer meet the walls at first floor. Externally, full depth diagonal cracks can be seen (that are also expressed internally), openings are out of alignment and disturbances in the outer

leaf also indicate lateral movement in the structure. Stonework is also heavily weathered in the rear wings with extensive hollowing of stonework and general mortar loss being apparent. The submission is accompanied by a structural report that describes the structural failures and advises that re-building of the later wings and the brickwork stack (later) is required. The heritage statement reflects on this and advises that the scale of works ranges across the building, with the most significant interventions comprising the proposed dismantling and rebuilding of the rear wings to address the leaf separation and foundation movement. These works amount to the demolition of secondary extensions to the building. The rear wings will be rebuilt to their existing appearance reducing potential harm to the character of the building; and the frontage range, wherein the majority of the architectural interest of the building lies, will be unaffected. The harm to historic fabric, whilst regrettable, has been shown to be necessary to remedy severe structural problems and will therefore contribute to the long-term preservation of the remaining building. Overall, the scheme is deemed to have a neutral to limited positive effect on the significance of the building. Given the information provided and my own knowledge of the building and its condition I would regrettably agree with this assessment. Ideally, tying in and repair is advisable, but I concede the rear wings are in a very poor state, are later than the principal house, and contribute less. Given the fact this building has suffered a long period of decline and dilapidation I feel that the proposed repair works are justified and proportionate and will sustain the significance of the building. Other works including the infill of the space between the rear wings to improve internal circulation and other minor opening alterations or additions raise no concerns. Internally the house is virtually devoid of historic fixtures and fittings due to the fire and subsequent decay. I note the removal of the dividing wall between the GF diner and kitchen and would advise this represents minor harm to the legibility of this space. However, overall, this is a minor matter and on balance I do not object. Regarding the impact on the setting of the proposed garage block I was initially concerned this may negatively impact on the setting due to its size. However, on balance the orientation of the garage block at ninety degrees to the principal elevation of the listed building means from the roadside the overall impact will be lessened. Even so, I note the side wall of the garage block is in line with that of the principal elevation / front wall of the listed building.

Consequently, I would request the garage block is re-positioned further to the south east to further reduce its prominence and avoid undue competition (visually) with the listed building. Assuming that is achievable I would raise no objections but would suggest rigorous conditioning of an approval to ensure materials and methods are appropriate and sympathetic.'

The plans have been amended and the garage block has been repositioned in line with the Conservation Officers comments. Overall, the proposal is acceptable and would preserve the character of the Listed Building and is in compliance with Local Plan Policies, D1, HE1 and HE3 and is therefore considered acceptable subject to conditions.

#### Residential Amenity

The building is detached, and the rear extension and garage block is set approx. 18m from the dwelling to the rear. The new windows to the proposed rear extension are not habitable and would not cause any significant overlooking. The proposal would not cause any significant overshadowing or overbearing impact to the adjacent dwellings. There are no objections in terms of residential amenity and the proposal is in accordance with policy GB2 and the SPD House Extensions.

#### Highway Safety

The dwelling is served from a shared access and turning and sufficient vehicular parking is available within the curtilage of the dwelling. In terms of the access the proposed boundary walls and the installation of gates the proposals are considered acceptable and adequate visibility is maintained. The Highways Officer considers that there are no adverse impact upon the highway and has no objection subject to the parking area being surfaced in a hard surface in order to prevent the tracking of stone chippings onto the highway. The applicant has agreed to this and a condition which requires the access to be hard surfaced.

The proposals are therefore considered to have minimal highway implications. The proposal is considered to be in compliance with policy T4 of the Local Plan.

### Impact on PROW

A Public Right of Way (PROW) runs along the access to Bank House and the converted barns to the rear. Concerns have been raised that fencing has been erected to fence off the public right of way and that the surfacing is poor. The applicants do not have control over the whole length of the access and the proposed wall and gates do not impact the PROW. At the time of the site visit PROW was accessible from Barnsley Road.



### **Recommendation**

**Approve** with conditions