

Agenda Item A13	Committee Date 8 February 2016	Application Number 15/01399/FUL
Application Site Sidegarth Sidegarth Lane Halton Lancaster	Proposal Demolition of various extensions and erection of a single storey rear extension and two storey side extension	
Name of Applicant Mr & Mrs M Swindlehurst	Name of Agent Mr Sam Edge	
Decision Target Date 21 January 2016	Reason For Delay Committee Cycle	
Case Officer	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett	
Departure	None	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval – subject to amended plans	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 This application relates to an existing detached rural dwelling located in between the settlements of Aughton, Over Kellet and Gressingham. It is accessed off Kirkby Lonsdale Road via a long privately-maintained track, known as Sidegarth Lane, which is also a public right of way. The line of the right of way appears to cross between the dwelling and adjacent barn, and then splits beyond the residential boundary, with one path continuing in a south east direction and the other to the south west. The site is located within the Countryside Area, as identified on the local plan proposals map and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). There is a high pressure gas pipeline located approximately 280 metres to the south east of the site.
- 1.2 The submission sets out that the original part of the dwelling dates from the 17th century, although it has been altered since that date. The property is constructed of stone, painted white. The property is not listed. There are a number of large extensions to the building, most believed to date from the 1960s, although the single storey addition to the front may be older. There is a barn in close proximity to the dwelling which appears to have been used to some extent with the dwelling (and is subject to a separate planning application for conversion to holiday use, which will be considered on this Committee Agenda). The property benefits from a considerable amount of domestic curtilage. The nearest neighbouring residential property is approximately 450 metres to the south west.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks to remove a number of existing extensions to the property, and erect a single-storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension. Both extensions would be contemporary in style; the two-storey element being constructed in brick with dark grey metal windows and a dark grey capping detail to the roof; whilst the single-storey extension would have similar capping detail but with a grass roof and oak cladding. The grass roof would make use of the natural contours of the site to form part of the wider garden area. The extensions would be linked to the traditional farmhouse by virtue of a glazed link. The original stonework to the farmhouse would be exposed and repointed.
- 2.2 The garden area would be remodelled, including new stone walls, refuse storage and a cycle

storage area. The two-storey extension would be glazed to overlook the remodelled garden. Works to existing trees are proposed and these are detailed later in this report.

3.0 Site History

3.1 There is no recent planning history regarding this farmhouse.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objections – access arrangements are unaffected.
County Archaeology	Given that Sidegarth is not Listed nor in a Conservation Area, they do not recommend refusal. Instead they recommend a condition regarding (i) a more detailed historic building survey prior to demolition; and, (ii) a watching brief held during groundworks in certain locations of the site.
Conservation	No objections to the removal of the unsympathetic 20 th Century additions to the farmhouse; or the contemporary principle of the proposed extensions. There are however concerns regarding the scale and position of the two-storey element; materials; and alterations to the farmhouse façade.
Environmental Health	No comments received within statutory timescale.
Tree Protection Officer	No objections - subject to conditions requiring: submission of an arboricultural method statement; implementation of tree/hedge protection; details of hard and soft landscaping.
Parish Council	No comments received within statutory timescale.
Public Rights of way Officer	No comments received within statutory timescale.
Ramblers Associations	Objection – Footpath 18 passes through the site – it is not possible to determine the effect of development on the route; the route may already be obstructed.
National Grid	No comments received within statutory timescale.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 No comments have been received.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles
- Paragraphs 56, 58 and 60 – Requiring Good Design
- Paragraph 115 – Conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Paragraph 118 – Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
- Paragraphs 135 – Non-Designated Heritage Assets

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

- SC1 – Sustainable Development
- SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

6.3 Lancaster District Local Plan - saved policies (adopted 2004)

- E3 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- E4 – Countryside Area

6.4 Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted December 2014)

- DM27 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity
- DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact

- DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
- DM33 – Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings
- DM35 – Key Design Principles

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Design, scale, massing and the implications for the non-designated heritage asset;
- Impact of the extensions on the AONB;
- Impact on trees; and,
- Ecological Impacts.

7.2 Design, scale, massing and the implications for the non-designated heritage asset

7.2.1 The farmhouse at Sidegarth is visible on the 1840s Ordnance Survey (OS) map with extensions to the front, which were most likely agricultural buildings/stabling. OS maps indicate that the original house previously extended further west, but that this part was demolished in the later 19th Century. The local planning authority consider the house is capable of being considered as a non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with the advice provided in DM DPD Policy DM33. This approach is supported by the Council's Conservation Officer, particularly given that the proposed development includes removal of its' modern additions, which in turn will reveal more of the farmhouse and provide information about its' original construction (and any archaeological interests).

7.2.2 At present, much of the farmhouse is hidden from view, especially the front (north-western) elevation. Removal of the lengthy single-storey front extension - which presently accommodates a hall, utility, kitchen, sitting room, bedroom and bathroom - is considered to significantly benefit the setting of the farmhouse; as will the removal of the two-storey rear extension (currently accommodating an office and two sitting rooms, with a landing, bathroom and bedroom above). These works will leave the traditional farmhouse intact.

7.2.3 The new extensions are - like the buildings they replace - significant in scale, wrapping around two sides of the farmhouse but separated from it by a glazed link. They would provide a large ground floor living room/kitchen/diner, with a separate study and a series of smaller utility/storage buildings adjoining an integral garage. On the upper floor, three new bedrooms and a bathroom are proposed. Whilst the extensions are not dissimilar in terms of footprint, they do differ considerably in terms of design. The simple lines of the new extensions would rationalise the buildings and allow for a contemporary approach to be adopted, to help emphasise the different periods of construction. Whilst this is supported in principle by Officers, including the Conservation Officer, amendments to the design have been sought to reduce the massing impacts upon the farmhouse. In addition, further clarification has been sought regarding the fenestration and materials, and it is anticipated that these details will be available prior to the Committee meeting. Whilst it is clear that the new extensions are capable of being accommodated on this domestic plot, refinement of the design is required to ensure that the setting of the non-designated heritage asset is not compromised.

7.2.4 Aside from the removal of the later extensions, there are other heritage-related positives that emerge from the proposals, most notably the replacement of the concrete tiles with natural slate; the removal of impermeable non-traditional masonry paint (subject to pointing and mortar details being appropriate) and the retention of the interesting large chimney stack.

7.2.5 The proposals will reveal far more of this non-designated heritage asset than is currently visible, and the proposals have the potential to enhance its' setting. However this is subject to the receipt of amended plans referred to in 7.2.3 above.

7.2.6 The County Archaeologist has requested a single condition which will ensure proportionate archaeological recording and analysis. This would enable assessment of any buried remains that may still be in situ on the site of the older part of the property that occupied part of this site originally. This condition is considered appropriate.

7.3 Impact of the Extensions on the AONB

7.3.1 The property is neatly contained within its own setting by existing trees. Areas of woodland screen the site from the west, whilst other smaller swathes of woodland helps screen the property to the south. Views are available to the north and west but, notwithstanding the public footpath which offers views at close quarters, the views from elsewhere in the AONB are at considerable distance. At the distances involved, the extensions would be seen against the backdrop of the existing house and nearby barn. It is considered therefore that the proposal would not have any adverse impact upon the wider AONB designation.

7.4 Impact upon Trees

7.4.1 A tree survey and protection plan has been submitted with the application. A total of 9 trees have been identified within the context of the proposed development, including within the setting of the nearby dwelling. The species include Apple, Douglas Fir, Scots Pine, Sycamore, Birch, Beech, and Cypress. Four trees, namely T5, Birch, T6, Beech, and T8 & T9, both Leyland Cypress are proposed for removal because of their poor overall condition. T6 is the most significant of the trees proposed to be felled and concerns have been identified with regard to the structural integrity of this mature tree. The removal of these trees is considered to be acceptable in the interest of good arboriculture practice. However, new replacement tree planting is anticipated and would be controlled by condition. A Sycamore (T7) is a mature tree that has been pollarded in the past. This tree must be maintained as a pollarded tree and proposals include a regular 5 year pollarding programme which is acceptable.

7.4.2 The grass roof is an interesting addition to the proposals and, whilst not impacting upon the established trees, it has the potential to contribute successfully to the integration of the development within the surrounding landscape.

7.5 Ecological Impacts

7.5.1 A bat survey has been submitted to accompany this application. Whilst bats were found in the nearby barn, none were found in the areas of the dwelling that are proposed to be demolished. The survey confirms that the house is well-sealed offering no access potential for bats. Therefore, it is considered that there will be no impact upon protected species as a consequence of the development proposals.

7.6 Public Rights of Way

7.6.1 A public right of way (FP 18) appears to cross the wider site. The agent has now responded to requests to illustrate the route of the footpath on the site plan. The route of the footpath appears to run in between the barn and the nearby dwelling. As such, it is considered that the proposed extensions and works within the domestic curtilage can be accommodated without obstruction to the footpath route, and the proposal can, in planning terms, be considered favourably. However it would be prudent to include an Advice Note on any grant of permission to indicate that the developer is not entitled to obstruct any public footpath, and any works that did so would be subject to a stopping-up or diversion of a public right of way Order under the appropriate Acts.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are none to consider as part of this application, as the proposal relates to extensions to an existing house.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The demolition of modern additions to the farmhouse is to be welcomed, as are the sensitive changes to the external elevations, including the roof materials.

9.2 The new extensions offer a more logical arrangement for the dwelling, and in principle the contemporary approach is an appropriate one to pursue. However there remains some details that require further clarification, and the submission of amended plans to reduce the massing impacts

upon the farmhouse. It is anticipated that these amendments will be available prior to the Committee meeting, as discussed with the agent, and if this transpires in accordance with those discussions then planning permission can be granted.

Recommendation

That subject to the receipt of amended plans, Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3-year timescale
2. Amended plans condition
3. Development as per approved plans
4. Materials to be agreed in writing and then implemented in accordance with agreed details; including:
 - Details and samples of all external materials, including slate, roof membrane, stone, brick, oak cladding
 - Details of parapet, ridge, verge and eaves details
 - Mortar and pointing sample
 - Details of rainwater goods
 - Details of windows and doors, including glazing link (including colour)
 - Details of boundary treatments, including retaining walls
5. Submission of an arboricultural method statement (including pollarded tree)
6. Details of hard and soft landscaping
7. Implementation of tree/hedge protection
8. Archaeological recording and analysis condition
9. Removal of all permitted development rights

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

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 provided advice during the pre-application stage of the process in accordance with Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the applicant's subsequent proposal has taken that advice into account. As a result the local planning authority and the applicant have positively and proactively addressed the issues to enable permission to be granted.

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.