

Agenda Item A14	Committee Date 2 March 2015	Application Number 14/01123/LB
Application Site Mill House Formerly Moss House Farm Buildings Spout Lane Wennington		Proposal Listed building application for external and internal works to convert and extend derelict farm buildings, including mill, stables and ancillary accommodation into a residential dwelling with stables and ancillary accommodation
Name of Applicant Mr A Moores		Name of Agent Mr Joe Riley
Decision Target Date 16 December 2014		Reason For Delay Awaiting consideration of the change of use application 14/01122/CU, further consideration and consultation on the heritage impacts and committee cycle
Case Officer		Mrs Jennifer Rehman
Departure		No
Summary of Recommendation		Approve

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The wider site, its surroundings and the building is as described in the accompanying planning application, 14/01122/CU, which also appears on this Planning Committee Agenda.
- 1.2 For the purposes of this Listed Building Consent application, Moss House Mill Farm complex was originally a former steam-powered saw mill, corn mill, smithy with ancillary buildings built as a “model farm” complex in 1846, associated with Wennington Hall. The complex is Grade II listed under two separate listings (both listed in 1990). Although the buildings appear to be structurally sound, aesthetically they are in a poor condition, some elements significantly more so than others.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 Listed building consent is sought for various internal and external works to facilitate the change of use of the complex to form a single dwellinghouse and associated ancillary guest and staff accommodation – akin to a country estate. In respect of the Listed Building Consent, the development is broken down as follows:
- 2.2 **The former mill building** - This building will be converted and extended to create the main dwellinghouse providing 6 bedrooms over three floors. The exterior and openings will be refurbished and renovated, existing lean-to's (to either side) will be re-built like-for-like and the rear lean-to removed and replaced with a modern, glazed orangery. A small glazed link extension is proposed to the east to link with the leisure complex (discussed below). Various other listed building works are proposed, such as repointing, revealing and reinstating historic openings, replacement cast iron rainwater goods and repair or replacement of existing roof timbers and re-roofing.

- 2.3 **Silage Pits** - To the east of the mill, a subterranean leisure complex is proposed in the location of the former silage pits. This shall be accessed via a fully glazed link extension from the mill building. The complex will be in natural stone to match the existing building. The roof of the leisure complex shall be a grassed roof to fit in with the proposed landscaping around the estate with timber cladding and frameless glass forming the north and east elevations.
- 2.4 **Stable and cattle pen Buildings** - The stable and cattle block shall be converted into 3 residential apartments providing accommodation for staff and guests only. The remaining parts of the stable building shall be utilised for storage, utility space, laundry and stables (5 in total with a tack room). The stable courtyard shall be utilised as a kitchen garden and lunging yard. This will involve the removal of modern agricultural interventions/fixtures (including a small lean-to to the north elevation) and modest alterations or making good of existing openings. Some new openings are proposed.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The history of the site is as reported on the accompanying full planning application.

4.0 Consultation Responses

- 4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
English Heritage	Raised concerns over lack of detail in respect of internal fixtures and fittings and compliance with local and national planning policy.
Victorian Society	Object on the grounds of lack of information and assessment of the proposals impacts on the significance of the heritage asset, particularly in relation to the Mill Building.
County Archaeology	No objection subject to a condition requiring an archaeological building recording
Parish Council	Support the proposal
Conservation Officer	No comments provided.
Twentieth Century Society	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.
Ancient Monuments Society	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.
The Council for British Archaeology	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.
Garden History Society	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.
Georgian Group	At the time of compiling this report no comments had been received.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

- 5.1 Site notices and letters to immediate neighbours have been posted. The scheme has also been re-advertised for a change in description. At the time of compiling this report no representations have been made to the application.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

- 6.1 National Planning Policy Framework
 Paragraphs 7, 12, 14, 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles
 Paragraphs 131-134 and 141 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
 Paragraphs 186 - 187 – Decision Taking
National Planning Practice Guidance
- 6.2 Lancaster District Development Management DPD

7.0 Comment and Analysis

- 7.1 The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designed heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. Similarly, the local planning authority in exercising its planning function should have regard to s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states *“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”*. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF seeks to express the statutory presumption set out in s66(1) of the 1990 Act. How the presumption is applied is covered in the following paragraphs of the NPPF, though it is clear that the presumption is to avoid harm. The exercise is still one of planning judgment but it must be informed by the need to give special weight to the desirability to preserve the heritage asset.
- 7.2 The proposal is coherent and well-presented and contains sufficiently detailed assessment of significance of the heritage asset and the impacts of the proposal upon that significance. Additional supporting information has been provided to address concerns of English Heritage and the Victorian Society. The scheme remains largely the same as the 2010 development that was approved in Spring 2011. The main differences relate to the design of the subterranean leisure complex building and the omission of a new basement level under the main mill building. Neither English Heritage nor the Council’s Conservation Officer raised objections to the previous consented proposals subject to conditions. The current, revised scheme is considered an improvement to the previous scheme on two grounds. Firstly, the omission of the new basement negates the need to underpin the historic mill building therefore reducing the risk of damage. Secondly, the revised design of the leisure complex still represents a modern extension but has a more pleasing solid and linear composition rather than the approved circular glass structure. This better reflects the former farmstead’s character. Whilst the local planning authority are supportive, the same cannot be said for the Victorian Society, who whilst being supportive of the re-use of the buildings, have objected to the scheme primarily due to the lack of consideration to the internal fabric of the mill building and the implications of the proposed demolition of an original lean-to and a replacement extension wrapping the chimney. The Victorian Society have been re-consulted on the additional information and any comments received will be provided to Committee verbally.
- 7.3 The scheme involves the restoration and conversion of the listed buildings with a schedule of works proposed to ensure the special architectural and historic features are preserved or enhanced. Due to the condition of the building some re-building is required, but is proposed to be like-for-like in existing materials. Precise details and methods for repair/re-building works can be controlled by condition. There is, as discussed in the proposal section of this report, extensions proposed. Extensions and alterations to listed buildings should only be supported where there can demonstrate that the development would not harm the significance of the heritage asset. In this case, the extensions are modern, subservient and complimentary to the existing historic buildings. The most significant addition to the complex is that of the leisure complex and garaging, but with these located below ground level there is no significant harm to the listed building complex or its setting. Whilst the proposals will alter the character of the heritage asset and will lead to some loss, such loss is not considered substantial. An archaeological building recording condition is necessary to ensure an appropriate historic record for the listed complex is secured. Precise construction and finish details can also be controlled by condition, such as details of the re-pointing of the buildings and precise details of new windows/doors/flues. The use of conditions has been carefully considered having regard to the previous consents and the level of detail provided to date. Given the listed status of the development, conditions are considered necessary to safeguard and preserve features of special architectural or historic interest that the building possesses.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 None.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 Despite the concerns raised by the Victorian Society, the works required to facilitate this change of use are generally considered sympathetic to the listed status of the building and where additions are proposed the designs are such that the historic character and appearance of the buildings would not be undermined or lead to substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. Whilst some modifications and additions are proposed to the complex, the development provides a good opportunity to conserve this important designated heritage asset for future generations to enjoy. The proposals are considered compliant with policy DM30 of the DM DPD and section 12 of the NPPF and on this basis, Members are advised that this listed building application can be supported.

Recommendation

That Listed Building Consent **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3-year time limit.
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. LB precise details, materials and finishes
4. Re-use of existing stone and samples of any new stone/slate to be agreed
5. Re-pointing details
6. Mortar details
7. Boundary details and gates
8. Archaeology/building recording

Article 31, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

The proposal complies with the relevant policies and provisions of the Development Plan and on consideration of the merits of this particular case, as presented in full in this report, there are no material considerations which otherwise outweigh these findings.

The local planning authority has proactively worked with the applicant/agent in negotiating amendments which have now positively influenced the proposal and have secured a development that now accords with the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None.