
2022/0222 and 2022/0225 (LBC)

Mr Brian Mangham

Removal of existing conservatory to enable erection of single storey rear extension that includes multi fuel log burner and associated chimney, single storey link extension, erection of detached summerhouse outbuilding in rear garden, addition of juliett balcony and privacy screen and formation of parking area and erection of car port (Part Retrospective) (Amended Description)

The Long Barn, 134 Genn Lane, Barnsley, S70 6NW

Site Location & Description

The applicant's residential dwelling refers to a converted barn on Genn lane in Ward Green. The barn has an L-shape with the main section of the dwelling being rectangular in shape measuring 19m x 6m, and an attached smaller barn to the South-West corner measuring 6m x 8m – attached to the neighbouring property (no. 130 Genn lane). The building has a conservatory projecting off the Western elevation with a grassed and landscaped garden to the West which contains numerous trees, as well as 2 x outbuildings (summer house and car port) and a gravel parking area.

Genn Lane is one of the primary routes connecting the areas of Worsborough and Ward Green to Park Road/The Town Centre. The property is found within a small courtyard of converted agricultural buildings with access off Genn lane into the shared courtyard used for parking. The building itself is not principally listed but is attached to the nearby listed buildings to the South (nos. 130 and 132 Genn Lane) and in close proximity to another listed building (The Granary, no. 128A Genn Lane) which is 10m to the South-East measured between the closest points of the two buildings. There is a separate access to the property to the immediate North of the dwelling (on Genn Lane).






Proposed Development

The applicant is seeking approval for several alterations to the dwelling, some of which are retrospective with the application being amended to include these elements. The proposed and retrospective alterations include the following:


- Removal of the existing conservatory on the Western elevation and replacement with a single storey extension. The extension is to be constructed from stone, matching slate roof tiles with oak framed windows. The extension will include a log burner and an associated chimney/flue to the Northern elevation of the extension.
- Addition of Juliet balcony to the Southern elevation, to replace the existing with the same dimensions.

- Erection of outbuilding to be used as a summer house and home office – constructed from and finished with timber cladding and oak beams. The timber cladding is to be painted black with a black corrugated roof. The outbuilding is located within the garden area to the West of the dwelling and also contains a log burner and a chimney on the North facing roof slope.
- Introduction of privacy screen (Trellis Fencing) to the Southern boundary line in the South-West corner of the garden.
- Formation of gravel parking area and replacement gates (Retrospective).
- Erection of car port constructed and finished in timber cladding painted black and replacement boundary treatment (timber fencing) which is like-for-like (Retrospective).


Proposed Site Plan to Rear/West of the dwelling (including retrospective parking area):




Proposed Extension plans, Elevations and 3D sketch (Including Juliet Balcony on South Elevation):



Proposed Car Port Plans and Elevations (Retrospective):



Proposed Outbuilding Plans and Elevations (Summer house and home office)



Relevant Planning History

B/86/1009/WB/LB – Conversion of barn into dwelling and garage (Listed Building) (Historic)

B/86/1010/WB – Conversion of barn into dwelling and garage (Historic)

B/91/1535/WB – Renewal of permission B/86/1010/WB for conversion of barn to dwelling (Historic)

B/91/1536/WB/LB – Renewal of permission B/86/1010/WB for conversion of barn to dwelling (Historic)

B/92/0258/WB – Conversion of existing barn into dwelling house and garage (Historic)

B/92/0261/WB/LB – Conversion of barn into dwellinghouse and garage (Historic)

B/94/0454/WB/LB – Erection of chimney to listed building (retrospective) (Approved)

2007/1582 – Erection of a conservatory to side of dwelling (Refused)

2007/2011 – Erection of a side conservatory to dwelling (Listed Building Consent; Approved with conditions)

2007/2015 – Erection of a side conservatory extension to dwelling (Resubmission; Approved with conditions)

2019/0413 - Alterations to Listed Building consisting of provision of replacement windows, removal of internal walls to enable conversion of garage into living room and enlarged bedroom, change from garage door to French doors, ensuite bathroom, installation of multi flue burner with internal flue pipe, erection of external blockwork wall and block-paved hardstanding (Approved with conditions)

2019/0429 - Alterations to Listed Building consisting of provision of replacement windows, removal of internal walls to enable conversion of garage into living room and enlarged bedroom, change from garage door to French doors, ensuite bathroom, installation of multi flue burner with internal flue pipe, erection of external blockwork wall and block-paved hardstanding (Listed Building Consent; Approved with conditions)

2021/1286 – Formation of a 1.2m high external wall, external paving area and courtyard entrance gate (Listed Building Consent; Withdrawn)

Policy Context

Planning decision should be made in accordance with the local 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 Council has also adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes, which are other material considerations.

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 places - The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. 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.

It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

Within section 12, paragraph 130 is the most relevant which indicates that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Local Plan

The Local Plan (adopted January 2019), alongside the Joint Waste Plan and relevant neighbourhood plans, form the statutory development plan for Barnsley. It establishes policies and proposals for the development and use of land up to the year 2033 and will be used when considering planning applications and to coordinate investment decisions that affect the towns, villages and countryside of Barnsley. The Local Plan supersedes 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:

Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development – sets out principles when considering development proposals.

Policy GD1: General Development – sets out appropriate proposals for development.

Policy D1: High quality design and place making – sets overarching design principles for the borough to ensure that development is appropriate to its context, and improves what needs improving, whilst protecting what is good about what we have.

GB1: Protection of Green Belt – 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, the Council 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, on highway safety.

HE1: The Council 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 the building's significance.

H9: Protection of Existing Larger Dwellings – Development within the curtilage of existing larger dwellings will be resisted where it will have an adverse impact on the setting of the original dwelling, and the size of the remaining garden area. The loss of existing larger dwellings will be resisted.

Policy 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.

SPD: House extensions and Other Domestic Alterations

Supplementary Planning Document - House Extensions sets out the design principles that specifically apply to the consideration of planning applications for house extensions, roof alterations, outbuildings & other domestic alterations. The general principles are that proposals for should:

1. be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building
2. not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties
3. maintain the character of the street scene and
4. not interfere with highway safety.

These policies are considered to reflect the 4th Core Principle in the NPPF, which relates to high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Consultations

Conservation Officer (Two responses):

First response:

This application follows a recently withdrawn application for a small, enclosed area at the western end of the courtyard. This required listed building consent due to the curtilage and attached nature of the structure and this also applies in this case. To be clear the building is not principally listed but is of significance and externally has a strong influence on the setting of Genn House and the Granary which are both individually listed. This new proposal includes the removal and rebuilding of the existing conservatory on the north-western gable, the erection of a summer house to the northwest of the barn, and the alteration of an existing full height window in the south elevation to a door with a small cast iron railing protecting this opening. I visited the site on the 4th of May and can confirm the existing conservatory is entirely modern construction and of no historic merit (erected 2007). Generally, the barn has

been modernised and there are a variety of modern interventions likely to have been implemented following approval of the barn to a dwelling under PP and LBC's between 1986 and renewals up to 1992. Consents were also granted in 2019 for further internal changes. These account for the bulk of the internal changes, partitioning, interior brick skinning and various re-building of external walls around openings occurred. Even so, the barn retains a good degree of sympathy with the setting and the overall plan form / and the bulk of the envelope (minus the roof) appears original or of original fabric. The changes proposed are spilt into those that directly involve the building (the replacement of the conservatory plus chimney and the window) and those that affect the setting (summer house). The existing conservatory is of no value, and I raise no objections to its removal. The replacement structure is generally more traditional in terms of its form and materials and includes masonry (stone) side walls to the north which includes a flue / chimney which matches the existing chimney on the long roadside elevation. The roof is pitched and tiled, and the gable is proposed in timber frame and infilled with glass to the full height of the apex. Clearly this is a modern and contemporary device but uses traditional facing materials (bar the glass) and I feel will appear sympathetic. To the side of the gabled projection is a small glass box infill area. This is borderline acceptable but on balance I do not object due the lack of harm to the wider setting (this is a completely private area) and the reversibility. The proposed conversion of the full height southern courtyard window (which itself is clearly modern – including its proportions – (owing to masonry rebuilding around the area and new cill)) raises no concerns. The opening will be converted to a door with cast iron railings that constitute a minor change and do not in my view harm the setting. To the rear garden of the property a small summer house is proposed. I understand the trees are to remain and this screening plus the location of the structure means this is located in an area of the setting that is the least intrusive. In terms of the design and materials I would class this as neutral and the timber plus the black decoration will not in my view be intrusive or harmful to the setting. Overall, I raise no objections but would suggest the following conditions.

Second response (to the amended scheme including retrospective elements):

I did a site visit for this one on the 4th of May and have provided comments. However, I did indeed notice the new car port and gates to the north eastern corner of the garden. My view on this is that whilst it certainly need PP, I don't feel the structure or the gates are harmful to the setting of the listed building. Generally, that materials are either natural (timber) or visually unobtrusive and overall, despite the proximity I don't feel the structure is intrusive. This is as much to do with the location, as it is to do with the fact this is a much less sensitive part of the setting - the courtyard elevation for example is more sensitive to change, and works here could affect the setting of Genn House and The Granary. As it stands however, the timber gates and car port are acceptable to my mind and I don't raise any objections.

Highways DC – Initially raised concerns with the proposed development given the lack of turning facilities within the parking area which is off a classified road, lack of appropriate visibility, and tight access/egress into the proposed access/parking. However, the applicant provided further details indicating that the access into the site has long been established (this is confirmed on street view) and highways issued a second consultee response acknowledging that it would be possible to access the site and park to the East of the parking area. Subject to a condition which requires the parking area and the area to the East of the gates to be hard surfaced, the objection was removed.

Tree Officer – No objection to the scheme but recommended that further information was submitted prior to development commencing which ensures the protection of the trees.

Pollution Control – No objection subject to a condition and informative.

Representations

Neighbouring properties were notified on two occasions – once for the original proposal (April 2022) and once for the amended proposal which included retrospective elements such as the parking area, car port and replacement boundary treatment (June 2022).

Original proposal:

Two representations have been received, objecting to the proposal raising the following concerns:

- The summer house (which showed 'guest house' on the original plans) appears to be an attempt to expand the existing AirBnB business on site. Guests are coming to the site on a regular basis and there are genuine concerns that the development will exacerbate these issues.
- This is the second application over the last couple of months, all apparently geared towards increased footfall for a commercial venture that has had an immediate impact on all residents of a very small residential settlement.
- The privacy screen to the front/South of the dwelling may detrimentally impact on parking provision.
- Genn Lane is on a higher ground level than the neighbouring property and there are concerns that the summer house and Juliet balcony will have a detrimental impact on the privacy enjoyed by the neighbours.
- The development will increase the number of fuel burning stoves on the site to 4. It is expected that these will meet the regulations of the smoke free zones of the area.

Amended Proposal (retrospective elements):

No representations received.

Assessment

Principle of development

The applicant's property resides within the Green Belt. Proposed development in the Green Belt must adhere to Local Plan Policies GB1 and GB2. GB2 states that buildings should not be extended or altered where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions exceed the size of the original building. The original building is how the building stood in 1948 or whenever the house was built, whichever is later. The policy is measured/assessed in internal floorspace, with floorspace within the roof space not taken into the account. Outbuildings are not taken into account when calculating original floorspace but are taken included within the calculations when identifying cumulative additions to the original dwelling.

The building is historic, visible on O/S maps from as early as 1890 with the original building being the rectangular barn and the attached smaller barn. The building has been extended previously with a conservatory attached to the Western elevation with 2 x outbuildings in the rear garden. The following dimensions have been calculated:

Original – 158sqm

Existing extensions (including outbuildings but excluding the removed conservatory and car port which is retrospective and will be included below) – 8.5sqm

Proposed extensions and outbuildings (including car port) – 49sqm
Total – 57sqm

As such, the policy restriction enclosed within Local Plan Policy GB2 in terms of floorspace has been complied with. However, general compliance with Local Plan Policy GB1 will be required which states that all such development will still be considered in terms of their openness of the Green Belt and whether they cause other harm.

In this case, the proposed development includes various alterations and extensions to the dwelling, which are required to be individually and accumulatively assessed against the restrictions of Local Plan Policies GB1 and GB2.

The proposed dwelling extension is to replace an existing conservatory, almost doubling the existing projection and floor space, but nonetheless this is considered to be sympathetic to the size and scale of the host dwelling. The extension is designed with a setback on the Northern side elevation and a set down in the roof level. The proposed summer house measures 26.5sqm with a maximum roof ridge height of 3.7m which is not considered to be excessive by domestic standards. Both the floorspace size and overall scale of the summer house is considered to be sympathetic to the host dwelling. The proposed car port (retrospective) will replace a series of smaller outbuildings on site which had a similar footprint size to the proposed car port. The car port is appropriately designed with a restrained height and scale and the site visit showed that it is largely screened from public areas by the boundary treatment and trees. The replacement fencing/gates are almost identical to those which they have replaced (as shown on google street view) and have little impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Likewise, the Juliet balcony does not increase the size of the dwelling at all, and the size of the opening is not being enlarged through the development. There are also trees on site which are being retained and present natural screening into the site from Genn Lane and the surrounding area.

All in all, it is the opinion of the LPA that the extensions and alterations to the property are fairly modest in scale, seek to replace existing features – such as the conservatory and previous outbuildings on the Northern boundary – and do not detrimentally impact the openness of the Green Belt or cause other harm, in the opinion of the LPA. The proposed development is in compliance with Local Plan Policy GB1 and GB2 and is acceptable in principle, subject to other local and national planning policies being complied with.

Residential Amenity

Two objections have been received in response to the original proposal raising concern with various elements, particularly in relation to the addition of the Juliet balcony and the summer house which face directly onto the neighbouring property and the neighbouring rear garden area, resulting in overlooking which is accentuated by the applicant's property being on a higher ground level. Concern has also been raised as to the real intended use of the development given that part of the building is used as an AirBnB, with concerns that this will be expanded should an approval be granted. These concerns have been acknowledged and can be understood and will be assessed below. However, it should be noted that the existing use of part of the property as an AirBnB is not being considered during this application. Local Plan Policy H9 seeks to protect and retain existing larger dwellings, which is classified as 4+ bedrooms or a dwelling that could be converted to 4 bedrooms without significant adaptation. The existing bedroom number is unspecified on the plans provided but there is clearly a minimum of 2 with a significant sized building that contains rooms capable of conversion and sub-division. The dwelling is therefore classed as an existing larger dwelling. The proposed development is not for the sub-division of the building into a larger holiday let, which would require separate permission and the proposed development is in compliance with H9 as it does not change the use of the dwelling. Nor does it have an adverse impact on

the setting of the dwelling or the size of the remaining garden area. The expansion of the existing AirBnB business (or sub-division of the dwelling) would require planning permission and it is likely that this would be found unacceptable in terms of Local Plan Policy H9 and possibly GD1.

The Juliet balcony is located on the Southern elevation, facing directly onto the neighbouring property (no. 130 Genn Lane) and towards the shared courtyard area. The site visit and the elevation drawings show that there is an existing window in the very same position on the Southern elevation with the elevations showing that this has the exact same dimensions as the proposed Juliet balcony and full-length opening door. The Juliet balcony will have a very minimal projection from the elevation with no space to step onto the balcony to be used for sitting/socialising etc. The Juliet balcony will face directly onto the Northern elevation of the neighbouring property at no. 130 Genn Lane, which also contains habitable room windows. The distance between the Juliet balcony/Southern elevation of the dwelling is c.10m which is much less than the recommended 21m separation distance between habitable rooms. However, this relationship is existing with the distance between the two windows not being decreased through the development. It is also appreciated that the Juliet balcony is also raised slightly from the ground but is still effectively a ground floor window. Additionally, being positioned on the Southern elevation, it faces onto what is a shared courtyard and therefore not a private area. Juliet balconies do tend to increase the potential for overlooking into neighbouring properties but in this case, it will be very similar to the existing relationship and the slightly increased impact is not considered significant enough to refuse.

The outbuilding is located within the garden area with the frontage (containing a door and several windows) facing South onto the very rear portion of the applicant's garden and no. 130's rear garden – at a fairly close distance of around 7m. The concerns regarding overlooking can be understood but the outbuilding does not face onto the neighbouring property itself and is at a distance of c.18m to the rear elevation of no. 130 which is at an acute angle. Additionally, there is fairly strong boundary treatment/vegetation on the shared boundary between the two properties. As such, there is no direct view into a large part of the neighbouring garden area. The plans also reference the addition of a privacy screen on the Southern boundary line and whilst no elevation drawings have been submitted for this, the applicant has confirmed it would be trellis fencing with a height of 1.2m to provide additional screening. The use of the outbuilding has also been clarified to be a summer house/home office which is a standard use for a domestic outbuilding and a condition will be attached to ensure that it is not used as for separate living accommodation or any commercial use.

The proposed extension is built off the Western elevation of the dwelling facing onto the applicant's substantially sized garden area. It has a large amount of glazing on the Western elevation but again this does not face onto any neighbouring property, with strong boundary treatment to the South. The extension is single storey and is modestly sized compared to the host dwelling, is situated to the North of neighbouring properties and will have very little overshadowing or overbearing impact to the neighbours.

The parking area and replacement fence/gates (retrospective) are located to the Northern side of the dwelling, away from residential properties and have little impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours.

The Car Port (Retrospective) is modestly sized, again positioned to the North-West of the dwelling away from residential properties and it is also considered that this has little impact on the residential amenity enjoyed of the neighbours.

All in all, whilst the concerns by the neighbours have been appreciated and can be understood, the proposed individual alterations to the dwelling are considered to be

restrained and fairly modest in size/scale. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

The applicant's property is not principally listed but is attached to a listed building to the South (Group listing at nos. 130 and 132 Genn Lane) and is therefore considered to be listed by virtue of attachment. Additionally, there is a listed building to the South-East (The Granary, no. 128a) at a fairly close proximity. The proposed development will therefore be assessed in terms of impacting its own historic character and that of the three nearby listed buildings.

The proposed development comprises of several elements which will change the appearance and character of the dwelling and its garden area. The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection to the majority of the proposed works subject to conditions. The individual elements of the proposed development will be assessed in further details in the sub-sections below:

Proposed Extension to the dwelling:

The proposed extension is to replace an existing conservatory which is clearly a modern addition to the historic building which the Conservation Officer argues has no historic value and raised no objection to its removal. The replacement extension has a larger projection at 4.5m, with a width of 5m and a pitched roof with a height of 3m to the eaves and 5.2m to the roof ridge. It features a modern and contemporary design with oak beams and a large amount of glazing on the Western elevation, as well as a chimney/flue on the Northern elevation. However, this is considered to be an attractive design and overall complements the existing dwelling, whilst being sympathetically sized. The extension features a setdown of 0.5m in the roof level and is set back from the Northern side elevation by 0.5m. This will ensure that the extension remains subservient to the host dwelling and will reduce the potential for the unsightly bonding between old and new materials. The chimney will be visible from the road/Genn Lane but there are similar features on the existing dwelling and this will be constructed from matching/appropriate materials.

The extension is close to the attached listed building (no. 130) but will largely be screened from view by the existing attached smaller barn which lies directly between the applicant's property and no. 130. Similarly, it will be screened from view from the courtyard (and neighbouring properties) to the East. Overall, the extension meets the design principles within the SPD as well as Local Plan Policies D1, HE1 and HE3 and is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Proposed Outbuilding (Summer House/Home Office):

The outbuilding has a footprint size of 26sqm, which compared to the host dwelling (158sqm) and the total garden area (c. 300sqm) is considered to be sympathetic in terms of overall scale. The maximum roof ridge height is limited to 3.7m which is standard for domestic outbuildings and is not considered to be excessive. Additionally, the eaves height is limited to 2.4m which is in compliance with the SPD which aims to restrict outbuildings to 2.5m. It is constructed/finished in timber cladding painted black with a black corrugated roof. The design/style is that of a traditional log cabin and is considered to be appropriate within this setting. Additionally, there are several trees within the garden area of the property, especially on the Northern boundary line which would help screen the development from the road.

The Conservation Officer has stated in his response that the summer house is small scale with trees to be retained which screen it. The location of the summer house is also in a position in which the impact on the setting of the listed buildings is the least intrusive. Indeed, whilst it would likely be visible from the rear elevation of no. 130, there is substantial screening on the boundary line and as mentioned above the height is limited to what is standard for domestic outbuildings.

As part of the Summer House development includes the erection of a 1.2m trellis fence on the South-Western corner of the garden area. This is fully enclosed within the applicant's property, and not on the boundary line and is considered to be appropriate. It will largely be screened from the surrounding area and is to provide some additional screening from the outbuilding. It is considered to be appropriate in terms of design.

Addition of Juliet balcony:

The Juliet balcony is attached to the Southern elevation and therefore faces directly onto the neighbouring listed buildings and onto the Courtyard area. The elevation drawings show that there is not a significant difference from the existing opening/window to the proposed with the Juliet balcony not changing the overall shape or size of the window. The opening will be converted to a patio door, with a small Juliet balcony on the external elevation which has a very minimal projection – with no space to stand on with the balcony barely being visible when installed. The Conservation officer has indicated that the existing window (to be replaced) is clearly modern and raises no objections to the replacement of this element. The opening will be converted to a door with cast iron railings that constitute a minor change and do not harm the setting of the listed buildings. Subject to the use of matching timber windows, it is not considered that this replacement presents concerns in terms of design or on the historic setting.

Formation of parking area and replacement fence/gates (retrospective):

The formation of a parking area (subject to certain restrictions) is usually considered to be permitted development, hence not requiring a planning application, within the curtilage of residential dwellings. However, permission is required in this case due to the parking area being located within the curtilage of a listed building. Likewise, the erection of any boundary treatment within the curtilage of a listed building requires planning permission.

The parking area is entirely enclosed within the site, screened from the road by the substantial 2m-high boundary treatment. It is not visible from the street and has little impact on the character or setting of the listed buildings. Highways have been consulted on this proposal and have requested that the parking area is hard surfaced to bring it up to modern highways standards. The applicant has agreed to this measure and also agreed to hard surface the area of land in front of the gates (to the immediate East of the gate and north of the building). Hard surfacing is considered to be an appropriate surfacing material, preferred over gravel. This is therefore considered to be appropriate in terms of design.

The replacement gate/fence is very similar to what is has replaced and is considered to be appropriate in terms of design with a standard height. The only real difference to the previous gate is that it is wider to allow vehicular access onto the parking area.

The Conservation Officer has been consulted on both of these elements (replacement gate and parking area) and had no objections.

Erection of car port and replacement boundary treatment (retrospective):

The historic aerial photographs clearly show that there were 2 x outbuildings on the part of the site where the car port has been erected. The previous outbuildings have obviously since been removed to make space for the car port but were likely not important structures as the Conservation Officer has not objected or raised concern with their removal. The car port is modestly sized measuring 3m x 5m, with a pitched roof with a limited height of 1.8m to the eaves and 3.2m to the roof ridge at the highest point. This is considered to be in compliance with the SPD in that it is sympathetically sized compared to the host dwelling, with an eaves height below 2.5m and does not take up a disproportionate amount of garden space. It is constructed/finished in timber cladding painted black with natural oak beams which is considered to be appropriate.

The boundary treatment on the Northern boundary line and associated gates providing access to the parking area has been replaced, almost like for like with timber fencing. This is very similar to what was previously on site and is appropriate in terms of design.

Accumulative Design and Historic Environment impact:

Accumulatively, it is felt that the proposed elements of the development have all been designed with the original character of the dwelling and the surrounding area in mind and will be constructed out of suitable materials. The majority of the alterations (excluding the Juliet balcony which is a fairly minor change, similar to the existing) are on elevations which are largely screened from the nearby listed buildings and do not have a direct detrimental impact on the historic buildings. They are all considered to be in line with the restrictions of the SPD for House Extensions and Local Plan Policies D1, HE1 and HE3 and are considered to be acceptable.

Highway safety

The Site Visit conducted by the Case Officer showed that there had been several unauthorised alterations to the dwelling including the reinstatement of an access off Genn Lane (to the north of the property) and the formation of a parking space within the site, with replacement boundary treatment and a wider gate to allow vehicular access into the site. As such, the original application did not include these elements, but the Case Officer requested that they were added to the application with associated plans/elevations submitted. Planning permission is not usually required for the formation of a parking area/hard surfacing within the curtilage of dwellings but in this case it does as it is within the curtilage of a listed building.

Genn Lane is a classified road with the dwelling on a slight bend. Typically, creating a parking space/access off a classified road would require high quality specifications including sufficient space within the site allow for vehicles to turn so that they can enter and leave the parking space in forward gear. There is no such space to allow for these facilities in this case with visibility poor leaving the parking area. However, what was also clear from the historic maps/google street view images is that the access/dropped kerb into the site from Genn Lane has long been established (visible from 2010 street view images) and highways have record of these works being undertaken in the past. As such, the applicant has not actually created an access onto the site, rather a parking space has simply been formed with a wider gate allowing access into the space. Colleagues in Highways have been consulted on this proposal and whilst an objection was initially made to the intensification of the access given it did not meet the required specifications, the applicant submitted additional information (access strategy) to explain and justify the scheme. On receipt of this, highways issued a second response stating it acknowledges a fallback position in that the applicant could park in the area to the immediate East of the gates. This would have a very similar impact on the highway as parking within the parking space would. There is also the clear benefit as the applicant has agreed to hard surface the parking area and the space to the East of the

gates. With all this considered, it is felt that there is a clear fallback position in that the resident could use the space to the immediate North of the dwelling for parking provision. It is felt that the parking space would have a very similar impact to this and the LPA is not in a reasonable position to refuse the parking area and other associated changes.

Impact on Trees

There are several trees within the garden area of the site, with the proposed outbuilding positioned in the middle of several of them and their respective rooting systems. A tree survey has been provided and a basic method statement which indicates that the outbuilding will be placed on site using no-dig techniques into the rooting system. The Tree Officer has assessed this information and has not directly objected to the proposal given the trees are unprotected but there are clear benefits to their retention for screening for visual amenity reasons. However, additional information was still required in the form of a full Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). This is normally covered under a condition with a discharge of conditions application; however the applicant submitted this information up front for assessment. The Tree Officer indicated that this was basic but provided sufficient justification in order to not raise any concerns/objections based on the impact on the retained trees.

Other matters

The neighbour comments partially referenced the use of the site as an AirBnB. The LPA is aware of this matter, but it goes beyond the assessment of this planning application. This situation will continue to be monitored and appropriate conditions will be attached to the decision notice to ensure that no further encroachment will occur – such as using the domestic outbuilding as part of the AirBnB. As covered in the residential amenity section above, Local Plan Policy H9 restricts the sub-division of existing larger dwellings in the Borough and expansion of the AirBnB or sub-division of the building into a larger holiday let would not be in compliance with H9.

Recommendation

Approve with conditions