

Item No 07:-

17/04707/LBC

**Barn To The Rear Of Porch Cottage
Little Rissington
Bourton On The Water
GL54 2ND**

Item No 07:-**Conversion and alterations of barn to form residential dwelling at Barn To The Rear Of Porch Cottage Little Rissington Bourton On The Water Glos GL54 2ND**

Listed Building Consent 17/04707/LBC	
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs D Hamilton
Agent:	Plan-A Planning And Development Ltd
Case Officer:	Christopher Fleming
Ward Member(s):	Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington
Committee Date:	11th July 2018
RECOMMENDATION:	REFUSE

Main Issues:

(b) Impact on the listed building

Reasons for Referral:

The application has been referred to committee by Cllr MacKenzie-Charrington to assess the impact of the proposals on the listed building given its current condition.

1. Site Description:

The barn to the rear of the Porch Cottage is Grade II listed, the barn can be divided into two distinct sections; the two storey bull house, and the four bay single storey store. Attached to the store is another agricultural building, the 'Open fronted shelter north of Brushwood Barn' which is also Grade II listed. This latter building has already been converted to residential use. These barns are located to the rear of Porch Cottage (Grade II listed) which is located on the main road through Little Rissington, and within the Little Rissington Conservation Area.

The application site is located to the eastern side of the cottages fronting onto the road through the village, and the building forms part of a 'U-shaped' building. The site is also within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

2. Relevant Planning History:

No history for the barn in question. Other history on the site for adjacent barns is as follows:

13/03744/FUL and 13/03745/LBC Planning permission and listed building consent for the Conversion of open fronted shelter and stone built store to holiday let. Permitted 09.12.2013

15/01024/FUL and 15/01025/LBC planning permission and listed building consent for the conversion of open fronted shelter and stone built store to dwelling. Permitted 24.04.2015.

16/01715/FUL and 16/01716/LBC Planning permission and listed building consent for Amendment to planning permission 15/01024/FUL and 15/01025/LBC. Permitted 18.07.16

3. Planning Policies:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

4. Observations of Consultees:

Conservation Officer - comments included within the report

5. View of Town/Parish Council:

Support the proposal

6. Other Representations:

1 letter of objection from a member of the public regarding time frames to determine the application

7. Applicant's Supporting Information:

Heritage Statement

8. Officer's Assessment:

The barn to the rear of the Porch House is a Grade II Listed Building. The Local Planning Authority is therefore statutorily required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest it may possess, in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) asks that Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Paragraph 132 states that when considering the impact of the proposed works on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It also states that significance can be harmed through alteration or development within the setting. Paragraph 133 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm applications should be refused unless it is demonstrated that that harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits. Paragraph 134 states that where a development proposal will cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset that is less than substantial harm, that harm is weighed against the public benefits of those works. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account and that a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

During the course of the application the Conservation Officer has raised a number of concerns in relation to the works required to facilitate the conversion. These works included (amongst others) the modification and partial removal of the historic roof trusses, the removal of historic partitions, the creation of a new opening between the single storey range and the bull house, the re-location of a wall opening on the front of the bull house and the alteration of the rear and front walls of the single storey range. Officers concluded that the harm that the proposals would cause, whilst extensive, was not enough to reach the level of substantial harm, (under the terms of the NPPF). However, less than substantial harm does not then automatically lead to a conclusion of acceptability of that harm, which may still be sufficient to warrant refusal. Whilst the harm would be less-than-substantial, it would nevertheless be considerable.

In evaluating the identified harm, in accordance with the paragraph 134 of the NPPF, officers need to weigh it against any potential public benefit resulting from the proposed works. In this case, at present the public benefits of maintaining the building would be at the expense of losing too much of the building's historic interest. With this in mind, officers conclude that the justification of public benefit that has been put forward for this current scheme to be unpersuasive and not the 'clear and convincing' justification that is required by the NPPF.

Overall it is considered that there are no benefits arising out of the proposal that would justify the identified harm, which outweighs the presumption in favour of development set out in the NPPF. As such it is considered that this proposal would not accord with Section 12 of the NPPF, in particular paragraph 134 and section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

9. Conclusion:

From the information that has been submitted, it would appear that the conversion of this listed barn to residential use would require substantial and dramatic interventions, with much of the structure of the building, and a number of its significant features being removed, altered or rebuilt. Not only would the works be contrary to Sections 16 (2) of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990 they would also contradict section 12 of the NPPF.

For the above reasons the application is recommend for refusal, as it is considered that the proposals in this application would be detrimental to the significance of the listed building.

Overall it is considered that there are no public benefits arising out of the proposal that would justify this harm, which outweighs the presumption in favour of development set out in the NPPF. As such it is considered that this proposal would not accord with Section 12 of the NPPF, in particular paragraph 134.

10. Reasons for Refusal:

The outbuildings to the rear of Porch Cottage are Grade II Listed as being of special architectural or historic interest. As such, the Local Planning Authority is statutorily required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest they possess.

The proposals are for alteration or removal of tie beams, purlins, walls, historic partitions and historic cladding, as well as the creation of a number of new openings. These proposals would harmfully alter the character and would contribute to a cumulative degradation to the appearance of the listed building which would be less than substantial harm but considerable.

The proposal would thereby fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the designated heritage asset. No mitigating public benefit would accrue therefrom that would outweigh this harm. The proposal thus conflicts with Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.